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HALF a century after the death of Marx the world is different from what it was when that titan of revolutionary thought and struggle left it.

And the colonial world, whose problems have been raised to the level of revolutionary theory and revolutionary policy by Karl Marx, is also different.

The epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution, the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism and the world-wide historical victory of the Five-Year Plan differs from the epoch which followed upon the defeat of the Paris Commune not only by the gigantic sweep of the revolutionary struggle. The present epoch differs from that epoch also by the fact that now revolutionary classes have developed, that tens of millions who had been sunk in dead, historical slumber were roused to battle; the whole world is split in half by the struggle of socialism and capitalism. In this new historical setting the ideas of Marx—including the basic ideas on the national-colonial question—can progress only under the Leninist banner. Only as an inalienable and most important part of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the national-colonial revolution as part of the world proletarian revolution can these ideas win the masses, move millions, tens and hundreds of millions of people, establish a permanent creative bond with life.

In this setting the ideas of Marx must make their way in a struggle with international social-imperialism and social-fascism.

Marx preached over and over again: “No people oppressing other peoples can be free.”

But all over the world the parties of the Second International are participants in the system of colonial plunder and oppression.

Marx's great companion-in-arms, F. Engels, said: “The so-called freedom of the British citizen rests on the suppression of the colonies.” (Letter to Marx, May 23, 1856.) But in imperialist govern-
ments—particularly under the Versailles system—all bourgeois democracy, all “freedom,” “rights” and “constitutional guarantees” are inseparably bound up with colonial slave holding; the bourgeoisie does not resort to stronger and more open means of class suppression only as long as it is able to keep the working class in check by bribing the upper strata with colonial super-profits.

“All the basic contradictions of capitalism, of imperialism, which lead to revolution, all the basic antagonisms in the labor movement which led to a most embittered struggle with the Second International—are all linked up with the division of the population of the world.” (Lenin.)

THE SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC COLONIAL POLICY

The Second International is no longer content with justifying imperialism. The social-democratic agents of finance-capital of different countries cynically bargain at their congresses as to the division of the colonies. The policy of the Second International is to pacify the colonies and semi-colonies. This is the peculiar, ideological “gas detachment” of imperialism.

Marx taught:

“The Hindus will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society sown among them by the British bourgeoisie so long as the present ruling classes in Great Britain itself will not be forced out by the industrial proletariat or so long as the Hindus themselves do not grow strong enough to throw off the British yoke once and for all.”

In contrast to this the resolution of the Brussels Congress of the Second International promised the oppressed people only “that degree of self-government (!!) as is desirable for the native population.”

How great a “degree of self-government” England gave to India we can inquire of Ramsay MacDonald, who took part in concocting this cowardly fraud.

But perhaps some one heard of the fight of the French socialists against the brutality of Pasquier and Co. in Indo-China, against “elections” held for the Syrian “Parliament” with the help of tanks!

Perhaps it is not the Japanese social-democrats who gave us the annexationist slogan—“socialist (!!) control over the rights (???) of Japan in Manchuria in China?”
Marx threatened the usurpers of capital:

"When our European reactionaries, in their flight to Asia, with which they are faced in the near future, finally get to the Chinese Walls, to the gates which lead to the arch-conservative citadel, how are we to know that they won't find there the inscription: 'Republique Chinoise, Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite'."  

Marx exposed the revolutionary embryo of the future in the Taiping movement and mobilized the proletariat of the capitalist powers against intervention in China.

The president of the Second International, Emile Vandervelde, is zealously attacking today the Chinese coolies who oppose imperialism and medievalism under the banner of Marx and Lenin:

"Armed bands, solemnly called the Red Army, wander to and fro, evaporating at the appearance of the regular armies. Generally they are indebted only to the absence of the government army, busy in other places, for the local successes which they have been able to win. We can expect (!) that the Nanking government, freed from this care, will be able to cope with them quickly."  

Sic 'em, Araki, League of Nations, imperialists of the world!

As a consistent proletarian revolutionist, Marx put the question point blank: "Can humanity fulfill its destiny without a radical revolution in the social state of Asia?"  

You want to know what the camp of Otto Bauer and other Austrian "Marxists" think about this?

Listen to the voices coming from this camp: "Down with imperialism to the coolie, means 'Down with the Railroads'; to the artisan, 'Down with the Machines'. This is a reactionary trend back to the Middle Ages."  

Marx untiringly and passionately preached a national-revolutionary war against the oppressors. He did not presuppose that the Otto Bauers and Dans would profane his memory.

Let us bring to mind how Otto Bauer met the Chinese revolution of 1925-1927 from the tribune of the Marseilles Congress. He de-

1 Review New Rhine Newspaper, 1850.
2 E. Vandervelde, A Travers la Revolution Chinoise, p. 223
3 New York Tribune, June 25, 1853.
4 Otto Manchen, China, 1931, p. 218.
clared it a “danger to peace” and added to it the vilest slander against the U.S.S.R., in the spirit of “hundred per cent” interventionism:

“Bolshevism in its very essence is a military caricature of socialism, since it is convinced that emancipation within can be attained only in a bloody civil war, since it is convinced that emancipation on the external field can be achieved only by a bloody war of the revolutionary nations against capitalist nations.”

This “friend of the oppressed” made this revelation after the imperialists had shot at the unarmed demonstrations of workers and students in Shanghai, on Nanking-Road, on May 30, 1924. Otto Bauer was silent about this shooting which opened the doors of the revolution.

But why these researches into the past when Judas Dan, the old Iscariot of Russian counter-revolutionary Menshevism, wrote in the organ of Bauer and Co., Der Kampf, in connection with the attack of the Japanese plunderers on unarmed China, of what a threat, in the sense of Bonapartism and the victory of counter-revolution—the defense of its territory against usurpers constitutes in China!

Marx showed that the national-emancipatory struggle could be successful without an agrarian-peasant revolution, while Austro-Marxism declared that China is ready only for Stolypinism, i.e., for the rule of a feudal-bourgeois counter-revolution.

Marx searched for a non-capitalist, socialist path of development for the backward nations, skipping over capitalism.

The Second International anathemized the very thought of the possibility of such a path as the pernicious offspring of Bolshevism.

The Second International, confronted with Marx, irrefutably testifies not only to the fact that Marx and the Second International are on different sides of the barricades; it proves at the same time that only by fighting against the Second International and all its henchmen can we defend and continue the cause of Marx.

THE STRUGGLE FOR THE REVOLUTIONARY HEGEMONY OF THE PROLETARIAT

If we turn to the general, principal formulation of the national and national-colonial question by Marx, we are easily convinced that Marx always and invariably raised this question from the viewpoint

5 Zweiter Kongress der Sozialistischen Arbeiterinternationale in Marseille 22 bis 27 August 1925, p. 332.
6 Der Kampf, September, 1930.
of the revolutionary proletariat, from the viewpoint of the struggle for the revolutionary hegemony of the proletariat, from the viewpoint, in the final count, of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. In view of the inequality of the revolutionary process this means the subordination of the national question to the interests of the proletarian revolution in the more advanced countries and to the interests of the all-democratic revolution in the more backward countries. In the period of 1848-1871 the national question, the question of national emancipation, of the national-state unification of a large number of nations of Europe was one of the most important questions of the struggle for the democratic revolution in Europe. The shifting of the European bourgeoisie as a whole over to the camp of counter-revolution after the suppression of the uprising of the Paris proletariat in June, 1848, gave a definite class conclusion:

"Neither the Hungarian, the Pole, nor the Italian will be free as long as the worker remains a slave." (Marx, "The Class Struggle in France").

The struggle of the proletariat for the consistent completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and for its transition into a socialist revolution was thus inseparable from the consistently democratic solution of the questions of the independence of Poland, of the national unification of Germany, of the national emancipation of Italy, of the emancipation of Ireland, etc. The struggle for the national-democratic reconstruction of Europe was directed against the international gendarmes of that day, against feudal tsarism, and it could be carried to the end, to the destruction of all the strongholds of reaction only in the struggle with mongrel bourgeois landlord national-reformism under the leadership of the working class. Tsarism represented the bulwark of reaction not only in the West, but also in the East. "Every step backwards in the development of the revolution on the continent was accompanied by the success of Russia in the East." (Marx.) The interests of British capital which fought for its industrial and colonial monopoly, clashed with tsarism. However, it constantly retreated from serious single combat with it, since the destruction of tsarism was fraught with world-wide consequences of the greatest revolutionary significance.

On the other hand the industrial and colonial monopoly of England blocked the highway of revolution.

"If England," writes Marx in the name of the General Council of the First International in 1870, "is the classic home of
landlordism and capitalism then, on the other hand, the material conditions for their abolition are more developed here than elsewhere. The General Council is now placed in a fortunate position thanks to its direct control of the great lever of the proletarian revolution. . . . England can not simply be placed side by side with the other countries. She should be regarded as the home of capital."  

**MARX' DECLARATIONS ON THE COMING UPRISINGS OF THE OPPRESSED NATIONS**

Reviewing the events, the correlation of class forces and interests, the struggle within individual countries and the struggle on the international arena from this international revolutionary proletarian tower, Marx took part in the struggle of the oppressed nations as the authorized representative of the only consistently revolutionary class.

It is precisely because of this that he met the Taiping uprising in China in the full armor of revolutionary knowledge. He boldly declared that the

". . . next uprising of the nations of Europe and the next stage of their struggle for republican freedom and a more economic form of administration will most likely be much more dependent on what will take place today in the Celestial Empire—the direct opposite of Europe—than on any other existing political cause . . . Bearing in mind that British industry has already passed through a great part of its usual cycle, we can boldly prophesy that the Chinese revolution will give off the sparks into the greatly charged mine of the modern industrial system and will bring about the explosion prepared long ago by the general crisis which, when it spreads abroad, will be directly followed by political revolutions on the continent. China causing an upheaval in the western world will be a curious spectacle at the time that the western empires with the help of the British, French and American military vessels implant 'order' in Shanghai, Nanking, and at the mouths of the Grand Canal."  

Gifted prophetic words! The malicious eunuchs of imperialism of the Second International can snigger toothlessly at the fact that it did not happen "according to Marx" in the concrete setting of the 50's and the 60's of the nineteenth century. Then the proletarian revolution did not interlace with the national-colonial revolution.

---

7 Letter to Kugelmann, March 28, 1870.
8 Marx, *Revolution in China and in Europe*, June 14, 1853.
"The empires trading in order," as Marx called them, helped feudalism to gain the upper hand in China by their intervention in order to subordinate feudal China to foreign capital. While at the same time the revolutionary tempos were not adequate enough to upset the calculations of reaction.

However, in the final historical count, Marx was right. The struggle for the republic in China aroused by the "bales of cotton of the British bourgeoisie" became a mortal danger not only to the rule of the British but to the rule of international capital as well. And at the same time it found a bulwark in the experience of October, in the struggle for the Soviets, in the struggle of the U.S.S.R. against world imperialism.

Marx did not bow slavishly to the "bales of cotton" of the British, Japanese and other bourgeoisie as do all the henchmen of social-democracy, including the most "left," who declare these "bales" to be the inviolable, absolute incarnation of civilization to which all must submit. On the contrary! With the fiery passion of a revolutionist, he watched how the "tremendous accumulation of goods" drew bourgeois society to the depths of the industrial crisis, increasing tenfold the revolutionary sweep of the struggle of labor against capital and freeing the tremendous reserve of revolutionary energy of the oppressed people.

Marx attacked the home of capital, never forgetting that

"in the extremities of the bourgeois organism, some violent catastrophies must naturally take place sooner than in its heart where the possibilities for compensation are greater." 9

The master of the world market of those days, England, dreaded failure in China no less than a new outburst of revolution in Europe.

THE RENEGADES IN THE SERVICE OF IMPERIALISM

The contemptible renegade, Roy, having deserted the ranks of communism, presented the social-imperialist theory of decolonization as the newest revelation of Marxism.

Marx, who also struggled with the liberal Manchester cotton adherents of "free trade" on the point of India, for the "soul" of the British proletariat, systematically and to the end exposed their hypocrisy.

9 Review New Rhine Newspaper, May to October, 1850.
"We cannot compel the British bourgeoisie," he wrote in his remarkable article, "The Future Results of the British rule in India", "to desire the emancipation or the genuine improvement of the social condition of the masses of India, an improvement conditioned not only by the development of productive powers, but by their being mastered by the people. But what it can do is to create the material pre-requisites for the realization of both these tasks. Has the bourgeoisie ever done more? Has it ever resulted in progress, without driving both individuals as well as whole nations on to the path of blood and filth, disaster and humiliation?" 10

Hence Marx came to the conclusion that India could be freed only by a national-emancipatory revolution in India, or by a proletarian revolution in England, or by their combined efforts.

British capital cannot and does not want to develop the productive forces of India to an extent which would free India from economic dependence on England or especially to assure that these productive forces would be mastered by the people of India in the way of independent, national industrial development. This would contradict its nature. India is its subjected, official appendage. It must not be economically and politically independent. In the interests of the exploitation and the enslavement of India, the British bourgeoisie are compelled to bring into India a certain insignificant minimum of industrial progress. But the "commanding heights" of foreign capitalism confront the masses of people of India as a hostile and overwhelming force of national oppression.

This is how Marx regarded it.

Marx, we can say, was most foreign to the real social-imperialist superciliousness which treats the national-colonial revolution as if it were mere canaille even then when it tries to cling to it. It roused him to indignation.

We can imagine how the living Marx would react to the vile renegade lines of some Roy or other who in 1930 went so far as to describe the great Chinese Communist Party as a "party of village paupers gravitating to banditism." 11

We can imagine with what disgust he would have answered the inflated social-democratic tirades of Trotsky to the effect that the "peasant movement, although it bears the name of soviets, remains scattered, local, provincial." 12

11 M. N. Roy Revolution and Counter-revolution in China, p. 466.
12 Bulletin of the Opposition, September, October, 1930.
There is no need to engage in idle guesses on these questions. Let us remembr how he regarded the Taiping uprising in China and the Sepoy rebellion in India—two movements which grew out of incomparably more backward conditions, when there was no colonial industrial proletariat.

We know how he estimated the movement of the Taipings in its first phase as long as it had not degenerated under the influence of the landlords and the gentry.

MARX ON THE SEPOY UPRISING

About the Sepoy uprising he wrote:

"From the very first glance it was evident that the subjection of the Indian nation rests on the loyalty of the native army by he organization of which British government created against itself the first basic center of opposition which the Indian people ever had at their disposal. . . . This is the first case in history of Sepoy regiments beating up their European officers; of the Mussulmen and Hindus forgetting their enmity and combining; of, finally, the uprising in the Anglo-Indian army coinciding with the appearance of general dissatisfaction with the British rule on the part of the great Asiatic nations." 13

Marx and Engels had no illusions in regard to the confused, contradictory nature of the movement.

"The French monarchy," they pointed out "was struck first of all not by the peasantry but by the nobility; the uprising in India was begun not by the tortured, oppressed ryots, robbed of their last shirt by the British, but by the Sepoys, dressed, well-fed, fostered, indulged by the British." 14

Marx and Engels appealed for a revolution of ryots—of peasants—as the vindictive sword on the head of the British capitalist usurpers!

Without a Marxist struggle for the emancipation of the enslaved nations, proletarian internationalism would be impossible.

One of the most significant places in Volume I of Capital reads:

"In the United States of America any sort of independent labor movement was paralyzed so long as slavery disfigured a part of the republic. Labor with a white skin cannot emancipate

---

14 Ibid, August 14, 1857.
itself where labor with a black skin is branded. But out of the
death of slavery a new and vigorous life sprang up. The first
fruit of the Civil War was the agitation for the 8-hour work
day—a movement which ran with express speed from the At-
lantic to the Pacific, from New England to California.” (Trans-
lation by E. and C. Paul, p. 309.)

THE ANTI-MARXISM OF VANDERVELDE, BLUM, RENAUDEL & CO.

These lines in Capital are a slap in the face to Mr. Vandervelde,
who supports the barbarous exploitation of the black slaves of Bel-
gian imperialism, to Blum and Renaudel, who helped the French
money lenders suck the blood out of the subjects of the French
colonial empire. This is a contemptuous kick to Henderson and
Lansbury, who support the British autocracy in Black Africa and
this is a slap in the face to Hillquit and Thomas who support the
national oppression of the Negroes in the United States.

Marx was the practical organizer of the struggle against inter-
vention which the British textile manufacturers started in order to
help the slave holders of the South—who supplied them with raw
cotton for their undertakings.

“To the British working class,” he wrote in the proclama-
tion of the German Workers’ Association of Self-Education in
1863, “belongs the everlasting merit that it warded off the re-
peated attempts of the ruling classes at intervention for the
benefit of the American slave holders, organizing a number of
enthusiastic meetings, although the continuation of the Amer-
ican Civil War brought terrible sufferings and deprivations to
millions of British workers.”

Lansbury and Maxton can say: “Nous avons change tout cela.”

Their “repulse” to the modern imperialist “feats” of British
capital, “feats in comparison with which the interventionist attempts
of the 60’s seem but a child’s play, are as like to the tickling of the
soles of Messrs. Churchill and Chamberlain as two drops of water.”

MARX ON THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

The American bourgeoisie of the North by their cowardly dilly-
dallying aroused the indignation of Marx and Engels.

“The North,” writes Marx in a letter to his friend Engels
on Aug. 7, 1862, “has transformed the slaves into a military
force of the South instead of setting them against it. The
South shifts all the productive work onto the slaves and can, therefore, unhindered, throw all its forces to the front. . . .

One regiment of Negroes works miracles on the nerves of the Southerner, . . . Such a war should be led in a revolutionary way; so far the Yankee has tried to carry it on in a constitutional way.”

Marx saw the real conditions for the complete extinction of slavery in the revolutionary war which would simultaneously be a military uprising of the Negroes themselves. The American bourgeoisie crowned this emancipatory struggle by making the Negroes semi-slaves—with share-farming, Jim Crow laws, lynching and the terror of the Ku Klux Klan. No matter how we approach the treasure of the Marxist legacy, there looms everywhere about us the gigantic figure of the revolutionary leader—the fighter and thinker—without reproach and supremely brave.

He was able to grasp, to nurture, to carefully foster and develop every movement of the oppressed against the oppressors in all ends of the world. He was not the revolutionary globe-trotter-cosmopolitan that the petty bourgeois imagination draws. No! He was a world strategist of the proletarian revolution and that is just why he could so boldly and fearlessly march through the decades, impelled by mortal hatred for hired slavery, for colonial slavery and for feudal mediavalism.

PREDICTING THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

Together with his worthy co-champion, Engels, he paved the way to the great October, decades before 1917, preparing for the coming of the new Lenin stage.

Engels wrote to Marx from Manchester (April 14, 1856):

“The last phase of speculation is approaching: Russia is importing capital and with it, speculation. In view of its size and the state of the railroads, speculation will inevitably assume proportions which will soon lead to a crash. And when we hear of the great Irkutsk road with branches to Peking, it will be time to pack up our bags. This time there will be an unprecedented crash; all the elements are present—intensity of upsurge, its international character and the drawing in of all propertied and ruling social layers.”

This prophecy can be read through the short-sighted spectacles of a narrowly restricting survey. And it can—as a matter of fact,
must—be interpreted on the basis of wide historical perspectives. In Engels' prediction, as within an embryo—also lies the prediction of the battles for concessions in China, the war of tsarism with Japan, the revolution of 1905 with its great international consequences, and ultimately, of October.

"The Great Siberian Road" extended its rails to the Pacific Ocean later but its construction was no slight factor in paving the way for the downfall of tsarism.

Marx and Engels watched this advance of tsarism on the Far East so jealously because they foresaw that Russia would be transformed from a heap of reaction and a feudal barrier into a revolutionary bridge between the proletarian revolution and the revolution of the colonial nations.

Marx and Engels fought all their lives against social-chauvinism and above all with social-chauvinism which sprang from the industrial and colonial monopoly of British capital and nipped the buds of the proletarian revolution in England.

MARX ON THE "FIRST COLONY OF ENGLAND"

Marx and Engels regarded Ireland as the "first colony of England".

"The British bourgeoisie not only exploited Irish poverty in order to worsen the condition of the working class in England through the forced migration of the poor-Irish, but in addition divided the proletariat into two hostile camps. . . . The average British worker hates the Irish as a rival who lowers wages and the standard of life. He has a national and religious hatred of him. He is portrayed to him in almost the same light as the black slaves are portrayed to the poor whites in the southern States of North America. This discord between the British proletariat is artificially cultivated and fostered by the bourgeoisie. It knows that in this discord lies the real secret of its retention of power. This discord manifests itself also on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean. Crowded off their native land by the bulls and the sheep, the Irish migrate to the United States, where they are a considerable and ever-growing part of the population. Their only thought, their only passion, is hatred for the British. The British and American governments, i.e., the classes which they represent, cultivate this hate in order to eternalize international contradictions which are an obstacle to every serious and honest alliance between the working class of both countries and consequently an obstacle to their mutual emancipation. The essential preliminary condi-
tion for the emancipation of the British working class is the transformation of the present obligatory union, i.e., the slavery of Ireland, into an equal and free union, if this is possible, or in complete separation, if this is inevitable.”

That is what Marx declared in 1870 in the name of the General Council of the International Association of Workers.

“The British working class will achieve nothing,” emphasized Marx in a letter to Engels (Dec. 10, 1869), “until it gets rid of Ireland. The lever must be established in Ireland. That is why the question is of such tremendous significance to the social movement in general.”

The Irish question has remained a weight on the feet of the British working class to this very day. And to this very day the British workers have not yet kicked out the Hendersons who shot the Irish socialist, James Connolly, and other rebels in 1916 and who continue to support the dictatorship of British imperialism in Ireland.

In his polemics against Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin showed that the

“...policy of Marx and Engels in the Irish question was the greatest example, one which has retained its tremendous practical significance to this very day, of how the proletariat of an oppressor nation must regard the national movement—it warned against the slavish haste with which the philistines of all countries, colors and languages, hasten to recognize as 'utopian' the change of the borders of a state, created by violence and the prerogatives of the landlords and the bourgeoisie of one nation.” (On the Right of Nations to Self-Determination.)

The ideas of Marx and Engels, the ideas of the relentless struggle with national oppression and inequality find their deserving culmination in the “Declaration of the Rights of Nations of Russia,” proclaimed by the October Revolution in the constitution of the U.S.S.R., in the constructive realization of the Five-Year Plan.

The social-fascist manufacturers of false documents try to cover up the traces, palming off the legend of a “young Marx”, whose “enthusiasm” was overcome by the mature Marx.

You don't know what to wonder at more: the shameless speculation on ignorance or the impudence of the desecration of the memory of Marx!

Let us bring to mind what Marx wrote to Wilhelm Liebknecht on February 11, 1878, during the Russian-Turkish War:
“Thanks to the period of corruption, which set in in 1848, the British working class was gradually more thoroughly demoralized. Ultimately it reached the stage where the working class became the simple appendage of the ‘great Liberal Party’, i.e., the party of its own subjugators, the capitalists. The leadership of the British working class passed wholly into the hands of the venal leaders of the trade unions and the professional agitators. These valiants noisily glorified the tsar—the liberator of nations—after the fashion of the Gladstones, Brights, Mundells, Moreleys, mill owner rabble, etc., and at the same time did not move an inch for their own brothers condemned by the mine owners of South Wales to starvation.”

Social-democratic grovelling before the mill owner canaille! Listen to the lion’s roar of our Marx, that Marx whose cause was continued by the great Lenin!

THE MARXIST STRUGGLE AGAINST BOURGEOIS NATIONALISM AND NATIONAL-REFORMISM

Mercilessly attacking great-empire nationalism as well as its most cunning socialist reincarnations, Marx and Engels at the same time tried to arm the proletariat and the toilers of the oppressed nations for the struggle against their own bourgeoisie, against bourgeois nationalism and national-reformism.

In this same Ireland, bourgeois national-reformism tried to isolate the toiling masses from the influence of the international class struggle of the proletariat. These gentlemen, in the words of Marx, hold to the view that “it was necessary to ignore the fact that the British workers sympathized with the Irish”.16 Engels declared in regard to them:

“Ireland is still nonetheless ‘a sacred Island’, the hope of which must be confused with the vulgar class struggle of the rest of the sinful world. In part, this is undoubtedly genuine madness of people; in part it is just as surely the consciously calculated tactics of the leaders in order to maintain their domination over the peasants. In addition there is also the fact that a peasant nation has always been compelled to take its literary representatives from among the city bourgeoisie and its ideology, and in this sense Dublin is to Ireland what Copenhagen is to Denmark. For these gentlemen every labor movement is the shereest heresy and the Irish peasant must not know that the socialist worker is his only ally in Europe.”16

15 Letter from Marx to Engels, Dec. 4, 1869.
16 Letter from Engels to Marx, Dec. 9, 1869.

16
On the basis of the irreconcilable struggle against all forms of great-empire oppression and chauvinism, with it as the point of departure, Marx and Engels exposed bourgeois nationalism among the oppressed nations.

Marx and Engels proved the obvious and genuine class essence of this bourgeois nationalism, which harangues for national freedom to the extent that it must organize governmentally the class domination of "national" capital without the payment of tribute to an alien subjugator. Already in this epoch bourgeois nationalism in the most important European countries fears a national revolution with a violent break-up of the agrarian system from below and of all the social relations which have grown up by no means less than they do enslavement by foreigners. The threat on the part of the revolutionary rank and file invariably makes it capitulate before the alien enslavers. Marx lived and fought in an epoch in which there was no colonial industrial proletariat, in which the antagonisms between capital and labor had not yet been shifted on to a colonial basis. But he gave the colonial proletariat an irreplaceable weapon in the struggle for its class self-determination.

Marx, whose work was carried on by Lenin, gave the sharpest weapons for the struggle against Gandhism, Kemalism, Sun Yat-Senism and all other forms which the preaching of cooperation and "sacred unity" of the classes, supposedly on the basis of the struggle for national liberation, take.

Marx did not halt at the "Great" Chinese Wall and was not frightened by the Indian jungles. Marx studied the historical conditions for the destruction of the feudal stagnation in the East. "I think", said Marx, pointing to the ancient Indian community, "that it is difficult to conceive of a firmer basis for stagnant Asiatic despotism". Only the undermining of the traditional pillars could free Montblanc in a revolutionary way, through the creative energy from below, hidden beneath the weight of the immobile centuries of slumber and inactivity.

It is precisely this aspect of the Marxist practical revolutionary dialectics that Lenin advanced to the fore. He appealed for a study of

"...the dialectics which Marx applied concretely in his Capital, and used in his historical and political works with such success that today the awakening of new classes to life

17 Letter to Engels, June 14, 1853.
and battle in the East (Japan, India, China), i.e., those hundreds of millions of humanity who comprise the greater part of the population of the world and who, until now, have by their historical inactivity and historical slumber caused stagnation and decay in many of the foremost states of Europe—this awakening of new people and new classes to life confirms the correctness of Marxism daily more and more.\(^{18}\)

Marx exposed beforehand the thorough hypocrisy of Gandhism which preaches behind the cloak of the establishment of domestic industry protectionism in the interests of Indian “national” capital and the rejection of an agrarian-peasant revolution. The Indian bourgeoisie, indivisibly bound up with feudal landlordism and money lending, by demagogic grimaces for slavish “non-violence” and the spinning wheel—the famous “charka”—tries to find a way of drawing the toiling masses away from a genuine struggle against imperialism and medievalism.

Marx could not foresee what Sun Yat-Senism would be like, revised, corrected, distorted and amended by Kuomintang counter-revolution. But he prepared an excellent antidote against the ideological opium, outlining the path of the Chinese revolution along the lines of a union with the socialist revolution in Europe.

Marx was not in a position to imagine Kemalism, which declares itself to be the most modern discovery of the twentieth century, but he ridiculed the bourgeois Turkophilism of Urquhart who eulogized Turkey as a country inaccessible to class antagonisms.

**ON AVOIDING THE MISHAPS OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM**

Finally—and this is particularly important—Marx raised the problem of the non-capitalist, socialist development of backward nations.

In the introduction to the Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto, January 21, 1882, Marx raised the question:

“It is asked now, can the Russian community, this already greatly destroyed form of primitive collective ownership of land, pass directly into the highest communist form of land ownership or must it, on the contrary, first pass through the same process of decay which the historical development of the West conditions?”

Marx's answer was clear and unequivocal:

"The only possible answer today to this question is the following. If the Russian revolution will serve as a signal to the workers' revolution in the West so that both will supplement each other, then the present Russian system of land ownership may be the point of departure for communist development."

Basing himself precisely on this prospect, Marx wrote to the editorial offices of Home Notes in 1877:

"If Russia continues along the path which it has gone along since 1861, then it will deprive itself of the most marvelous chance that history has ever offered any nation for avoiding all the mishaps of the capitalist system."

Marx and Engels were irreconcilably hostile to all the liberal-gentry and petty bourgeois Narodnik (Populist) attempts to gloss over village patriarchalism, and alongside with this they were no less hostile to all the bourgeois attempts to make capitalism an absolute, the upper limits. It is precisely this that gives us every reason to assert that the social-democratic theory of the equal and harmonious "transition" of capitalism into socialism is in crying contradiction to the direct statements of Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels did not live to the epoch of imperialism when the effect of the law of the unequal development of capitalism, characteristic for this epoch, became the decisive force.

The victory of socialism in one country, the struggle of two systems on this basis, the struggle of backward nations for a non-capitalist path of development in connection with this struggle—all this was developed by the proletarian revolution under the specific conditions of the present epoch. But there can be no doubt but that these conquests of the Leninist stage were begotten from the fundamental ideas of Marx and Engels and are their inevitable, internally essential continuation. The formulation by Marx of the problem of the non-capitalist, i.e., socialist development of the backward nations, helped the victory of the October revolution on the basis of an alliance of the vanguard proletariat with the peoples of the East who had been liberated from the yoke of imperialism. It became one of the bases of the Union of the Socialist Soviet Republics. It lay at the bottom of the gigantic socialist construction of the U.S.S.R. and the victory of the Five-Year Plan. This idea, lifted to the highest level by the soviet movement, sowed the soviet seeds on colonial soil. Under its powerful influence there appeared in the world new
nations of the soviet type, new soviet national states, new currents of culture—national in form, socialist in content, new national forms of the construction of socialism—in Central Asia, in the Caucasus, in White Russia, etc.

The epoch of Marx did not know of soviets, this historically ripe and completed form of the proletarian dictatorship and construction of socialism. It did not know of a colonial proletariat able to become the soviet organizer of the national-colonial revolution under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. Finally, it did not know the decisive sources of revolutionary action—the Leninist Party, although Marx and Engels in 1846 had set themselves the task of organizing a class, a special party of the proletariat, which would counterpose itself to all other parties. Bolshevism alone could solve this task fully.

But Marx is the founder of the theory of the proletarian dictatorship and Communism, the founder of the party of the proletariat, the founder of the theory of the national-colonial problem and of the non-capitalist path of the development of backward nations.

This Marx is our Marx and cannot be any other Marx. He is the leader-fighter, fighter-teacher. This Marx lives in the battles for Communism, for the Leninist cause.

**LENINISM—THE MARXIAN TEACHINGS ON THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL REVOLUTION UNDER NEW CONDITIONS**

Leninism formulated its point of view on the national-colonial revolution under new conditions, unknown to Marx and Engels, on the basis of the new conditions of the development and the conditions of the victory of the proletarian socialist revolution. It is precisely this which marked the new Leninist stage.

"The roads to the world revolution are not so straight-forward as they were wont to appear in days gone by when there had as yet been no victory of the revolution in a single land, and when a fully-fledged imperialism (which marks the advent of the socialist revolution) was still in the womb of time.

"A new factor has come to the fore: the variations in the rate of the development of capitalist countries, under the conditions that are created by a developed imperialism, conditions which lead inevitably to wars, to a general weakening of the capitalist front throughout the world, and to the possibility of achieving the victory of socialism in individual countries. Another new factor has come to the fore: the huge area of the
U.S.S.R. lying betwixt West and East, betwixt the very heart of international financial exploitation and the arena of colonial oppression, a vast region whose mere existence would suffice to revolutionize the whole world.”

In that most important work, *The October Revolution and the Tactics of the Bolsheviks*, Comrade Stalin pointed out in 1924 that

“It is more than likely that in the course of the development of the world revolution, there will come into existence—side by side with the foci of imperialism in the various capitalist lands and with the system of these lands throughout the world—foci of socialism in various Soviet countries, and a system of these foci throughout the world. As the outcome of this development, there will ensue a struggle between the rival systems, and its history will be the history of the world revolution... The world-wide significance of the October revolution lies not only in the fact that it was the first step taken by any country whatsoever to shatter imperialism, that it brought into being the first little island of socialism in the ocean of imperialism, but likewise in the fact that the October revolution is the first stage in the world revolution and has set up a powerful base whence the world revolution can continue to develop.”

The colonial proletariat, the coolies, the city and the peasant poor, the toilers and the exploited peasants, on the fiftieth anniversary of the death of Marx have a chance to compare imperialism which transforms man into a labor animal with the magnificent victories of the Five-Year Plan.

“The results of the Five-Year Plan have shown that it is the capitalist system that is bankrupt and unstable, that it has become obsolete and must give way to another, higher, Soviet socialist system of economy, that the only system of economy that has no fear of crises and is able to overcome difficulties that capitalism cannot solve—is the Soviet system of economy.”

The consequence of the unequal development of capitalism under conditions of its general crisis is a split in the world. “Capitalism no longer is the sole and all-inclusive system of world economy.”

The struggle of socialism and capitalism, of two systems, of two worlds, has become the pivot of the world-wide development.

---

20 Ibid., pp. 215, 216.
22 Stalin, *Results of the First Five-Year Plan*. 21
This fact is of exceptional significance for the fate of the national-colonial revolution. The revolutionary creative power of the masses is stimulated by the very conditions of the rise and the development of the national-colonial revolutions. They must *create anew* incomparably more than fell to the share of the former national revolutions which "found everything ready made" and completed and gave form to the conquests of spontaneous capitalist development. They must achieve their aims, breaking the front of imperialism by passing through the bourgeois-democratic stage, *resting* directly on the victory of the proletarian revolution.

As a matter of fact, would it have been possible without the October revolution and the victory of the Soviet Government in the Civil War, without the U.S.S.R., the Chinese revolution of 1925-1927, without the Canton Commune and the subsequent Soviet movement?

Would Communist parties in all colonial countries where there is a working class have been possible without October and the victory of the Soviet Government?

Would the liquidation of the Sevres Treaty and the attack against the Anglo-imperialist enslavement of Persia in 1921-1922, the great revolutionary movement in India and the attempts to organize soviets in Indo-China, the uprising of 1926 in Indonesia and the formation of a Mongolian national republic, have been possible without October and the victory of the Soviet Government?

October and the victory of the Soviet Government and socialist construction forced the colonial and semi-colonial nations to regard the world differently. At first these were the victories of the Red Army. Later, they were the economic victories of socialism, the construction of the socialist economy in the U.S.S.R., the realization of the first Five-Year Plan and the beginning of the second.

The colonial proletariat and the peasantry, drawn further and further down to the abyss of the general crisis of capitalism, have, in their living experience, in the experience of battles, become more and more convinced that they can get disinterested cultural help, the conquests of vanguard science and technique only from the victorious socialist proletariat. They see within the U.S.S.R. completely new nations emerging from the furnace of October, the Civil War and socialist construction. These nations, finding their organized governmental existence in the Transcaucasian Federative S.S.R., in the Central Asiatic Socialist Soviet Republics, in White Russian and
Ukrainian S.S.R.—are not at all like the nations of the epoch of rising capitalism. These are nations of the epoch of rising, growing socialism.

LENIN'S TEACHINGS FURTHER DEVELOPED BY COMRADE STALIN

Continuing the work of Lenin and his theories, the leader of the Leninist army, Comrade Stalin, has worked out the problem of the construction of socialism in one country, the problem of socialist reconstruction of the economy, the culture and the living conditions of the formerly oppressed nations, the problem of the struggle for a national-colonial revolution under the hegemony of the proletariat, the problem of the development of colonial parties under the relentless struggle on two fronts against right opportunism and liquidationism, against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and “left” opportunism.

The Soviet Republics of the East, Comrade Stalin pointed out, “are developing and consolidating themselves as national units not under the aegis of the bourgeois regime but under the aegis of the soviet powers, an unprecedented fact in history, but nevertheless, a fact”. And this fact, in a new way, rouses, mobilizes and organizes the masses of the colonial proletariat for battle, and in their footsteps, after their example, and under their leadership, the masses of peasants.

The nations which have moved ahead under the threat of being trampled down by imperialism and barbarous medievalism themselves see that imperialism, which until now had concentrated in the hands of the so-called “great empires” all the most important resources, means and conquests of civilization, is now counterposed by socialism which has already torn the only veil of capitalist world economy, which has already mastered the first-class achievements of science and technique. The nations, forced to overtake others after a long delay, are presented with two alternatives by history: either the tortuous colonial path of the development of capitalism under a feudal and semi-feudal agrarian system in the shadow of the “great” empires and their antagonisms or—the path to socialism which permits them to pass from the Soviet Government to socialist industrialization and the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. The internal “national” dynamics of the class struggle condition these or other rates, forms and peculiarities of the ripening and development of
the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. But the very class
struggle on national bases is developing under the influence of the
soviets, socialist example.

Here the tremendous difference between the nations of rising
capitalism and the soviet national example has its effect. The na-
tions of rising industrial capitalism tore people out of the clutches of
feudal oppression and feudal fragmentation, out of the clutches of
estates and local limits. They molded the classes of bourgeois so-
ciety which rose on the national-democratic struggle. Self-deter-
mination in national governments was a progressive, necessary cause.
The nation was a revolutionary power, a power of the bourgeois-
democratic revolution in the field of the reconstruction of interna-
tional relations on the basis of new national states, freed from
feudal heritage as well. However, just as soon as the destructive,
revolutionary work was done and the bourgeois-exploiter skeleton of
these nations hardened, they—in the field of international relations—
turned from a weapon of emancipation into the conductor of oppres-
sion, violence, of an annexation policy and national persecution.
France of 1793 soon gave way to Bonaparte France.

The international role of nations of the soviet type as outlined by
Leninism in the works of Lenin and Stalin is quite different. They
cannot degenerate into a nursery of bourgeois-rapacious nationalism
which lines its own pockets since their whole skeleton is built up on
the Soviet Government, on the struggle for the abolition of classes,
the construction of socialism. Its vital force lies in the fact that
it is a conductor not only of national exclusiveness, but of an inter-
national alliance of the toilers in the struggle with capital, on the
basis of the completest and unconditional equality of rights, assur-
ing the participation of millions of masses in soviet socialist con-
struction.

THE POWER OF THE SOVIET EXAMPLE

The magnetic power of the soviet example is reflected in the
fact that the insurgent proletariat and peasant masses, confronted
with the solution of certain historical tasks, solve them under the
leadership of the proletarian, communist vanguard, along the paths
of the soviet movement, along the paths of the struggle for soviets.

Class antagonisms mature and come to the surface in the setting
of a national-colonial revolution, unequally, in a revolutionary tempo,
by no means in strict and formal conformance with the economic pre-requisites. The defects in economic, political and cultural development must be compensated for by revolutionary leaps and bounds. But revolutionary leaps presuppose tremendous exertion on the part of the national majority, presuppose the participation of millions in the solution of the historical tasks. "The revolution is accomplished at a time of a particular upsurge and exertion of all human abilities, of consciousness, will, passion, the fantasy of tens of millions lashed by the keenest struggle of classes," said Lenin.

THE "MIDDLE PATH" OF THE NATIONAL BOURGEOISIE

The national bourgeoisie tries to find its supposedly middle path between imperialism and revolution. This is the result of its class position and class interests but this also dooms it to a treacherous-reformist policy in regard to imperialism.

"Independent rule, a feature of 'free' independent capitalistic development, hegemony over an 'independent people'—this imperialism will never voluntarily yield to the national bourgeoisie. In this respect the contradictions of interests between the national bourgeoisie of the colonial country and imperialism is objectively of a radical character. In this respect imperialism demands capitulation on the part of the national bourgeoisie. The native bourgeoisie as the weaker side, again and again capitulates to imperialism. Its capitulation, however, is not final as long as the development of the working masses and the development of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle, to the extent that the development of the class struggle, the danger of class revolution on the part of the masses has not become immediate, acute and menacing. In order, on the one hand, to avoid this danger and, on the other hand, to strengthen its position in relation to imperialism, bourgeois nationalism in these colonies strikes to obtain the support of the petty bourgeoisie, of the peasantry and in part also of the working class. Since in relation to the working class it has but little prospect of success, it becomes the more important for it to obtain support from the peasantry. But just here is the weakest point of the colonial bourgeoisie. The unbearable exploitation of the colonial peasantry can only be put an end to by way of the agrarian revolution. The bourgeoisie of China, India and Egypt is by its immediate interests so closely bound up with landlordism, with usury capital, and with the exploitation of the peasant masses in general, that it takes its stand not only against the agrarian revolution but also against every decisive agrarian reform."23

23 Thesis of the VI Comintern Congress on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies, pp. 24, 25.
The experience of China in this sense is most instructive. The struggle of the working class in China was the battering ram of the revolution. Its first great conflicts with imperialist capital and the militarist hirings of imperialism brought the struggle with imperialism onto the all-national arena and gave it a genuinely revolutionary scope. The Hongkong strike paved the way for the March on the North of 1926—from Canton to Hankow. The March on the North gave birth to the spirit of a genuine people’s revolution. The struggle of labor not only against the imperialist but also against national capital developed in full swing. The fight of the peasants with the landlords, the money lenders and the gentry began to turn into an agrarian-peasant revolution. The number of participants in the 1922 strike was 139,050; in 1924—61,860; in 1925—784,821; and 539,585 in 1926. The Chinese workers put the most valuable Bolshevik experience into practice, in a number of cases combining the general political strike with an armed uprising. The national bourgeoisie participated in the anti-imperialist struggle. But it shifted immediately over to the other side of the barricades and came to the head of the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution, just as soon as it caught sight of the threat of the organization of a genuine revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. The communist vanguard was caught unawares by this turn of events, the petty bourgeois fellow-travelers headed by Cheng-Du-Hsiu who had penetrated the leadership of the party and had opposed with all their might the development of the revolutionary labor and peasant movement, disorganized it. On the other hand, the Trotskyist-Zinoviev opposition tried to drag the Chinese communists into the social-democratic swamp. The Canton commune marked the beginning of a new, soviet stage. More than two years of unprecedented bloody counter-revolution, a severe agrarian and then industrial crisis, new imperialist violence and degradation were needed before it could “mature” in class struggle. The years of counter-revolution and military wars and regroupings revealed the complete inability of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie to win and defend national independence and the integrity of China in the struggle with imperialism, to assure the national-governmental unification of the country, to solve the agrarian problem and to lay a stable foundation beneath the development of independent industry. The soviets in China began to grow and spread over entire districts.

The working class is arriving at distinct class consciousness, at the final and irrevocable demarcation from “its” bourgeoisie, it is
beginning to rally around its revolutionary, communist, proletarian, irreconcilable, party vanguard in the mass revolutionary struggle—through active participation in the struggle of millions of masses. Only this struggle will disclose and rend the last strip that conceals the genuine relations and inter-relations of class forces. We cannot learn to swim unless we first jump into the water. We need mass, direct reaction of the proletariat to all aspects of the class enemy in order that the proletariat, organized under the leadership of the Communist Party, be in a state to ward off, not in words but in deeds, the bourgeois, national-reformist attempts to becloud both its own ranks and the semi-proletarian and non-proletarian strata of the toilers. We need a class, proletarian-party sense of reality for the struggle for the proletarian, class hegemony. Classes find each other out in the class struggle—such is the fundamental principle of the Marxist-Leninist theory of class recognition. In this struggle Bolshevik partyism takes on form, is verified and tempered.

The separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie, its organization into an independent revolutionary force opposed to the national-reformist bourgeoisie, presupposes its irreconcilable-consistent struggle for the agrarian-peasant revolution, for the alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the hegemony of the working class for the victory of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, for the workers' and peasants' republic of the Soviets against bourgeois national-reformism. Cheng-Du-Hsiuism in China exposed itself completely as a counter-revolutionary bourgeois influence on the proletariat by its very avoidance of the struggle for the proletarian leadership of the agrarian-peasant revolution, by its adaptability to Wang-Tsin Weism.

THE DANGERS OF RIGHT AND "LEFT" OPPORTUNISM

Conciliationism in regard to national-reformism, collaboration with it on the question of the labor movement and the agrarian-peasant revolution are also characterized by petty bourgeois nationalist-revolutionary groupings. While national-reformism dances a treacherous quadrille between imperialism and revolution, it seeks a middle path between the national-reformist bourgeoisie and the revolutionary proletariat, headed by the Communist Party. The demarcation of the proletariat from petty bourgeois groupings once again emphasizes the question of the attitude to the agrarian-peasant revolution as to the problem of the class "self-determination" of the
colonial proletariat, although the tactics of the proletariat in regard to this group are different from those in regard to national-reformism.

The adaptation to and the humoring of the national-reformist bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois nationalist *khvostism* within the ranks of the Communist Party inevitably take the form of *right-liquidationist opportunism*, glossing over the independent role of the proletariat and the Communist Party and are the chief danger in the setting of the embittered struggle not for life but to death with imperialism, with bourgeois national-reformism.

"Left" opportunism tries to play on the counter-position of the shop interests to the interests of the struggle for the proletarian hegemony in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. Side by side with this we should note that while right opportunism, undermining the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the name of cooperation with the bourgeoisie, places a cross on the task of the struggle for the bourgeois-democratic stage of the national-colonial revolution growing into its socialist stage, "left" opportunism under the pretext of struggle for socialism undermines the hegemony of the proletariat and the struggle for it by the denial of the national-revolutionary war, by the under-estimation of the anti-imperialist and agrarian-peasant struggle, by counterposing the shop interests of individual groups of workers to class interests, by *skipping over* the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution to the solution of the basic tasks of this stage. The evolution of Cheng-Du-Hsuiism and its transition into Trotskyism visibly testify to the kinship of both deviations which ultimately find a home in the camp of counter-revolution.

While the deviation from the struggle for the agrarian-peasant revolution prunes the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, the avoiding by the proletariat and its party of active and leading participation in the *anti-imperialist struggle* has no less fatal consequence. The avoidance of this struggle signifies at the same time a deviation from the struggle with the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeois-nationalist groups for the hegemony of the proletariat on that arena, not less decisive to the fate of the national-colonial revolution than the arena of the agrarian-peasant struggle. It is possible—and necessary—to say more: the arena of the anti-imperialist struggle is the arena of the struggle for the *initial class positions*. The proletariat, avoiding the anti-imperialist struggle,
condemns itself to political nonentity, thus completely untying the hands of the national-reformist bourgeoisie. It cannot be otherwise in a national-emancipatory revolution!

THE STRUGGLE FOR PROLETARIAN HEGEMONY

Thus the immediate reaction of the proletariat to the whole aspect of the bourgeoisie becomes the more selfless struggle of the proletariat headed by the Communist Party for the emancipation of the oppressed country from under the yoke of imperialism and feudal medievalism. The hegemony, won in this struggle, is the condition and the pre-requisite for the further struggle for socialism, for the non-capitalist, i.e., the socialist development of backward nations. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in the form of the Soviet Government with the leading role played by the Communist Party is what is new, is what incidentally lifted the Lenin stage, theoretically and practically, on the colonial basis beyond the limits of the country in which socialism is victorious. Leninism worked out the theory of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal evolution, victorious on the basis of an alliance of the working class with the peasantry on the condition that the hegemony is with the working class and the leading role played by the Communist Party in the setting of a general crisis of capitalism and a world-wide historical struggle of two worlds.

Leninism worked out the theory, strategy and tactics of the national colonial revolution of the soviet type passing through its democratic stage through the soviet dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry with the leading role played by the Communist Party and thus, as a result of the further differentiation of classes and the further class struggle, growing into the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At the same time Leninism, having given rise to the Bolshevik theory of the party, also gave birth to the Bolshevik theory of the Communist Party in colonial countries growing up and developing under conditions of modern national colonial revolution and victorious in the struggle with all forms of opportunism.

THE RISE OF SOVIETS IN THE COLONIAL COUNTRIES

The rise of the Soviet Government and the soviet movement on colonial soil (beyond the borders of the U.S.S.R.) is not just a transitory episode or stage, as the bourgeoisie try to console themselves.
They are the result of the revolutionary inequality of social development in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Classes, those classes which are called upon to clear a path for themselves with the sword and the hammer to the future, combine, organize, are trained, arm themselves, grow, rise to power and remake themselves, not trailing docilely and quietly in tow of "economic pre-requisites", made a fetish of by the cunning dodgers of the Second International in the interests of consolidating the rule of finance capital. They are passing through a school of revolutionary struggle which is irreplaceable. They are overtaking the slow and mutilated and obstructed economic development which is completed within the frames of imperialist domination and which gets only a slight respite from the rivalry among the imperialists and in the blunders of the imperialist system. They cannot help but overtake the slow and confused-contradictory ripening of economic pre-requisites under the aegis of imperialist domination because the "imperialist monopoly serves for the preservation and development of the conditions of its own existence, i.e., it fulfills the functions of enslaving the colonial masses". How can they wait quietly for the consolidation of new bourgeois economic bonds on their national territory when imperialism supports the fragmentation and partitioning of the enslaved country with the stick and the ruble, when it was already clear in the epoch of Marx that the "Hindus will not reap the fruits of the new elements of society, sown among them by the British bourgeoisie so long as in Great Britain itself the present ruling classes will not be forced out by the industrial proletariat or so long as the Hindus themselves do not become strong enough to throw off the British yoke". These classes—the working class, the basic masses of the peasantry and city plebeians—must draw their strength and the means for national self-determination on the basis of the overthrow of the imperialist yoke and feudal oppression from the revolutionary breakup, from the dictatorship of the revolutionary classes, the historical creation of the oppressed and exploited masses, rebelling under proletarian leadership.

The general crisis of capitalism compels the backward peoples to break through the front of imperialism and in an accelerated, revolutionary way, to overtake the vanguard nations. The soviets under colonial conditions are born as the product of the keenest and most

24 Resolution of the VI Congress of the Comintern, Inprecor, p. 1662.
tense revolutionary struggle which attains a union of the national and revolutionary war against imperialism with civil war against feudal exploiters as well as against the bourgeoisie to the extent that it, in agreement with imperialism and the betrayal of the interests of national emancipation seeks for salvation from the revolutionary hegemony of the proletariat and an agrarian peasant revolution.

It is the very intensity and the strain of the revolutionary struggle that condition the depth and the scope of class differentiation, the advancement of the proletariat with the Communist Party at the head and the rallying of the masses from below around this proletarian vanguard which by its struggle organizes, enlightens and rouses these masses.

Historically the soviets could rise only thanks to the union of such specific proletarian means of fighting as the general political strike, with an uprising and with a peasant struggle, and the revolutionary mobilization not only of the proletariat but also of the semi-proletarian and non-proletarian masses of toilers. The Chinese revolution of 1925-27, finding its culmination in the Canton Commune, demonstrated this. In Indo-China the first attempts to organize soviets were connected with the combination of activity of the workers and the peasants. The uprising in Sholapur, a textile center, which burst out spontaneously in 1931, was born from the general strike and led to the creation of the first rudimentary organs of revolutionary power in the form of insurgent rebel centers of opposition and revolutionary militia.

The soviets in China consolidate the hegemony of the proletariat in the embryos of government power. The soviets place in the hands of the masses, invincible weapons for carrying out all their decisions with the help of the organizations of the masses themselves and not through the apparatuses of the old officials and the oppressors. They are adapted to the organizations of the oppressed and exploited classes on a scale of millions, by self-made order, there and then replacing the old destroyed government apparatus. The soviets serve as the only means of the permanent revolutionary mobilization of the masses for the protection of their interests, for the introduction of corresponding measures. By their very nature, the soviets are a form for the consolidation and the training of the toiling masses by their revolutionary vanguard, by the working class and its party. At the same time it is a form which makes it pos-
sible for the masses, headed by the proletariat constantly to test the correctness of its decisions, constantly to change them in accordance with the demands of life.

The Chinese Red Army, which had driven off five punitive expeditions of Chang Kai-Shek and Co., and the Chinese Soviets, which had called to life groups of the poor and had confiscated the land of the landlords, the gentry and the money-lenders, and had divided the land equally, were examples of the power and the indestructibility of the soviet movement.

Marx and Engels invariably taught in support of a continuation of the national-revolutionary war with the agrarian-peasant revolution: they emphasized the leading role of the proletariat (and appealed for a repetition of 1793 on a new, wider basis). They regarded the Paris Commune as the first attempt at a dictatorship of the proletariat.

**THE LENINIST BANNER OF WORLD SOVIETS**

But Lenin alone raised the banner of the soviets over the whole world. Only he showed the inevitability of the soviet movement both in advanced and backward countries under the conditions of a general crisis of capitalism and the victory of the first socialist state in the world. Only he recognized the concrete revolutionary path and the forms of the historical creation of millions which had until now remained outside of history and has begun to make it under the leadership of the proletariat.

Lenin proved up to the task because the new epoch permitted him to create such a tremendous revolutionary weapon as the Leninist Bolshevik Party. Only through its medium was the proletariat in a condition to grow up to the unquestionable victory of the soviet government, of the soviet system, of the soviet socialist system of economy. Only the formation of an independent proletariat in the colonies and semi-colonies made the development of the soviet movement outside the borders of the U.S.S.R. possible. Only from this model could the colonial proletariat copy the militant lessons of organization and construction which they needed. The proletarian parties in the colonies only within the ranks of the Communist International could begin to grasp and put into the practice of their struggle, the experience of Bolshevism.

Marx and Engels gave the "basic, initial ideas" for the formula-
tion of the problems of a non-capitalist, i.e., socialist development of colonial nations.

Lenin set the problem as the problem of the Soviet reorganization of economics, politics and culture of the colonial nations, as the problem of the Soviet solution of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the national-colonial revolution and the problem of the Soviet transition onto the rails of non-capitalist development, as the problem of soviet, non-capitalist, i.e., socialist, development. In this historically concrete formulation of the problem already lies all that is necessary and enough for its full and victorious solution.

"Is it correct to assume", asked Lenin at the Second Congress of the Comintern, "that the development of capitalist economy is inevitable in those backward countries which are now liberating themselves and in which progressive movements have been started since the war? We answered this question in the negative. When the victorious revolutionary proletariat will carry on systematic propaganda, and the soviet governments will come to their assistance with all the means at their disposal, then it is wrong to presuppose that the capitalist stage of development is inevitable for these backward nations. Not only must we form independent nuclei of party organizations in all the colonies and backward countries; not only must we carry on propaganda for the organization of peasant soviets and adapt them to pre-capitalist conditions, but the Communist International must declare and give the theoretical basis for its statement that with the help of the proletariat of the more advanced countries the backward nations can arrive at and pass over on to the soviet system and through certain stages of development on to communism, skipping over the capitalist stage of development." 26

The form of the organization of the masses, worked out by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat as a result of the general crisis of capitalism and the split of the world into two camps, headed by the first socialist government in the world, is also accessible to the peasant masses since they, by the logic of their own struggle and under the organized influence of the proletariat, come up against that form of organization and successfully adapt it. The combination of a national-revolutionary war with a civil war against the landlords and the money-lenders, with the class struggle of the workers against the bourgeoisie, with the leading participation of the proletariat and the withdrawal of the bourgeoisie into the camp of counter-revolution, makes the organization of workers' and pea-

sants' soviets inevitable. The backward countries, not having their own proletariat, can arrive at the organization of peasant soviets, resting on the revolutionary help of the proletariat of the vanguard countries, on its bond with it, on the condition that there is a common struggle with the common enemy.

"In rousing the workers in the home countries for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat," reads the Program of the Comintern, "the progress of the world revolution also rouses hundreds of millions of colonial workers and peasants for the struggle against foreign imperialism. In view of the existence of centers of socialism represented by Soviet Republics of growing economic power, the colonies which break away from imperialism economically gravitate towards and gradually combine with the industrial centers of world socialism, are drawn into the channel of socialist construction, and by skipping the further stage of development of capitalism, as the predominant system, obtain opportunities for rapid economic and cultural progress. The Peasants' Soviets in the backward ex-colonies and the Workers' and Peasants' Soviets in the more developed ex-colonies group themselves politically around the centers of proletarian dictatorship, join the growing Federation of Soviet Republics, and thus enter the general system of the world proletarian dictatorship." 27

The existence of a conscious and organized colonial proletariat is the most important pre-requisite for the sovietization of the national-colonial revolution. The general conditions for the development of a soviet movement in the whole colonial world are created by the general crisis of capitalism and the struggle of two systems on a world scale.

THE TRANSITION FROM THE BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC TO THE SOCIALIST STAGE OF THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL REVOLUTION

In the more developed colonies and semi-colonies, the logic of their own development, the logic of the struggle with imperialism and the logic of the international class struggle compel the national colonial revolution to seek for a way to make the transition from the bourgeois-democratic stage to the socialist stage, from the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The masses are the living bearers of the historical contradictions and are the historically necessary instruments for their solution. It

27 Ibid., pp. 42-43.
is precisely in the epoch in which capitalism is replaced by socialism that their role grows inexpressibly, particularly to the extent that they are organized with the help of the soviets under the leadership of the working class. The explosive power of historical contradictions, reflected on the one hand in the transformation of man into animal for the transport of burdens in the colonies and, on the other, in the greatest industrial victories of socialism in the U.S.S.R., developed to the utmost the revolutionary creative resources and the abilities of the oppressed and exploited classes. This force, the force of the negation of the old and the striving to the new, in our epoch, without doubt overtook tremendously the motive powers of the contradictions of the epoch of Marx.

The national-reformist bourgeoisie in different countries toss about in different ways between Scylla and Charybdis, increasingly exhaust their opposition possibilities in these tossings to and fro, increasingly yield to the hypnosis of "hard" imperialist power. It would like to be free of imperialist rule, it grasps hold of every chink in the system of imperialism made by the rivalry of world empires. But it is still more afraid of revolution, having tasted of the soviet tree "of the knowledge of good and evil" and hates it. The working class hinders it from taking the peasantry in tow and leading it "along the normal path of bourgeois evolution". The contradictions of world capitalism which found such inimitable reflection in the world economic crisis of 1929-1933, and particularly in the unprecedented overproduction of agrarian colonial raw goods, contradictions of a backward, decaying, agrarian-feudal system, bring the colonial villages to a boiling point. The national-reformist bourgeoisie attacks the colonial proletariat as its worst enemy, particularly since it tries to heighten the already overwhelming rate of exploitation in the name of the success of "national" industry.

It cannot as a rule solve a single historical problem, cannot hinder the intensification of class contradictions and cannot divert the plunderous clutches of the imperialist pacifiers from the oppressed countries. All that it can do is to hinder the revolutionary struggle of the masses, protect the class interests of the upper groups at the expense of the all-national interests, divert the masses from the struggle by the homeopathy of non-violence, and grovel before imperialism (India) or mete out its "national-independent" justice to recalcitrant workers and peasants at the price of directly handing the country over to the plunder of the imperialists (China).
As the decisive stages of the struggle with imperialism approach, as the struggle with feudal exploitation and feudal oppression increases and assumes an all-national scope, more and more millions of masses will be drawn into this struggle under the hegemony of the proletariat and with the help of the soviets, and the soil will be better prepared for the transition from the bourgeois-democratic stage to socialist steps and measures.

In the resolution of the Executive Committee of the Comintern for July, 1930, it is said:

"The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in China will differ essentially from the democratic dictatorship outlined by the Bolsheviks under conditions of the revolution of 1905. First of all this difference is connected with the international setting of the Chinese revolution, with the existence of the U.S.S.R., a country of the proletarian dictatorship, successfully developing socialist construction; on the other, the conditions which are growing up in China allow it to count on the fact that the Communists will constitute the majority in the government. Thanks to this the proletariat will be able to realize not only the ideological but also the state hegemony over the peasantry. It is at the same time essential to take into consideration the fact that Chinese revolution presupposes an embittered struggle not only with feudalism and militarism but also with foreign and Chinese capitalists. The democratic dictatorship in China will be confronted with the need for consistent confiscations of enterprises belonging to foreign and Chinese capital, forced thus to take the very essential steps of a socialist nature. The presence of socialist elements also will be the specific peculiarities of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in China. The Chinese revolution with the transition from capitalism to socialism will have more intermediate stages in comparison with October but will considerably reduce the period of the growing-over into the socialist revolution, will complete much more rapidly the transition from a bourgeois-democratic to a socialist phase, than was thought applicable under the conditions of 1905."

First of all the struggle for the commanding heights of imperialism and then also for the Chinese capitalist commanding heights must compel the national-colonial revolution to resort to socialist measures—to the nationalization of banks, syndicates, of industries and transport-commercial undertakings of imperialist capital, to the confiscation of the property and enterprises of Chinese capitalists, who use their resources to support counter-revolution and intervention.
Without this the national emancipation from under the yoke of imperialism will not be real and complete.

The democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in the soviet form will prepare the prerequisites and the conditions for the transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of the class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the toilers and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the toilers (petty bourgeoisie, peasantry, intellectuals, etc.) or their majority, the alliance against capital, the alliance for the purpose of the complete overthrow of capital, the complete suppression of the opposition of the bourgeoisie and attempts at restoration by it, the alliance for the purpose of the final organization and the consolidation of socialism. This is a special kind of alliance which took form under special conditions, particularly under the conditions of frenzied civil war; this is the alliance of the steadfast adherents of socialism with its vacillating allies, sometimes with the 'neutrals' (then the alliance changes from an agreement to fight to an agreement for neutrality), the alliance between dissimilar classes economically, politically, socially, spiritually."  

The dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes a much further-reaching, deeper, and all-rounded demarcation of class forces along the line of the direct struggle between capital and labor, along the line of the struggle for the complete overthrow of capital—not, as formerly, along the line of the struggle for the overthrow of alien capital and feudal exploitation. This is a higher form of the class alliance of workers and peasants under which the proletarian leadership of the peasant masses exceeds the limits of bourgeois society and is conditioned by the direct struggle for the annihilation of classes.

In the remarkable document of 1905, entitled "The Attitude of Social-Democracy to the Peasant Movement", Lenin expressed the following viewpoint:

"Class antagonism between the village proletariat and the peasant bourgeoisie is inevitable and we beforehand expose it, explain it, and prepare ourselves for the struggle on these lines. One of the very possible causes of such struggle will most likely be the question: to whom and how is the confiscated land to be given? And we are not glossing over that question, we do not promise equal distribution, 'socialization', etc., but say: there we are still fighting, that we shall yet fight over it on

the new field and we shall fight with other allies. There we shall most certainly be with the village proletariat, with all the working class against the peasant bourgeoisie. Practically this may mean the transfer of that land to the class of petty peasant proprietors, there where enslaving, feudal big estates prevail, there are not yet the material conditions for large scale socialist production and nationalization provided there is a complete victory of the democratic revolution or the transfer of large scale capitalist estates to associations of workers because from a democratic revolution we are now beginning to pass to a socialist revolution and as soon as it is rendered possible by our strength, the strength of a class conscious and organized proletariat. We are for a continuous revolution. We shall not stop halfway. If we do not promise now and immediately all kinds of ‘socializations’ it is precisely because we know the real conditions of this task and do not conceal, but reveal the new maturing class struggle within the womb of the peasantry. In the beginning we support to the end, by all means, including confiscation, the peasants as a whole against the landlords and then (and even not afterwards but simultaneously) we support the proletariat against the peasantry as a whole. It is sheer utopia to try and gauge now the combination of forces within the peasantry on the ‘day after’ the (democratic) revolution. Without indulging in adventurism, not chasing after cheap popularity, we can say and do say only this: that we shall apply all our efforts to help the whole of the peasantry to make a democratic revolution in order that it be easier for us, the party of the proletariat, to pass on as soon as possible to a new and higher task—the socialist revolution. We do not promise any harmoniousness, any equalization, any ‘socialization’ as a result of the victory of the present29 peasantry uprising, on the contrary, we ‘promise’ a new struggle, a new inequality, a new revolution, for which we are striving. Our teaching is less ‘sugary’ than the tales of the socialist revolutionists; but he who wants to be fed only on sweets, let him join the socialist-revolutionists: to such people we say: good riddance!”30

The national-colonial revolution will not come “ready-made”. That is exactly why the class struggle at the bourgeois-democratic stage will go much further than the usually “set” limits, particularly the struggle for land. Under the influence of the great heat of the revolutionary struggle, arousing and activizing the more oppressed strata of the battraks and the poor peasants, under the influence of the fact that the landlord economy even in those districts where landlord landholding is in absolute control, is not widespread to any significant ex-

29 Lenin’s italics.
tent, and the kulak who ordinarily rents land from the landlord, but even more frequently rents land out, cannot particularly count on receiving supplementary land after the confiscation of the landlord's land; as a result of the linking up of the kulak with medieval oppression, the kulak tries to thrust the agrarian peasant revolution into the Procrustean bed, chopping off its legs and... head. Thus, already at the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution the antagonisms between the village bourgeoisie and the village proletariat and the poor are revealed with all force, although for the time being only within the frames of the bourgeois-democratic liquidation of the agrarian feudal system.

Only through the subsequent transition to socialist measures which restricts and nips in the bud the exploiter strivings of the kulak through taxes, the collective cultivation of the soil, etc., can one reserve the land for the poor and the toilers, the middle peasant, and save them from an increase of new kulak forms of enslavement.

In the nationalization of the land, water constructions, and irrigation sources lies the culmination of the agrarian peasant revolution. At the same time a more favorable setting for the transition to the first voluntary union, for the collective cultivation of the land and the collective, government-cooperative use of equipment is organized.

In 1918, in a Letter to the American Workers, Lenin said:

"Our peasants... are solving in practice the most difficult problem of organizing a new social state. Fighting against the kulak to secure the possession of land for the workers (instead of for the rich) to carry on agricultural production under a system of communist farming on a large scale."^31

Only a dictatorship of the proletariat, resting on the poor and drawing the middle peasantry into an alliance with them, which after some hesitation, will take a firm position in the new combination of class forces, is up to such a task.

It is impossible to foresee the concrete course of this process, but with the nationalization of the land, banks, industry and transport, with the Soviet government working under the leadership of the Communist Party,^32 the cooperation of small commodity producers who gradually turn to collectivization, must inevitably become the most important means for drawing the peasant masses into participation

---

32 (With the retention of petty artisan and handicraft undertakings on the most extensive scale.)
in socialist construction, which must develop on the basis of socialist industrialization.

The Leninist cooperative plan indicates the path to the non-capitalist development of the colonies.

The First Five-Year Plan realized under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, created new, unprecedented prerequisites for the socialist industrialization of backward countries, to the extent that they take the path of Soviet development.

Socialist industrialization is the decisive link in the transition to Socialism for the backward nations as well, and it is the worldwide historical conquest of Leninism together with the victory of Socialism in agriculture obtained on the basis of industrialization.

It is not enough to say that the process of national consolidation and organization of national states on colonial soil is made at a revolutionary pace. Within certain limits—and this is the most characteristic manifestation of the revolutionary inequality of the social development of our epoch!—it is not only interwoven but also merges with the national-colonial revolution. The national-colonial revolution, its various stages and various phases of development, determine the real, concrete content of the process of national consolidation and national self-determination. Marx and Engels knew well enough that nations win self-determination with weapons in their hands and self-determination in the style of 1793 is the historically more mature form of "self-determination".

The backward and enslaved nations through the working class and the basic mass of the peasantry territorially rally together, they find, each one individually, a common national tongue, are linked together by the oneness of economic interests, are combined in the organization of a common national "political superstructure" in the form of a nationally-independent and united government in the process of the revolutionary struggle. The greater the number drawn into the struggle, the more they are sovietized, advancing to the first plane the interests of the more exploited and downtrodden lower classes which pass on to their national stateness and national culture through a special, revolutionary school of training. They learn to read by analyzing communist proclamations, they learn to write by composing a list of the strikers' demands, presented to the capitalists, they learn to count multiplying the money-lending debts and partitioning off the land in the Soviet districts. They become citizens, learning to handle a rifle and a machine gun, joining the Comsomols, the trade
unions or groups of peasants, participating in the elections and the work of the Soviets, fighting in the ranks of the Red Army. The national colonial revolution of the Soviet type, the hegemony of the proletariat, fighting under the leadership of the Communist Party in this revolution, the trend and the transition of this revolution to non-capitalist, i.e., socialist rails are the pivot of this process of the national consolidation and national “self-determination.” This would be impossible if there were not a general crisis of capitalism, if October had not taken place, if there were not a world-wide historical struggle of two systems. The nations of the new Soviet type divesting themselves of old Adam in the most embittered class struggle are struggling into life—are also the conquests of the Leninist stage of the emancipatory struggle of mankind.

"Who ever realized that Tsarist Russia harboured no fewer than fifty nationalities and ethnic groups within its borders, By breaking the chains of a series of forgotten peoples and nationalities, the October revolution has breathed into them a new life and new possibilities of development. It is customary to speak of ‘India’ as a homogeneous whole. Yet, when the revolution breaks out in Hindustan, many hitherto ignored nationalities will emerge from their seclusion, will come forward, each with its own language and its own distinctive racial culture. As for the participation of the various nationalities in the general proletarian culture, this much is pretty certain, that such participation will take place in conformity with the language and the customs of each national participant.”

Subjection by the finance oligarchy of the world and the unequal development of world capitalism in the imperialist epoch is the reason why tens and hundreds of nations have up until today remained deaf under its weight, remained a historical nonentity. Only by breaking through the front of imperialism and joining with the socialist revolutionary proletariat can they come to the surface and begin, Soviet-like, by means of fighting and building, to take on form.

STALIN FORMULATES THE PRINCIPLE OF NATIONAL CULTURES

Continuing the Leninist theory on the national question, Comrade Stalin formulated the principle of national culture most exhaustively:

"What is national culture under the supremacy of the national bourgeoisie? A culture bourgeois in its content and

national in its form, having as its object to poison the masses with the venom of nationalism and consolidate the supremacy of the bourgeoisie. What is national culture under the dictatorship of the proletariat? A culture Socialist in its content and national in its form, having as its object to educate the masses in the spirit of internationalism and consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . . It may seem strange that we supporters of amalgamation of national cultures in the future into one culture, common both in form and in content, with one common tongue, are at the same time in favor of the flourishing of national cultures at the present time, in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But there is nothing strange in this. We must let the national cultures develop and expand, revealing all their potential qualities, in order to create the necessary conditions for fusing them into one common culture with one common tongue. The flourishing of cultures, national in form and Socialist in content, in the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship in one country, for the purpose of their fusion into one common Socialist culture, common both in form and in content, with one common tongue, when the proletariat is victorious throughout the world and Socialism becomes an every-day matter—in this lies the dialectical quality of the Leninist way of treating the question of national culture.” 34

The backward nations of the colonial world, growing to be a nation, forged by the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialist construction, also develop their struggle which, in the final count, becomes the struggle for the non-capitalist path of development.

The creative work and the struggle of Marx and Engels laid the foundation for the general theory of the national-colonial question. Leninism gave the concrete form to this theory and developed it in conformity with the conditions of the international socialist revolution in the epoch of imperialism, in conformity with the conditions for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat in a new historical epoch, in conformity with the conditions for the construction of Socialism in one country and the conditions of the conflict of two systems.

On the powerful shoulders of the giant of revolutionary struggle and thought, on the shoulders of Marx, those new generations of the working class which appeared in the world in order to continue and complete the work of Marx, grew up, came to power and conquered on one-sixth of the globe under the leadership of the great Lenin. . . .

He did not live even up to the time of the first steps in the rap-

proachment of the struggle of the working class with the emancipatory movement of the colonial nations.

The pupils of Lenin transformed one-sixth of the globe and built up there the impregnable fortress of the world proletarian revolution; in this fortress, cotton—the product of the socialist fields and tractors, in this fortress, oil and electricity—nurture the dictatorship of the proletariat and Socialism.

This fortress is the pledge and the foundation for the victory of Socialism throughout the world, including British Lancashire where the unemployed textile workers starve, and the cotton fields of India where the Indian ryots die under the stick of the white sahibs.

The half century since the death of the great Marx has not passed in vain!
TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

(From the Report to Twelfth Plenum of E.C.C.I. on The War in the Far East and the Tasks of the Communists, by Comrade Okano)

The common task of all the Communist Parties in the struggle against the war in the Far East and against the immediate danger of a military intervention against the Soviet Union, in the struggle against the false pacifism of the social-democracy, consists in the following:

1. We must develop a systematic ideological struggle against nationalism and chauvinism, propagate practical proletarian internationalism among the workers, carefully watch all the machinations of the foreign policy of our “own” countries, explain to the masses the true character of these criminal steps along a road leading to war.

2. We must actively respond to all the manifestations of anti-Soviet slander, and tirelessly spread the truth about the Soviet Union with facts in our hands. We must mobilize the toilers for a struggle against the white-guard emigrants in order to imbue the masses with the realization that the war against the Soviet Union signifies ruthless white terror, that, in case of war, the entire able-bodied population will be pressed into the fetters of militarism.

3. We must expose the real character of the war budgets, and the other measures of the military policy of the bourgeoisie, explaining to the masses the connection between the growing destitution of the toilers and the burden of war expenditures, reminding the masses of the grave results of the last imperialist war, conducting a tireless struggle against the militarization of the schools, against the military and class detachments of the bourgeoisie, against the military maneuvers, and strengthening the proletarian fighting and sporting organizations, and all the revolutionary organizations of the youth.

4. We must concretely expose all the sophisms and maneuvers of the League of Nations, and of the Disarmament Conference, particularly of the social-democratic pacifist politicians, explaining beforehand to the masses to what lying and provocative excuses the bourgeoisie and the social-democrats will resort to justify the new imperialist war and the attack upon the Soviet Union.
5. The modern methods of war create conditions under which Bolshevist work in the munition factories and on the transport is of as much importance as the struggle in the imperialist armies, conducted in the spirit of Lenin's teaching. Therefore the main task at the present time consists in the creation of central committees and committees of action in the war factories, ports, railways, ships; to carry on mass work and organize carefully prepared strikes of protest, and economic strikes, against the transportation of war materials and troops, particularly for Japan, for the development of the initiative of the great working masses.

6. We must carry on extensive anti-militarist work, remembering that the entire Party and Y.C.L. must participate in this work. It is necessary to bear in mind—the experience of Czecho-Slovakia and Belgium once more confirmed this—that the economic struggle and the mass actions of the proletariat create the most favorable conditions for anti-militarist work.

7. We must not ignore the fact that only a careful investigation of the international and internal position of each individual country, only a concrete investigation of the policy of the ruling circles and of the social-democratic parties in the speedily changing situation of each individual country, will enable the Communist Parties to fight successfully against the imperialist war and intervention.

* * * * *

(From the Thesis of the Sixth World Congress of the C. I. on the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies)

The immediate tasks of the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries in the colonial question bear a three-fold character. In the first place, the establishment of regular connections between the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union organizations of the imperialist centers, on the one hand, and the corresponding revolutionary organizations of the colonies, on the other hand. The connections hitherto established between the Communist Parties of the imperialist centers and the revolutionary organizations of the corresponding colonial countries, with the exception of a few cases, cannot be regarded as adequate. This fact can only in part be explained by objective difficulties. It is necessary to recognize that so far not all the parties in the Communist International have fully understood the decisive significance of the establishment of close, regular and constant relations with the revolutionary movements in the colonies for the
purpose of affording these movements active support and immediate practical help. Only in so far as the Communist Parties of the imperialist countries render in fact practical assistance to the revolutionary movement in the colonies, in so far as their help actually facilitates the struggle of the corresponding colonial countries against imperialism, can their position in the colonial question be recognized as a genuinely Bolshevik one. In this lies the criterion of the revolutionary activity in general.

The second series of tasks consists in genuine support of the struggle of the colonial peoples against imperialism through the organization of mass demonstrations and other effective activities of the proletariat. In this sphere, the activity of the Communist Parties of the big capitalist countries has also been insufficient. The preparation and organization of such demonstrations of solidarity must undoubtedly become one of the basic elements of Communist agitation among the mass of the workers of the capitalist countries. The Communists must expose the true spolitical character of the capitalist colonial regime by all the agitational means at its disposal (press, public demonstrations, parliamentary platform); they must mercilessly tear aside the network of lies with the help of which the colonial system is represented as an affair of civilization and general progress. A special task in this sphere is the struggle against missionary organizations, which act as one of the most effective levers for imperialist expansion and for enslavement of the colonial peoples.

The Communists must mobilize the wide masses of workers and peasants in the capitalist countries on the basis of the demand for granting, unconditionally and without reservation, complete State independence and sovereignty to the colonial peoples. The fight against the bloody suppression of colonial risings, against armed intervention of the imperialists against the national revolutions, against the growth of the military aggressiveness of imperialism, with its new armed seizures of territory, demands from the international proletariat systematic, organized and self-sacrificing struggle. It is necessary to take into account the lessons to be drawn from the fact that not a single section of the Communist International in the capitalist countries has succeeded to an adequate degree in mobilizing the masses for active support of the Chinese revolution against the unceasing attacks of world imperialism. The preparations for world war, the attack of the imperialists against the peoples of "their" colonies, with a view to their "pacification," places the task of active support for the colonial revolution in the center of
attention and struggle for the proletariat of the capitalist countries.

Striving for the immediate recall of the armed forces of imperialism from the oppressed countries, the Communist Parties must work unceasingly for the organization of mass action in order to prevent the transport of troops and munitions to the colonies.

The struggle against the colonial policy of social-democracy must be looked upon by the Communist Party as an organic constituent part of its struggle against imperialism. The Second International, by the position it adopted on the colonial question at its last Congress in Brussels, has finally given sanction to what has already always been the practical activity of the different socialist parties of the imperialist countries during the post-war years. The colonial policy of social-democracy is a policy of active support of imperialism in the exploitation and oppression of the colonial people. It has officially adopted the point of view which lies at the basis of the organization of the "League of Nations", according to which the ruling classes of the developed capitalist countries have the "right" to rule over the majority of the peoples of the globe and to subject these peoples to a cruel regime of exploitation and enslavement. In order to deceive a portion of the working class and to secure its cooperation in the maintainance of the colonial regime of plunder, social-democracy, in the most shameful and repulsive manner, defends the exploits of imperialism in the colonies. It disguises the real content of the capitalist colonial system, it wilfully ignores the connection between colonial policy and the danger of a new imperialist war, which is threatening the proletariat and toiling masses of the whole world. Wherever the indignation of the colonial peoples finds vent in the emancipatory struggle against imperialism, social-democracy, notwithstanding its lying phrases, in practice always stands on the side of the imperialist executioners of the revolution. During the last few years, the socialist parties of all the capitalist countries have been voting for the credits which the governments of these countries demand for the carrying on of war against the colonial peoples struggling for their freedom (Morocco, Syria, Indonesia), they themselves take a direct part in the business of colonial exploitation (French socialists act as governors in the colonies at the appointment of imperialist governments, the socialist cooperatives of Belgium participate in colonial enterprises for the exploitation of the Negro population of the Congo), and they approve of the most cruel measures for the suppression of colonial uprisings (defense by the leaders of the British Labor Party of intervention in China, the activity of
the Dutch Socialist Party in defense of the suppression of the insur-
rection in Indonesia). The social-democratic theory, alleging that
the capitalist colonial regime can be reformed and converted into a
“good colonial regime”, is a mask behind which the social-democrats
attempt to conceal their true social-imperialist character. The Com-
munists must tear this mask from them and demonstrate to the
toiling masses of the imperialist countries that the socialist parties
are the collaborators and direct accomplices of imperialist colonial
policy, that they have in this sphere betrayed in the most flagrant
fashion their own socialist program and that they have become an
agency of imperialist plunder in the imperialist countries and in the
colonies.

The Communists must pay the greatest attention to the attempt
of the social-democrats, made with the aid of the capitalist govern-
ments, to extend their influence in the colonies and to establish there
their own sections and organizations. These attempts correspond
to the policy of that portion of the imperialist colonizers which
makes it its aim to reinforce its positions in the colonies by the buy-
ing up of definite strata of the native population. The specific con-
ditions obtaining in some colonies may lend a certain success to these
attempts and lead to the temporary development of a reformist move-
ment in these countries under the influence of the social-democracy
of the capitalist countries. The task of the Communists must be to
wage a decisive struggle against such attempts, to expose the colonial
policy of the socialists before the native masses and in this way to
direct against the social democratic leaders—servants of imperialism
—the same well-deserved hatred which the oppressed colonial peoples
bear against the imperialists.

In all these spheres, the Communist Parties of the capitalist
countries can only achieve success if they also carry on an intensive
propaganda in their own ranks in order to explain the Communist
attitude to the colonial question, in order to eradicate completely
every vestige of social-democratic ideology in this question and to
resist any possible deviation from the correct Leninist line.