

REVOLUTIONARY REALISM AGAINST DOGMATIST ADVENTURISM AND OPPORTUNISM

The Chinese leaders often refer to the perspectives of the 81-Parties' Statement as being based on "historical idealism." What they mean is that the majority of fraternal parties, subjectively wanting to avoid struggle and desiring a peaceful solution of problems, have developed illusions about imperialism and reaction and "prettify" them. The viewpoint is sometimes carried to the extent of accusing brother parties of being overawed by imperialist atomic blackmail and running away from struggle like frightened mice. In fact, even a theoretical explanation is offered that this is the result of the improvement in the standard of living of the Soviet people and the working class in Western countries. References to the "growth of capitalist elements in the USSR," the old calumny of the Trotskyites, are also made. Thus the "degeneration" of the leadership of the CPSU and other communist parties is said to arise from the same roots and to be of the same nature as that of the social-democratic parties in the past.*

We must now turn, therefore, to the *objective basis* of the strategical-tactical line of the Moscow Statement, and the question of its *actual implementation*.

* "... as a result of Khrushchov's revisionist role, of the open declaration that the Soviet state has changed its nature and is no longer a dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the execution of a whole series of erroneous domestic and foreign policies, the capitalist forces in Soviet society have become a deluge sweeping over all fields of life in the USSR, including the political, economic, cultural and ideological fields. The social source of Khrushchov's revisionism lies precisely in the capitalist forces which are ceaselessly spreading in the Soviet Union.

"Khrushchov's revisionism represents and serves these capitalist forces."
(Eighth Editorial Comment of *Hongqi* and *People's Daily*, p. 20.)

The defeat of the fascist powers in the Second World War, in which the Soviet Union played the key role, led to a very great weakening of the imperialist system as a whole. It unleashed a world revolutionary process by which, within a few years, socialism became victorious in many new countries extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, covering one-third of the population of the globe. Socialism, from being confined to one country, became a world system. Its encirclement was ended for good. The process still continues years after the world war, as witnessed in Cuba.

The Soviet Union, far from remaining debilitated for years as expected by the imperialist powers, swiftly recovered from the crippling devastation inflicted on it by the Hitlerite invasion. Today it ranks second only to the USA in industrial production. In 1950-51, its industrial output was less than 30 per cent of the USA. Already by 1961 it had reached above 60 per cent of the latter. Its pace of advance during the last decade, four times faster than that of the USA, confirms its aim of outstripping the latter in the early seventies. It shattered the monopoly of the USA in nuclear weapons in record time. In certain spheres of science and technology, e.g., nuclear science, rocketry and the exploration of outer space, it is already much in advance of the USA. Its defensive military might is invincible. It trains twice as many engineers and technicians every year as the USA. Its moral and political unity is greater than ever.

Under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, it is triumphantly marching forward towards the construction of the first communist society of modern history. The confidence of its citizens, government and the CPSU is supreme.

The other socialist countries, relying on their own strength and resources, as also with the magnificent fraternal assistance of the Soviet Union, are making exemplary progress.

The victory of the anti-fascist forces in the Second World War also unleashed an unprecedented torrent of national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America. National liberation revolutions triumphed over vast areas of the world as a result of which fifty countries, formerly colonial and dependent, have achieved national independence. This process also continues unabated. As the Moscow Statement says, "this is a development ranking second in historic importance only to the formation of the world socialist system," (p. 26) and that, because of it, "the complete collapse of colonialism is imminent." (p. 26.)

The newly-independent countries, pursuing a neutralist, non-aligned, anti-colonial foreign policy, have brought added strength to the world camp of peace which stands against imperialist aggression and war.

The victory of the anti-fascist forces in the Second World War also gave a great impetus to the growth of the working class movement and the communist parties in advanced capitalist countries as also in many of the newly-liberated countries. The strength of the trade-union movement and the communist parties has grown in membership, experience, militancy and striking power.

All these factors, together with peace loving people all over the world have led to the emergence of a world peace movement unprecedented in its breadth in human history.

Simultaneously, inter-imperialist contradictions have sharpened, the worst warmongering monopoly interests in the imperialist countries are more isolated and detested than ever before.

All these phenomena, generalised in an interconnected manner, have been described in the Moscow Statement as under:

Our time, whose content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two oppos-

ing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of the transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a worldwide scale. (p. 2.)

Such is the objective, realistic basis of the general line of the 81-Parties' Statement and not "historical idealism" as the Chinese leadership would have us believe. In fact, the talk of "historical idealism" is a clear underestimation of the new strength of the forces of world revolution.

Has the new strength of the world forces of socialism, national independence, peace and democracy given visible proof that the goals and perspectives of the Moscow Statement are realisable in practice? The proof is there for anyone to see. In fact, it is precisely on the basis of such tangible results that the strategy and tactics of the Moscow Statement have been worked out.

The resolution of our Central Executive Committee entitled "On Certain Questions Before the International Communist Movement" adopted in its meeting from 4th to 7th September, 1960, as also the speech of Comrade Ajoy Ghosh at the 81-Parties' Conference, highlighted this point by contrasting the course and manner of world developments between the two world wars and since the Second World War. Both have stressed two key features of the two periods:

First, all the national freedom movements of the subject, dependent countries in Asia and Africa, after the First World War, were suppressed by the various imperialist powers. Turkey could be considered an exception, though its case was not quite similar in that it had not been under direct imperialist rule. And the achievements of the Turkish revolution proved short-lived. In contrast, almost all the national freedom movements in the post-Second

World War period have succeeded. The process has extended to the Latin American countries under indirect foreign rule. Failures have been exceptional, and those in cases where the imperialists have maintained their hold with the aid of reactionaries inside the country concerned. Further, the success of national liberation movements has continued and is continuing more than eighteen years after the end of the Second World War.

Second, between the two world wars, Germany, Italy and Japan, aided and abetted by England, France and the USA, successfully attacked country after country. Manchuria, Abyssinia, Austria, the Sudetenland, Albania and finally Czechoslovakia were overrun one after another. Spanish democracy was overthrown by reaction, aided by German fascism. The forces of socialism and peace were incapable of halting the process. If world peace was not shattered on these occasions, it was at the cost of national independence and democracy, at the cost of the advance of fascism, the spearhead of imperialism. Everyone of these advances was a stepping stone to the unleashing of the Second World War, which, in the end, was launched by Nazi Germany.

In contrast, in the period after the Second World War, thanks mainly to the strength of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union, as also the strength of the forces of national independence, imperialist aggression or threats of aggression and subversion against Korea, Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, Zanzibar and other countries have been successfully repelled or halted. The North Vietnamese and Algerians, equipped with socialist arms, defeated regular imperialist armies in pitched battles. The neutrality of Laos and Cambodia has been protected. Indonesia has been strengthened to successfully withstand the armed pressure of the Dutch and Malaysia. The most glorious example, of course, is that of Cuba, which, backed by Soviet military might, has proudly and successfully defend-

ed its independence from the mightiest imperialist power of the world, the USA, and that within a stone's throw from the borders of the United States.

What do all these facts demonstrate if not the main contention of the Moscow Statement that it is the world socialist system and the forces fighting against imperialism that now determine the main content, trend and features of contemporary history? More concretely, that the tasks of fighting for national liberation, the defence of peaceloving countries, the repulsion of imperialist aggression, i.e., the defeat of the "export of counter-revolution" and the preservation of world peace can all be carried out in the new epoch effectively and simultaneously? World peace can now be preserved, not at the sacrifice of national independence and democracy, but together with their advance, by defeating and forcing imperialism and reaction to retreat step by step.

World war is not precipitated so to say, abruptly or all of a sudden. It is the end of a series of successful acts of imperialist aggression. To arrest and defeat such acts is curbing the outbreak of a world war.

It is in this sense that the Moscow Statement emphasises that the preceding achievements and advance have been made in conditions of peaceful coexistence and competition between the two social systems. Such a claim, however, in the eyes of the Chinese leaders, is a desertion from Marxism.

It must also be pointed out that the Moscow Statement takes pointed note, and that for the first time in the history of the international communist movement, of one more new phenomenon of our epoch, viz., that "the peoples of the colonial countries win their independence both through armed struggle and by non-military methods, depending on the specific conditions in the country concerned." (p. 27) To this point we shall return later.

The irresponsible attitude of the CPC leadership on the

question of carrying out the inter-related tasks of defending the sovereignty and integrity of peaceloving countries from imperialist aggression, while, at the same time, preventing imperialist mad men from plunging the world into a nuclear holocaust, was revealed nakedly at the time of the Caribbean crisis in October 1962.

The details of the episode are well-known to everybody. Their essence boils down to this that, having known from the Cuban government that there was imminent danger of a full-fledged military invasion of Cuba by the American army, the Soviet government dispatched missiles and atomic warheads to Cuba, which it subsequently withdrew on an assurance from President Kennedy that neither the USA nor any of its allies would invade Cuba.

The developments at the height of the Cuban crisis were extremely rapid and brought the world to the very brink of a nuclear burst up, far closer, in fact, than at any moment since the invention of nuclear weapons. Under the circumstances the Soviet Union had to shoulder the responsibility of taking the decision of withdrawing its missiles without the slightest delay. Consultation with the Cuban government was not possible and did not take place.

However, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The American invasion did not take place, and sixteen months after the crisis, the flag of Cuban independence is flying higher and Cuban socialism is marching victoriously forward.

Dr. Castro himself testified to the correctness of the decision in his statement on May 23, 1963. He said:

Time passed and shed light on the events. The imperialist plans for invading Cuba fell through. It proved possible to avoid war.

Dr. Castro, in fact, went further and stated that the Soviet Union's timely and energetic warning in last March (1963) acted like a wet blanket on the hotheads of the bellicose elements.

Despite such overwhelming evidence, the Chinese leadership accused the Soviet Union of "Munich" and "purchasing peace by sacrificing Cuban sovereignty." The placing of the missiles in Cuba was denounced as "adventurism" and their withdrawal as "capitulationism." These charges have never been withdrawn. The Chinese claim to be better Cubans than the Cubans themselves.

In fact, while both the dispatch of the missiles and their withdrawal were coolly calculated acts based on the confidence of the superiority of the forces of socialism, it is the Chinese criticism which, in the first instance, is based on the underestimation of the socialist forces, and in the second, on the pursuit of an adventurist gamble inviting a world war.

But this is not all. As Comrade Dange, Chairman of our Party, points out in his pamphlet in reply to the "Mirror", the Chinese leadership chose the very moment of the Cuban crisis for its attack on India. He says,

One may ask: Why this war on the India-China border on such a large scale just at the time of the Caribbean crisis and when a world war was being threatened? Was it all a coincidence? (*Great Debate*, p. 317)

The reply is that when every lover of peace, national independence and socialism was rushing to the aid of Cuba, the Chinese leaders, far from doing any such thing, decided to pursue their own narrow national interest even at the cost of throwing a spark in an already explosive situation.

The manner and *content* of the Chinese leadership's denunciation of the Partial Test Ban Treaty can have no other explanation except that of being an expression of great-power mania and nationalistic ego.

As pointed out earlier, the Moscow Statement calls for a persevering struggle for disarmament, achieving tangible results on a series of issues among which the banning of

atomic tests is clearly mentioned. It says, "such agreement should pave the way to general disarmament."

The Partial Test Ban Treaty is clearly one such agreement. It prevents the further pollution of the atmosphere by radio-active elements, hinders the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and thereby reduces the danger of war breaking out by accident, miscalculation or the wrecklessness of imperialist maniacs. It reduces international tension and creates an atmosphere for more advanced agreements. This does not end the danger of war, no such claim is made. But it is a valuable advance all the same and has been welcomed for that reason by peaceloving states and people all over the world.

What is the Chinese leadership's criticism of the Treaty? The charge of US-USSR collaboration and betrayal of all the peoples of the world is, of course, repeated. But what is far worse, the Treaty is attacked as "a joint-Soviet-US plot to monopolise nuclear weapons and deprive China of the right to possess them." (*Hongqi and People's Daily*, September 6, 1963, p. 4)

The Soviet leaders have repeatedly declared and Chou En-lai has very recently confirmed during his African tour that in the event of an imperialist attack on China, the Soviet Union would go all out for its defence. In not having its own atom bomb, therefore, China has all the advantages of atomic defence, without having to shoulder the burden of its cost. In the absence of atomic bases on Chinese soil, the danger of an atomic attack on China is also lessened.

Further, if the Soviet Union supplies atomic weapons to China, none can prevent the USA from supplying them to West Germany, the most bellicose imperialist power of the day.

Why then should China insist on its "right" to possess the atomic weapons, the exercise of which is harmful to itself and all mankind and good for nobody except the warmongers of the West?

There is no reply except that the Chinese leaders consider the possession of atomic weapons as a necessary symbol of "great power" status. Imperialist jingoists in the past, and also at present, are known to consider military might as the symbol of national greatness. Is it any wonder that de Gaulle's insistence on the possession of atomic weapons is also based on the megalomania of the "grandeur of France"? He has said so in so many words, the Chinese leaders have not, that is the only difference.

And then to talk of a "Soviet-US combine for the settlement of world problems" (*ibid*, p. 24) is the limit. Such charges can only be denounced, not argued with.

In respect of what they consider to be their national interest the Chinese leaders are by no means averse to carrying on negotiations with the imperialists and making agreements with them. In the course of such negotiations, they have shown themselves capable of giving diplomatic compliments to diehard imperialists and reactionaries like de Gaulle and Ayub Khan. France's official declaration that it had not given any assurance to the PRC that on its recognition France would withdraw its recognition to Kuomintang China, was explained away by Chou En-lai himself as a "matter of procedure and politeness." It was not denounced as the impermissible recognition of the theory of two Chinas. The CC CPC letter of June 14 speaks of "certain patriotic kings, princes and aristocrats" (p. 14) among whom, the King of Nepal and Ayub Khan are certainly indicated.

But if the Soviet leadership and other socialist countries carry on negotiations, come to agreements, make a relative distinction between imperialist or bourgeois rulers, the CPC leadership immediately smells a rat and starts howling about "prettifying" the imperialists, trusting them, raising illusions about them and what not. And this is done despite all the valid reasons and explanations given by the Soviet leadership.

The Moscow Statement itself says that

the policy of peaceful coexistence is also favoured by a definite section of the bourgeoisie of the developed capitalist countries which takes a sober view of the relationship of forces and the dire consequences of a modern war. (p. 20)

But the "pure" Marxism of *Hongqi* and *People's Daily* naturally cannot compromise with such "revisionist" evaluations. They tell us,

It is the ABC of Marxism-Leninism that in a class society there is no reason that can transcend class. The proletariat has proletarian reason and the bourgeoisie have bourgeois reason. (Editorials, November 19, 1963, p. 10)

And then we have the usual harangue about atomic weapons not changing the nature of war or the nature of imperialism. People, not weapons, we are told, decide fate of wars, and war is inseparable from imperialism. Hence the people will finish off imperialism in an atomic war. Nothing has changed because of atomic weapons and there is nothing new to worry about.

The simple point that atomic weapons are immensely more destructive than the previous weapons, and what is more, with the Soviet lead in such weapons, imperialists themselves realise that they cannot unleash war without having to face their own extinction is thus of no significance and is disposed of.

But what have the imperialists themselves to say in the matter? The convocation address of President Kennedy delivered at the Washington University on June 10, 1963 is a very revealing piece of thinking on the part of one who was the foremost spokesman of the mightiest imperialist power on earth, "the main force of aggression and war", as described by the Moscow Statement. Passages from the address would well stand quotation.

Kennedy's basic views, of course, remain the same as of any imperialist or bourgeois. He said, "As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant, as a negation of personal freedom and dignity." So there is no question of harbouring any illusion that his attitude towards war and peace had changed because of any change in his attitude towards communism.

But then we have,

I speak of peace because of the new face of war. Total war makes no sense in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains almost ten times the explosive force delivered by all the allied air forces in the Second World War and when the deadly poisons produced would be carried by wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners of the globe and to generations yet unborn.

Then he proceeded,

I speak of peace as the necessary rational end of rational men. All we have built, all we have worked for, would be destroyed in the first twenty-four hours.

He termed the Russian social system as "evil" and then proceeded,

But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture and in acts of courage. Among the many traits the peoples of our two countries have in common, none is stronger than our mutual abhorrence of war. No nation in the history of battle ever suffered more than the Soviet Union suffered in the course of the Second World War... It is an ironical but accurate fact that today, should total war ever break out again — no matter how — our two countries, the two strongest powers, would become the primary targets and suffer the greatest devastation.

President Kennedy then called on the audience to

begin by looking inwards and re-examine our own attitude as individuals and as a nation, towards the Soviet Union, for our attitude is as important as theirs.

Could all differences between the USA and the USSR be ended? Kennedy replied:

If we cannot end now our differences, we can help make the world safe for diversity... We are willing to engage in peaceful competition.

On the question of whether the Soviet Union would carry out its obligation regarding disarmament, Kennedy said,

agreements to this end are in the interests of the Soviet Union as well as ours and hence it can be relied upon to accept and keep treaty obligations.

No one expects or says that the imperialists can be trusted to adhere to all these views and sentiments in practice. That is why the Soviet Union always keeps its powder dry. But they are certainly not all hypocrisy and cheating. And that for the reason that Kennedy expressed these views because he realised that there was no alternative. Imperialists are imperialists, but their policies have to bear some resemblance to their coolly calculated self-interest.

In fact, Lenin himself had anticipated such a development. He had said that a time would come when war would create the "danger of undermining the very conditions of the existence of human society." (*Kommunist*, No. 14, 1963). He had said that the imperialists would have to take cognisance of such a situation.

But all this is wasted on the Chinese leaders. For them, there is "a bourgeois reason and a proletarian reason" and there can be no meeting ground between the two. Any

such concept is embellishing imperialism, or "historical idealism."

We have already pointed out that the principle of peaceful coexistence of states of different social systems, far from disabling the socialist countries from giving moral and material aid to the people fighting for national independence, far from preventing them from giving military protection to peace-loving independent countries attacked by the imperialists, actually enjoins upon the socialist countries to render such aid to the people and the countries concerned.

But the Chinese leadership, which considers itself the most flaming champion of the cause of colonial liberation, does not accept this. It accuses the Soviet leadership and the communist parties in advanced capitalist countries of being "apologists of neo-colonialism" in the name of peace and peaceful coexistence. The bitterest of all its charges against the CPSU and the brother parties is that "they are taking a passive or scornful attitude towards the struggle of the oppressed nations for liberation. In fact, they are protecting the interests of monopoly capital... cater to the needs of imperialism and create a new 'theory' to justify the rule of imperialism in these areas." (CC CPC Letter, pp. 12-13).

The best answer to these accusations has been given by Comrade Khrushchov himself in his replies to the questions submitted to him by the editors of four newspapers, one from Ghana, two from Algeria and one from Burma. ("On the Liberation Movement in the Present Period," *News and Views from the Soviet Union*, December 28, 1963.) Below we give certain vital excerpts:

Question: Is there not a contradiction between the policy of peaceful coexistence and the national liberation struggle?

Answer: I think that history has already provided a convincing answer to this question in the experience of

the national liberation movement itself. It is a fact that the peoples have achieved the greatest successes in the struggle for political independence in the post-war period, a period that has, on the whole, been marked by the peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems. It was then that the world colonial system collapsed, and imperialism, held back by the might of the community of socialist states, proved unable to hurl its main military forces against the peoples who had arisen in the struggle for their liberation.

In this connection I could quote Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, an outstanding fighter against imperialism, who said that if it had not been for the Soviet Union the movement for emancipation from the colonial yoke in Africa would have experienced the full force of cruel and brutal suppression.

Over 50 national states have appeared on the political map of the world under conditions of peaceful coexistence. The flames of a victorious national liberation struggle leaped to the Western Hemisphere and the glorious Cuban revolution triumphed.

There is nothing unexpected in this from the Marxist point of view, it is fully in accordance with objective laws. The principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems, if it is understood in the Leninist way, does not mean a reconciliation with imperialism, damping down the revolutionary struggle and curtailing the national liberation movement. This principle concerns relations between states with different social and political systems. It envisages the existence of those countries without wars, without any intervention in internal affairs, and the maintenance and development of normal diplomatic, economic and other relations between states. It goes without saying that it does not by any means imply that the struggle between states with different social systems ceases under the conditions of

peaceful coexistence. On the contrary, peaceful coexistence presupposes an economic struggle or competition, to use the language of capitalists, in the form of economic emulation and also political and ideological struggle. It presupposes vigorous action on the part of the socialist countries and of all the forces of peace and progress against the aggressive and colonialist intrigues of imperialism. But, I repeat, that is a struggle that must develop in peaceful conditions, without any interference in the internal affairs of the coexisting countries.

We know that as long as there is national and colonial slavery, the national liberation struggle will continue. We give that struggle our full support. No Marxist-Leninist has ever regarded peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems as meaning the preservation of the *status quo*, as a sort of armistice with imperialism, as a "guarantee of protection" against the revolutionary process of national and social emancipation. No one applies this principle to relations between imperialism and the oppressed peoples, since the principle of coexistence does not place a veto on the struggle of those peoples. On the contrary, Marxist-Leninists have always believed that the oppressed peoples can win their freedom only by a determined struggle against their enslavers, when necessary by taking up arms.

That is why we always have been and always shall be against the peaceful coexistence of exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed. That is why we favour the peaceful coexistence of capitalist and socialist states and at the same time give all possible aid to the peoples conducting a national liberation struggle.

Equally groundless are the attempts to represent the struggle for disarmament as an effort to disarm the peoples who have arisen in struggle against imperialism. Is it not clear that disarmament concerns mainly the arsenals of the Great Powers who have the main body of arma-

ments concentrated in their hands? The peoples of the colonies and the newly-free countries also stand to gain if the imperialist war machine is dismantled, they stand to gain from the elimination of imperialist military bases in their countries. In the final analysis disarmament will strengthen the security and independence of the young national states. If an end were put to the arms race, fairly large funds would be liberated in the young national states which could be used to meet the needs of economic and cultural development. The socialist states, in their turn, would also be able to considerably increase their economic, scientific and technical aid to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. But as long as the imperialists reject disarmament, the liberated countries are right in strengthening their defence potential.

A situation of international tension and the war preparations of the imperialists prevent the young national states from concentrating on the fulfilment of their own primary tasks. The imperialists, using the cold war hysteria, are trying to draw the liberated countries into military blocs, set up military bases on their territory, force those countries to participate in the arms race.

From what has been said it can be seen that the struggle for peaceful coexistence and for disarmament is a vital issue for the peoples of the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Moscow Treaty on the partial nuclear tests ban is the first, but nevertheless an important, step in the right direction and it is fully in accord with their interests. The majority of young national states joined the Treaty, and thereby show statesmanship and solicitude for the fate of the peace. Further efforts in this direction are needed. We fully support the African states that proposed to turn Africa into an atom-free zone. We offer full support to their struggle against the French imperialists continuing their nuclear tests in the Sahara. Any further steps making for the lessening of inter-

national tension and the consolidation of peace will meet with our understanding and support.

Question: Would you again please explain your position on the issue of peaceful and armed forms of struggle of the peoples against the colonialists?

Answer: Our party has frequently outlined its position on this issue, but I am willing to repeat it. First of all, I should like to say straight away that there is no universal recipe suitable for all countries and peoples. The application of one form of struggle or the other depends on concrete conditions, primarily on how strongly the colonialists and their henchmen resist. We know that some of the people oppressed by imperialism won their independence by armed struggle. Theirs were sacred wars which we always have supported and still support. Others achieved independence by peaceful means. We believe that both these forms are legitimate and expedient when they lead to national liberation.

Guinea, for instance, was able to throw off the colonial yoke without an armed struggle. The mass movement of the Guinean people against the foreign enslavers that continued for a number of years undermined the foundations of the colonial regime and created a situation in which Guinea was able to achieve independence without an insurrection, after rejecting the 'French community' which was being imposed on her. The Guinean people have strengthened their independence with the support of the other freedom-loving peoples.

Things took a different turn in Algeria.

The Algerian people drove out the French colonialists after many years of bloody armed struggle. Their heroism won the admiration and respect of all freedom-loving peoples. They always had the full sympathy and support of the Soviet people. Nor was it a purely platonic support.

The USSR despatched large quantities of weapons to the Algerian patriots free of charge. We also afforded Indo-

nesia, Yemen and other countries substantial help in their armed struggles.

We lent all our power to the support of the Egyptian people when they were faced with the necessity of dealing the imperialist aggressors an armed rebuff. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are actively helping the young national states to strengthen their defences, establish and train armed forces to protect from the inroads of the imperialists the independence they have won. We Marxist-Leninists stand firmly on Lenin's principled position—we believe that the peoples do not take up arms and shed their blood of their own free will. The violence of the colonialists forces them to it, and when a people is forced to rise in armed struggle it is the duty of all internationalists to give them every possible aid and support. That is our position in respect of the armed struggle of the peoples for their national liberation. At the same time, any thinking person who faces reality must see that today the task of most of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America who have created their national states, is not only that of defending their country against the aggression of some imperialist power, but that of achieving economic independence, developing the economy, raising the living standard of the people and developing democracy. Nobody will believe that the problems of the national renaissance of the liberated countries can be solved on the battlefield. The important thing for the countries that have achieved national independence is to reconstruct their economic and social system, improve the living standards of the masses, eliminate the dominance of the foreign exploiters and to destroy the political positions of their internal allies. The centre of gravity in this struggle—a struggle that is undoubtedly anti-imperialist in character—lies in consummating the national liberation, anti-feudal, democratic revolution." (pp. 11 to 15).