

# **CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM**

**NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES OF EAST ASIA**

**Reports Presented in 1949  
to the Pacific Institute of the Academy  
of Sciences, U.S.S.R.**

Bombay  
PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.,

The postwar years have seen a mighty revolutionary upsurge in Asia. The once backward and submissive people are today rising to break their change of age-long slavery. They refuse to live in the old way. The imperialists are unable to rule in the old way. There is a crisis in the colonial system.

The imperialists say that the crisis has been “engineered by the Communists”—but this view is not accepted by many who hold that the refusal of the imperialists to quit their colonies is the main cause of the crisis.

This volume contains a series of reports presented by leading Soviet writers to the 1949 session of the Pacific Institute, Academy of Sciences, USSR. These reports give an analysis of the colonial crisis from the Marxist point of view, and show why liberation of the colonial peoples is essential for freedom and peace of the world.

*First printed in India: April 1951*

*Price: Rs. 4*

## **PUBLISHERS' NOTE**

This volume contains reports by Soviet Academicians to the Pacific Institute of the Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R., in 1949. This volume was originally published in Moscow in Russian. The reports in this volume have been translated in English and published in India by the People's Publishing House, Ltd., in a series of six separate booklets. Here they are offered in a consolidated volume. The reports on Indonesia and Philippines, which are there in the original Russian edition, have been omitted in this volume.

## CONTENTS

1. <a href="#"><u>CRISIS OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA AND THE NEW STAGE IN THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF HER PEOPLES</u></a> By A.M. Dyakov .....	1
2. <a href="#"><u>SHARPENING CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM AFTER WORLD WAR II</u></a> By E. M. Zhukov .....	25
3. <a href="#"><u>CHINA: FROM A SEMI-COLONY TO A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY</u></a> By G. Astafyev .....	42
4. <a href="#"><u>KOREA: AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR</u></a> By F. I. Shabshina .....	81
5. <a href="#"><u>THE PEOPLE OF VIETNAM IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE AND DEMOCRACY</u></a> By V. Y. Vasilieva.....	109
6. <a href="#"><u>NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES OF MALAYA</u></a> By G. L. Bondarevsky .....	120
7. <a href="#"><u>MANOEUVRES OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN CEYLON</u></a> By S. V. Pokrovsky .....	131

## CRISIS OF BRITISH RULE IN INDIA AND THE NEW STAGE IN THE LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF HER PEOPLES

The upheavals which took place in India after the Second World War represent one of the clearest indications of the post-war sharpening of the crisis of the Colonial system of imperialism. India belongs to the category of the more industrially developed colonies, with a national big bourgeoisie in India has its long history. India is a clear example of the fact that after the Second World War the national big bourgeoisie has become the main support of imperialism in the most developed colonies. Here we see that in those colonies where the proletariat is emerging as an independent political force and where a well-organised big bourgeoisie has entered into a compromise with imperialism, complete liberation from the rule of imperialism is impossible without a struggle against this bourgeoisie.

The objective conditions for the anti-imperialist revolution in India were already created long ago. Already before the First World War, the organised national movement, directed against British rule, represented a political force. After the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which had a tremendous influence on India, the national movement assumed a mass character. India marched ahead of other colonial and dependent countries in the struggle for its liberation. In 1920, at the Third Congress of the Comintern, V.I. Lenin, speaking of the awakening of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, said:

“British India is at the head of these countries, and there revolution is maturing in proportion to the growth of the industrial and railways proletariat, on the one hand, and to the increase in the brutal terrorism of the British—who are more frequently resorting to massacres (Amritsar), public floggings, etc., on the other. “(V.I. Lenin, Thesis of report on the Tactics of the Russian Communist Part to the Third Congress of the Comintern, *Selected Works*, Two-Volume Edition, Moscow, Vol. II, p, 731

In his work *On the Foundations of Leninism*, J.V Stalin in 1924, wrote that in India the imperialist chain may break earlier than in other countries.

These observations of Lenin and Stalin were completely in conformity with the objective situation that had developed in India immediately after the October Revolution; if at the present time British imperialism retains India in colonial dependence, through in a new and concealed form, then this can be explained by the distinctive features of the Indian national liberation movement and by the distinctive features of British policy in India.

India's exploitation by British imperialism was carried out not through local and formally independent government as in the semi-colonies like China, Iran, Egypt, etc., but through governments which in fact were wholly independent on imperialism. India was directly ruled by British officials. In spite of the fact that already since the second half of the nineteenth century, India had firmly embarked on the path of capitalist development and the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie assumed a sharp character, the bourgeoisie was nevertheless dissatisfied with the existing form of British rule. This contributed to creating illusions about the unity of interests of all classes of Indian society in the struggle against British imperialism, till the October Revolution and even till the thirties of the twentieth century, only the feudal princes, the semi-feudal landlords and the comprador sections of the bourgeoisie openly supported British rule., nevertheless feared the mass anti-imperialist and anti-feudal movement. It utilized the mass movement to extract political and economic concessions from the British ruling classes; but when this movement assumed an active character and began to broach upon the interests of the bourgeoisie, it invariably betrayed it.

The Indian bourgeoisie created its class organisations considerably earlier than the proletariat. Therefore, headed by the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords, the All-India National Congress captured the leadership of the national liberation movement. Though in the struggle against the rule of British imperialism, the bourgeoisie was nothing but a most unreliable and vacillating member, always ready for compromise and for betrayal, the Congress under its leadership virtually monopolised the leadership of the entire movement till the thirties of this century.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, in the period of the upsurge of the national liberation movement of India, to which the Russian Revolution of 1905 had given an impetus there appeared sharp contradictions within the national movement between the Right wing comprising of the bourgeoisie and the landlords and the left wing comprising of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia., result of this was the split in the National Congress and the expulsion of democratic elements from it; the Right wing of the Congress came to a compromise with British imperialism on the basis of the constitutional reforms of 1909.

After the First World War and the October Revolution these contradictions were further aggravated. The broadest masses of the workers and peasants of India rose in struggle. Already by 1919 the masses in the most important provinces had entered the movement. However, the bourgeoisie was able to retain leadership in its hands. This to a considerable extent can be explained by the advent to leadership of Gandhi. Gandhism was the most powerful weapon in the hands of the bourgeois-landlord leadership of the National Congress, which made it possible for it to hold back the masses in obedience and to utilise the growing mass movement in its own interests.

Gandhi preached class peace, the inviolability of private property and of existing social relationships. Thus he was the representative of the interests of the Indian big bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. By skilfully playing upon the anti-imperialist sentiments of the broad masses, by utilising their political immaturity and down-trodden existence, their religious and social prejudices and their native patriarchal faith in the possibility of liberating themselves peacefully from the yoke of a foreign nation, he created those peculiar forms of participation of the political struggles which were advantageous to the bourgeoisie. Therefore, immediately the movement began assuming form which was dangerous for the bourgeoisie, it was able to utilise Gandhism so that betraying and decapitating the movement, it could retain at the same time its influence to a certain extent. In the period of the 1919-1922 movement, the membership of the National Congress rose to ten millions. The bourgeoisie betrayed the 1919-1922 movement—its (bourgeoisie's) major section heading the National Congress came to an agreement with British imperialism. In his speech to the students of the University of the Toilers of the East in 1925, J.V. Stalin characterised the political situation in India and the tasks of the Indian Communists in the following manner;

“The fundamental and new feature in the conditions of existence of such colonies as India is not only that the national bourgeoisie has split into a revolutionary party and a compromising party, but, primarily, that the compromising section of this bourgeoisie has already managed in the main to come to an agreement with imperialism. Dreading revolution more than imperialism, concerned more about its moneybags than about the interests of its own country, this section of the bourgeoisie the wealthiest and the most influential section is completely going over to the camp of the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, having entered into a bloc with imperialism against the working and peasants of its own country. The victory of the revolution cannot be achieved unless this bloc is broken. But in order to break this bloc fire must be concentrated on the compromising national bourgeoisie; its treachery must be exposed, the toiling masses must be emancipated from its influence, and the conditions necessary for the hegemony of the proletariat must be systematically prepared. In other words, it is a question of preparing the proletariat of such colonies as India for the role of leader in the liberation movement, and of dislodging, step

by step, the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen from this honourable position. The task is to create a revolutionary anti-imperialist bloc and to ensure the hegemony of the proletariat within this bloc.” (J.V. Stalin, **Marxism and the National and Colonial Question**, Lawrence & Wishart, 1947, p. 217)

However, the task of dislodging the bourgeoisie from the leadership of the national liberation movement and of freeing the broad masses of peasantry and the petty-bourgeoisie from its influence was not accomplished in the period owing to the weakness of the Communist groups and the absence of unity in the working class movement and also as a consequence of the claver demagogy of the bourgeois leaders. In the period of the World economic crisis, the position of the Indian bourgeoisie strengthened noticeably, the contradiction between it and British imperialism became aggravated and the representatives of that wing of the Indian big bourgeoisie which masked itself under “Left” phrases of the toilers to the side of the Congress and to utilise the mass movement as an instrument of pressure on the British imperialists, they widely employed anti-imperialist demagogy. Even in 1933 when a united Communist party was created and further the split in the trade unions was eliminated and the unity of the trade union movement was achieved, the task of dislodging the bourgeoisie from the leadership of the national movement was not accomplished.

Since 1935, the Communist Party of India followed the tactics of a United National Front and actively participated in the work of the National Congress. These tactics enabled the Indian communists to extend their influence among the workers, peasants, students, youth and a section of the intelligentsia. However, in carrying out the tactics of a United Front, the Indian Communists committed Right opportunist and nationalistic mistakes, which were expressed in the refusal to criticize Gandhi, Nehru and other bourgeois leaders of the National Congress and the refusal to expose their anti-popular leanings.

As a result of this the Communists were not able to fulfil the task of dislodging the bourgeoisie from the leadership of the national movement.

British imperialist policy in India is characterised by a great flexibility, by a skilful utilisation of the different contradictions and historical survivals (religion, princely states, castes, etc.) that are peculiar to Indian society. By carrying out this policy in practice in a planned manner and in particular by setting Hindus and Muslims against each other, British imperialism managed to succeed in the formation of separate Hindu and Muslim political organisations (the Hindu Mahasabha and the League), which became an important weapon for the realisation of the British policy. Profiting from the opportunism and the repeated treachery of the leaders of the National Congress, their connection with the Hindu landlords and moneylenders, their fear of the working class and the peasant movement and their incapacity not merely to solve the agrarian and national questions but even to put forward a more or less radical programme for their solution, the leaders of the Muslim intelligentsia and peasantry. Thus, it turned out that considerable democratic strata of the Muslims were not only divorced from but even set in opposition to the struggle of the great masses of the population of India.

As a result of all this, when the British imperialists were no longer able to rule India in the old way, they carried out the partition of India and created two dominions there, having ensured for themselves through this, new possibilities of playing upon the contradictions between the newly formed states, of setting them one against the other and thus retaining their political domination in a new form.

These were the basic reasons why though there existed in India all the objective pre-requisites for the complete overthrow of the oppression of an alien imperialism, in spite of the long history of her national liberation movement, the considerable solidarity of her working class and the existence of a Communist Party, India was not able to liberate herself from colonial dependence.

Before the Second World War, India saw a new rise in the national liberation movement. This ascent was in the initial stage of its development but even at this stage it differed considerably in many of its aspects from the rise in 1919-22 and the rise at the beginning of the thirties.

The main features of the pre-war rise in the national liberation movement were the followings:

1. The working class of India, though its individual sections remained under the influence of national reformism, emerged as an independent political force, and put forward a most consistent programme of struggle for the liberation of India from British rule and from the feudal survivals and was thus the foremost detachment, the vanguard of the entire national liberation movement. The Communist Party played a leading role in the main organisations of the working class and also in a number of peasant unions.

The rise in the working class movement was expressed in the great sweep of the strike movement, in the organised character of the strikes, their duration and in the fact that political demands were also set forth alongside economic demands.

2. The peasant movement was on the ascent. In the thirties peasant unions (kisan sabhas) began to be formed in India; although at the beginning of the war they comprised altogether of nearly half a million members, they nevertheless enjoyed influence in the advanced regions of India and particularly in East Bengal, in Andhra, in Bihar, in the United Provinces, in Kerala and in East Punjab. The peasant movement marched under the slogans of reduction of rent, abolition of usury, reduction in land and water taxes. The more progressive peasant organisations led by the Communists demanded the abolition of landlordism. Millions of peasants participated in the meetings, in the peasant marches and the strikes of tenants that were organised by the peasants' unions.

The peasantry actively supported the anti-imperialist slogans that were advanced by the National Congress at that time. One must take into account the fact that both in the period of the pre-war upsurge and at the present time the majority of the peasants are still under the influence of the reactionary ideology of Gandhism.

3. The movement against the feudal-landlord oppression and the remnants of serfdom embraced not only the population of the provinces of British India but also the majority of the princely states. There had been a movement in the princely states even earlier but then it bore a scattered and spontaneous character. In the process of this movement mass organisations (Praja Mandals, Praja Parishads) were formed in the princely states. These organisations had a very mixed social composition and in the majority of cases bourgeois and landlord elements, connected with the Indian National Congress stood at their head. The National Congress which till the pre-war upsurge had unceasingly pursued the line of refusing to organise the struggle in the princely states, after this movement began developing spontaneously, contrived to seize the leadership of this movement into its own hands, in order to impede its growing over into a revolutionary upsurge. In certain princely states the movement reached the stage of peasant uprisings (in the princely states of Orissa). The organisations of the subject people of the princely states were amalgamated on an all-India scale, by the creation of the so-called States People's Conference the leading role of which belonged to the leaders of the National Congress—thus predetermining the reformist character of the movement.

The people of the princely states who had earlier kept aloof from the India-wide national liberation movement and objectively played the role of a reserve of British imperialism in India, have now been converted into an active participant in the anti-imperialist struggle.

The help rendered to the princes by the British authorities in India contributed to the merging of the anti-feudal movement in the princely states with the anti-imperialist movement in India as a whole. However, the proletariat did not succeed even then in dislodging the bourgeois-landlord elements from the leadership of the movement.

In order to retain its authority among the masses, the leadership of the National Congress increased its pressure on British imperialism by putting forward more resolute demands than before (the immediate granting of independence, refusal to support British in future war, etc.). The objective sharpening of the contradiction between the Indian bourgeoisie and British imperialism also operated in this very direction.

In the period of the world economic crisis, owing to certain distinctive features of its manifestation in India, the position of Indian capital, not only did not weaken but became more strengthened; the textile industry, the main base of Indian capital grew; at the time of the crisis new branches of industry—sugar and cement where also Indian capital predominated—developed powerfully. In this connection, the position of the bourgeoisie, which had no rights in the political life of India became even more unbearable for it than before.

The promotion to the leading positions in the Congress of those representatives of the Indian bourgeoisie who were capable of widely resorting to Left phrases (Nehru and other “Lefts”) was a result not only of a change in the composition of the Congress but also an expression of the sharpening of the contradiction between British imperialism and the Indian bourgeoisie and an attempt on the part of the latter to utilise the mass movement. After the suppression of the movement in the beginning of the thirties, the National Congress was converted once again into a small organisation, comprising of some hundred thousand members and the fall in its influence created for the bourgeoisie the menace of masses freeing themselves from under its influence. The “Left” leaders of the type of Nehru were promoted in order to strengthen this influence.

Before the Second World War, when there was an upsurge in the national liberation movement, the Congress, through the manoeuvres of its leadership, once again extended its influence amongst the masses. The mistakes of the Communists in pursuing the tactics of the united Front also contributed in a considerable measure to this. The membership of the Congress rose to nearly six million. All parties and groups supporting the demand for complete independence—from Communists to Gandhites included—became members of the Congress. However, the leadership of the Congress continued to remain in the hands of Gandhi and his adherents, *i.e.*, the representatives of the Indian big bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords. Therefore, the National Congress never played the role of “general staff” of the national liberation movement, although it appeared as such in the eyes of the broad strata of the petty-bourgeois masses and even of a section of the working class which still retained illusions about the unity of the interests of all Indians in the struggle against British imperialism. The leadership of the National Congress, in spite of the very radical sounding speeches of Nehru, in spite of the declarations at the sessions of the Congress, attempted as before to utilise its influence amongst the masses not for the aims of liberating India from British imperialism and the oppression of feudal survivals, but for bargaining with British imperialism for terms of agreement more profitable to the Indian big bourgeoisie.

However, British imperialism did not meet the demands of the Indians bourgeoisie even halfway—not even to the extent of creating a basis for an agreement. The international situation did not yet compel it do this and the influence of the National Congress and of Gandhi on the masses gave some guarantee that the anti-imperialist movement would not assume a revolutionary character. In the pre-war period, the policy of setting Muslims against Hindus, which was directed towards the splitting of the national liberation movement was intensified.



In order to extend its mass base, the Muslim League declared as its aim the struggle for the complete independence of India; with this it drew over to its side a considerable section of the Muslim intelligentsia and peasantry. On the other hand, it strengthened its position in the Punjab and in Bengal by forming an alliance with two openly pro-British reactionary parties of these provinces and in particular, with the Right wing of the Bengal “Krishak Praja Party” headed by Fazlul Huq and the Unionist Party in the Punjab, headed by Sikander Hayat Khan.

In the period of the Second World War, the struggle against British rule in India did not cease. Till the attack of Hitler Germany on the USSR, the alignment of forces in India was essentially no different from the pre-war one. It was not merely a question of the National Congress refusing to render active assistance to the war efforts of Britain, but what was much more important was that till June 1941, an anti-war mass movement was going on in India, in which workers and artisans, students and peasants participated actively. This movement was expressed in the form of strikes, in various conferences of protest against drawing India into the war and also in the form of strike actions against the rise in prices, etc.

Till June 1941, there was virtually no change even in the composition of the National Congress. The Communists continued to participate in it and supported the anti-war line of the National Congress. In this period, the Congress strove to bring pressure on British imperialism without unleashing a mass struggle; it was the Communists who strove to raise the masses to launch a struggle for the independence of India. Naturally, therefore, the attempts of the British ruling circles to disrupt the national liberation movement and to weaken it became intensified.

Towards the end of 1939 and in the beginning of 1940, the leading circles of the Muslim League under the direct instigation of the British ruling circles put forward the slogan of the partition of India into two states—Muslim Pakistan and Hindu Hindustan.

It was only after the attack on the USSR by Hitler Germany, after the entry of the USSR into the war that significant changes took place in the alignment of forces within India.

The Communist Party of India declared that in order to defeat the bloc of fascist aggressors it would completely support the war efforts of the allies in the struggle against fascism, would call upon the Indian workers to increase their war production, without, however, ceasing the struggle against British imperialism for the liberation of India. The Communists completely supported during this period the demands of the National Congress for the promulgation of a declaration with respect to granting complete independence to India and the immediate creation in India of a government responsible to the Indian legislative organs and composed of Indian political leaders. The Communist Party of India demanded India’s participation in the intensification of the struggle against the fascist bloc, the opening of the Second Front and the fulfilment of all the obligations of the British Government with regard to trade supplies to the USSR. They advanced the slogan of converting the war into a people’s war.

The Indian bourgeoisie utilised widely the war situation and readily fulfilled the war orders and took part in the different links of the colonial administration connected with the allotment of orders and of other forms of “regulation” of economy. The landlords made a fortune out of speculation in grain during wartime.

At the same time the political representatives of the bourgeoisie and the liberal landlords attempted to utilise as before the war difficulties in order to bargain for concessions from the British Government and for being allowed to share power in India. In spite of the resolutions adopted by the National Congress on the question of war, in which sympathy was expressed for the countries struggling against the fascist aggressors and in particular towards the Soviet Union and China, the National

Congress declared that it would just as before not support the war efforts of British unless a “National” Government responsible to the legislative organs of India was formed immediately, *i.e.* it continued the policy of extorting concessions in favour of the Indian bourgeoisie. All the resolutions about sympathy towards the forces fighting against fascism were only a screen to conceal the narrow, class, bourgeois nationalist position of the Congress.

The first serious attempt of the British Government to reach an open political agreement with the Indian bourgeoisie, in order to draw it over to its side, was made in March 1942 when Cripps (one of the members of Churchill’s Cabinet and at the same time a representative of the Labourite top strata) was sent for negotiations with leaders of the Indian political parties. However, the programme stated in the draft declaration of the British War Cabinet, communicated by Cripps, was not adopted by the National Congress mainly because the British ruling circles had not agreed to the creation during the period of war itself of a responsible Government in India. The National Congress did not wish to content itself with mere declarations of promised concessions in the future and demanded immediate concrete steps directed towards drawing in the Indian bourgeoisie into the administration of the country.

Outwardly the Cripps mission aggravated the relationships between the British Government and the National Congress. Based on the mass movement, the National Congress as yet made attempts to extort concessions from the British Government in the interests of the propertied classes of India. It was precisely with this aim that the session of the All-India Congress Committee in Bombay, in the beginning of August 1942, adopted a resolution threatening the British Government that if in the immediate future a “National” Government was not set up in India, the Congress would begin a campaign of mass civil disobedience.

The declaration of the British authorities about the Congress being prepared with a plan for organising diversion and sabotage of war measures on a mass scale does not in any way correspond to reality. The leadership of the Congress would never agree to raising the masses in struggle against the British Government not only in the period of the war but also in times of peace. But the attempts to utilise the war difficulties of the British to bargain for concessions for the propertied classes of India, which was the basis of the policy of the National Congress in the period of the war contributed against its own will to the growth of the anti-imperialist movement and also to the retention of the authority of the National Congress among the broad masses; whereas the demands of the National Congress for the formation of a National Government and for declaring India as an independent country won the support of the masses, the British ruling circles were seriously disturbed by the development of events. Therefore, the British authorities arrested the leaders of the Congress in August 1942. The British Government knew for a certainty that these arrests would provoke a wave of indignation in India, bringing behind it spontaneous protest actions and contribute to the unleashing of an anti-British movement. On the other hand, contrary to the sentiments of the British authorities it was well known to the Government that the National Congress had made no preparations whatsoever for an active struggle against British rule and that the actions would bear an unorganized, local character and, therefore, it would not be very difficult to crush them. The calculations of the British ruling circles were to a considerable extent justified.

The leadership of the National Congress which was in prison did not sympathise with the mass movement of protest; those leaders of the National Congress who were at liberty, also made no attempts to lend it. The charge against the Indian Communists that was put forward by the leaders of the National Congress in 1945 and later that they had disrupted the 1942 movement and through this impeded the liberation of India from British rule was a slander directed towards discrediting the Communist Party. The 1942 movement could not grow over into a general popular uprising because it was deprived of leadership and bore a scattered character. Already, at the end of 1943, and in the beginning of 1944, the majority of the leading workers of the Congress were set free from imprisonment under various pretexts and in the spring of 1944 Gandhi also was set free. Although the then Secretary of State for India, Amery, declared

that Gandhi was set free owing to illness and that the British Government did not wish to go a single step further than the Cripps proposals, still there is no doubt that the British Government and the leaders of the National Congress intended to resume negotiations.

Towards the end of 1944, the anti-British movement once again began to intensify in India. Attempts were made to reach an agreement between the Muslim League and the National Congress on the basis of mutual concessions. Certain leaders of the National Congress and in particular Rajagopalchari urged that the Congress should agree in principle to the formation of Pakistan on the condition that a plebiscite would be held in those parts of the provinces which would be subject to the division. Under pressure from the ordinary members of the National Congress and the Muslim League, Gandhi (after his release) and Jinnah conducted negotiations in order to reach an agreement. However, as was to be expected, this agreement did not come about. It must be noted that all the progressive elements, both in the League and within the National Congress, genuinely strove to attain an agreement between these two organisations in order to unite their forces in the struggle against British imperialism. But neither the leadership of the Muslim League headed by Jinnah nor the majority of the leading Congressmen headed by Patel wanted this agreement.

In spite of the fact that the mass sections against British domination were crushed, the political situation towards the end of 1944 and the beginning of 1945 had become so aggravated that the Government expected new outbreak of the anti-imperialist movement. The then Viceroy of India, Lord Wavell, went to England in order to work out measures for the solution of the "Indian crisis". We came back from England when Germany had already capitulated. As a result of his negotiations with the British Government, the leaders of the National Congress who were still in prison were released and once again negotiations began between them and the British Government where measures were adopted which precluded an agreement between the Congress and the League. It was precisely this task which was pursued by the conference in Simla in June 1945.

The Labour victory in the British elections was rewarded by the Congress leadership as a favourable factor to reach an agreement with the British Government although any special hope about the Labourites granting any concessions immediately were not expected by even the Right-wing leaders of the Congress.

All these facts prove that a formal bargain between the British Government and the Indian bourgeoisie was not yet complete till the termination of the war, that the British Government even at this period hoped to get off with only insignificant concessions. At the same time the mass working class and peasant movement in India did not as yet assume a sweep sufficient enough to frighten the Indian bourgeoisie and make it more complaint. Therefore, the declaration of the Labour Government of September 19, 1945, which was a complete repetition of the terms communicated through Cripps, found a very cold reception from the leaders of the Congress. The Congress leaders, for example Abul Kalam Azad, the then President of the Congress sharply criticised the decision of the Labourite Government to conduct elections to the central and provincial legislative assemblies in the period between November 1945 and April 1946, without removing the laws and ordinances of the war period. However, in September 1945, there took place events in India which accelerated the compromise between the British Government and the Indian bourgeoisie. The international situation in general and in particular the situation developing in South-East Asia after the capitulation of Japan contributed in a still greater measure to this.

Mass anti-British actions began in India in September 1945, the trial of the soldiers of the so-called Indian National Army who had surrendered after the defeat of the Japanese in Burma served as a direct cause of this. A section of the officers and soldiers of this army, who were from among the soldiers and officers of the British Indian Army organised with Japanese aid by Subhas Chandra Bose and who

had been taken captive by the Japanese in Singapore were brought before a Military court on a charge of treason. Many of them were threatened with death sentences. This trial invoked a movement of protest. The cause of this was not only the popularity of Bose but also the growth of anti-British sentiments. Simultaneously with this there developed a movement of protest against the use of Indian troops for the suppression of the national liberation movement in Indonesia and in Indo-China. In Calcutta the movement commenced by the students was supported by a section of the workers. At the same time there were strikes of municipal workers there. As a result of this, matters reached the stage of armed clashes with the police. Barricades were erected in some areas of the city. For some days the city was without light and water. The British authorities did not succeed in crushing the movement by police force and British and American troops were called out. The movement was suppressed but it flared up in other towns and in particular in Bombay and in Delhi. During October and November 1945, the actions against the trial of Bose's army and against the use of Indian troops in Indonesia and Indo-China flared up several times in many towns of India.

The elections to the legislatures assemblies which were to a considerable extent intended by the British Government to distract the attention of the masses from the direct struggle against British rule in India and also to foment Hindu-Muslim differences did not yield the results which the British Government expected. Though the Muslim League came out with very sharp anti-Hindu slogans in the mass in Calcutta, Bombay, etc., Hindus and Muslims acted jointly.

Hoping to draw the masses to its side, the Congress entered the elections with an outwardly radical programme. It declared that it would fight for complete independence and not consent to Dominion Status; while objecting to partitioning the country into Hindustan and Pakistan, the Congress at the same time declared that India was to be a federation of equal political units. It promised to carry out the nationalisation of the main branches of industry and in the first place of those enterprises belonging to British capital and land reform with payment of compensation to the landlords and the capitalists.

The Communist Party of India took part in the elections with its own consistently democratic programme. It demanded the complete independence of India. It declared that it would fight for the granting of the right of self-determination to the point of secession to all national regions and including those where the Muslims comprised the majority of the population. The Communists put forward the demand of nationalisation of the main branches of industry without any compensation, the introduction of workers' control and the complete abolition of landlordism and usury. The Communist Party put forward its candidates in the industrial centres and also in some agricultural districts of the Madras and Bengal provinces. In order to defeat the candidates put forward by the Communists, the Congress made a bloc with the ultra-reactionary landlords and openly pro-British groups—for example with the Justice Party in Madras province and the Non-Brahmin Party in Bombay province. In certain areas, the Congress supported the candidatures of those landlords who had earlier stood against it.

This set-up of fighting forces anticipated the alignment of class forces which came into being in India immediately after its partition.

The Congress won a victory in the elections in all the provinces with a Hindu majority and also in Assam and in the North-West Frontier Province.

In the beginning of 1945, the political situation in India became still more acute. Anti-Government actions took place in the army and in the navy—the strike of airmen and staff personnel of the aerodromes, the revolt of the naval ratings, embracing the entire Indian Navy and the unrest among the Jubbulpore garrison. The workers rendered active support to the sailors by organising solidarity strikes. In Bombay, more than 300,000 workers and students took part in these strikes. These actions created alarm in the British ruling circles and of the National Congress which feared the drawing in of the

army in an active struggle against British imperialism. Therefore, the leaders of the Congress in conjunction with the leaders of the Muslim League did everything possible to disrupt the uprising of the sailors and compelled them to surrender to the Government.

Gandhi, Patel and Nehru took upon themselves the role of intermediaries in the negotiations between the Government and the sailors in revolt. It was the usual betrayal of the national liberation movement of the masses on the part of Gandhi and his companions—in—arms which made it possible for the British imperialists to retain power in their own hands through new manoeuvres and to prevent the downfall of their rule in India. It made it possible for the Indian bourgeoisie to once again take the initiative into its own hands and enter into a bargain to get concessions from the British Government.

A characteristic feature of the mass actions of the autumn of 1945 and the spring of 1946 was that the workers, the peasants and the sailors came forward not completely under the flag of the Communist Party, but that for the most part still under the slogans of the National Congress and the Muslim League. Although at this period the bourgeoisie had already entered into a bloc with even those feudal landlord groups which had formerly been against the Congress, still the masses and in particular the peasantry and partially even the workers had faith in the leadership of the National Congress and the Muslim League.

Thus, illusions about the unity of interests of all classes of Indian society in the struggle against the British had not vanished. This enabled the Congress to hinder the extension and deepening of the mass movement.

The mass actions of the spring of 1945 left a powerful influence upon the British ruling circles and the Indian bourgeoisie. Besides, these actions had commenced in such an international situation that they created a threat both to British domination in India and to the class interests of the Indian bourgeoisie. As a result of the defeat of the Hitlerite bloc and the decisive role played by the Soviet Union in this defeat, the victory of People's Democracy in the countries of Eastern Europe, the development of the national liberation movement in the British colonies occupied by the Japanese (Burma, Malaya), the anti-imperialist movement in the Middle East countries (Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iran and also as a result of the relative strengthening of the USA, which enriched itself during the war, Britain's position in the world was shaken very violently after the Second World War. Even in India, unfavourable conditions were created for the British. Under these circumstances a development of the broad liberation movement in India would have inevitably brought about the complete collapse of British rule there and a loss of the authority of the compromising bourgeoisie. Then an agreement with the National Congress would not have been able to throw the movement backwards and the retention of British positions in India would have been impossible as the mass movement would have passed out of the control of the bourgeoisie. It was precisely this which the British ruling circles feared. This explains why in the spring of 1946 the British Government adopted the decision to send a representative Cabinet Mission to India. In March 1946, the Prime Minister of Britain, Attlee, declared in his speech that the anti-British movement in India had assumed an extremely serious character, that it was intimately bound up with the movements for independence in other countries of South-East Asia and that this movement had begun to embrace the army. He declared, therefore, that the British Government could not but reckon with this and was prepared to grant India independence although he was convinced that it was more profitable both for Britain and India to retain equal members of the "British Commonwealth of Nations".

This speech of Attlee signified that the British ruling circles were unable to rule India in the old way and that to retain India in their hands, they had been compelled to come to a compromise with her well-off classes and to allow them to administer, the country. Thus having made them interested in the retention of political and economic ties with Britain, they turned them into open allies in the struggle against the mass democratic movement.

Though this statement of Attlee was in general received with satisfaction among Congress circles, still the National Congress, seeing the anxiety of the British Government, wanted to utilise the situation in order to extract the maximum concessions for the Indian bourgeoisie from the British ruling circles. In particular, at this period the Congress opposed still more resolutely the partitioning of India and hoped that it would succeed in achieving from Britain the granting of Dominion status for India without its preliminary partition. The British ruling circles did not grant this concession. They feared that after having gained power in India, the National Congress would establish links with the USA and that in a united India the mass movement would be able to assume more menacing dimensions than in a partitioned India. Therefore, in the course of its negotiations with the leaders of the Congress and the League the British Cabinet Mission headed by Pethwick-Lawrence in actual practice sought not to reach an agreement between them but to incite the Muslim League to take up an irreconcilable attitude and it supported the demand for the creation of Pakistan.

In its declaration promulgated on May 16 1946, the British Government put forward a plan for the creation of Dominion with provinces grouped in it into three zones—two Muslim and one Hindu. In other words, while not acceding initially to the creation of Pakistan as a separate Dominion, the British ruling circles proposed to create Pakistan and Hindustan as autonomous parts of a single Indian Dominion and according to the plan, the Central Government of this Dominion was to possess exceedingly limited powers. This proposal did not correspond to the interests of the Indian big bourgeoisie which wanted to enjoy power over the whole of India and it understood that the British scheme did not ensure this possibility for it. The National Congress accepted the Mission's Plan as the basis for the working out of a new constitution and refused initially to participate in a Provisional government.

The leadership of the Muslim League initially accepted the Cabinet Mission Plan and the proposal to participate in the Provisional Government. But through a number of manoeuvres the Viceroy succeeded in making the Muslim League not only refuse participation in the Provisional Government but also in the work of the Constituent Assembly and declare that it was going to begin a struggle for Pakistan.

This stand adopted by the Muslim League suited the British ruling circles. The aggravation of differences between the Muslims and Hindus gave the British new possibilities of manoeuvring and created favourable conditions for bringing pressure on the leadership of the National Congress. When the possibility of an agreement between the Congress and the League had already become nil, the British ruling circles proposed to the Congress and to its representative Nehru the formation of a Provisional Government and this time the Congress accepted this proposal.

This was a decisive step towards a complete agreement with the British Government. However, even after the formation of the Nehru Government, the Indian bourgeoisie still wanted to obtain more than was granted to it by the British ruling circles, *i.e.*, it aimed at securing power over the whole of India and strove to play upon international contradictions. The position occupied by the Nehru Government in UNO towards the end of 1946 is characteristic in this respect. Not only did the Indian delegation attempt to play upon the contradictions between Britain and USA within the Anglo-American bloc of aggressors which had already been formed, but sometimes on individual questions it came out in general against the line of this bloc.

The political situation in India continued to remain very tense. The strike movement of the workers and the students increased. In some regions and particularly in the princely states (Hyderabad, Travancore) there began mass actions of the workers and peasants, which sometimes gave rise to clashes with police and troops. In order to weaken this movement the British ruling circles, supported by the reactionary bourgeois-landlord elements, resorted to their traditional method—the method of fomenting

the differences between Hindus and Muslims. With this, they hoped to frighten the Indian bourgeoisie still more.

On August 16, 1946, the leadership of the Muslim League began its campaign of so-called direct action for the attainment of the demand of partition of India. In Calcutta, on that very day, with the connivance of the Bengal Provincial Government at whose head stood a member of the Muslim League—Suhrawardy—bloody clashes took place between Muslims and Hindus which was the beginning of bloody pogroms and massacres.

This bloody carnage assumed particularly fierce forms in Bihar and in the Punjab. At the same time, the Britain Government attempted through negotiations to secure the consent of the Congress for the partitioning of India and for granting complete autonomy to the princess. The representatives of the League and Congress were summoned to London in November 1946, to accomplish this.

The year 1946 was marked by a sharp aggravation of the class struggle in Indian industry. With the going over of industry from production of war materials to peacetime production, there began mass dismissals of workers. Wishing to preserve the high rate of profit, the Indian bourgeoisie began its attack upon the working class by reducing wages and intensifying workload through methods of capitalist rationalisation of production.

The position of the working class worsened sharply. India lived through years of famine, prices of prime necessities rose rapidly and, therefore, in spite of the dearness allowances, the real wages of the workers fell sharply. As an answer to the attack of the capitalists, the workers organised strikes—not only workers of big industrial centres like Bombay and Calcutta but workers of the princely states and of the less important industrial centres were also drawn into the movement.

In the first six months of 1946, 1,115 strikes took place in which more than half-a-million workers participated. The strike movement became still more intensified in the second half of 1946. In June, a general strike of the railway workers was being prepared for and it was averted by the fact that a part of the demands of the workers were granted; in July, there was a strike of one hundred thousand postal and telegraph employees; as a mark of solidarity with them, a 24-hour strike was declared in which 300,000 workers of Bombay and several hundred thousand workers of Calcutta took part. Note: V. V. Balabushevich, (*Academic Notes of the Pacific Institute*, Vol. II, p. 21)

The growth of the working class and peasant movement created anxiety in Indian bourgeois circles and in the leadership of the National Congress. After his return from London in December 1946, Nehru at the first Session of the Constituent Assembly came forth with the proposal to adopt a republican constitution for India and to pay no heed to the fact that the Muslim League and the princess were boycotting the Constituent Assembly. Nevertheless, at this very session, the Congress lowered its tone very sharply both in respect to the Muslim League and the princess. The leadership of the National Congress reached an agreement with the princess and gave up its former demand for election of all representatives from the states and consented to 50 per cent nominated by the princess. In order to reach an agreement with the Muslim League, the leadership of the National Congress adopted the method of voting in the Constituent Assembly that was recommended by the British Government in London and which had been earlier rejected by the Congress.

Thus, towards the end of 1945, the prerequisites were created for a complete agreement between the Indian big bourgeoisie, represented by the National Congress, and British imperialism and for its open going over into the camp of reaction and imperialism. Thus, there was formed a reactionary bloc of the feudal princess, landlords, the big bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists. The policy of repression against the working class and peasant movement, which is pursued by the Nehru government, the persecution of

the Communist Party and the change in the tone of the Congress press in relation to the British Government confirmed this.

The first official expression of the deal between the British ruling circles and the Indian bourgeoisie and landlords was Attlee's declaration in the House of Commons on February 20 1947, about Britain's "withdrawal" from India in June 1948, and the transfer of power to the Indian's. In this declaration, it was clearly indicated that power would be transferred not to a united central Indian Government but to a number of local governments. Still the National Congress received this declaration with complete satisfaction. In the spring of 1947, Nehru declared that while continuing the struggle for the independence of India, the former anti-British slogans must be discarded since they were outworn.

The newly appointed Indian Viceroy, Mountbatten, was received with benevolence by the leadership of the National Congress. At the conference of Asian countries in April 1947, the leaders of the National Congress, including Nehru came out with openly pro-British speeches and directed the edge of their criticism against imperialism "in general". This also confirms the fact that an agreement had taken place between the British ruling circles and the Indian bourgeoisie even before the partition of India and before the disappointment with which the leaders of the Congress received the decision of the British Government on the partition of India was only a mask to screen the betrayal of the National Congress and its deal with the British Government from the masses. In order to deceive its rank-and file members, the Muslim League also protested against the partition of Bengal and the Punjab. In actual fact, Jinnah and other League leaders were completely satisfied with the new British plan. The fact that this plan was welcomed in India as a step towards granting her independence and that no mass protest movement arose in India against this new manoeuvre of the imperialists, proof that the broad masses still had faith in the National Congress and its leaders, Gandhi and Nehru—for one cannot look upon the bloody clashes between the Hindus and the Muslims, which took place in the provinces of the Punjab and Bengal at the time of partition and which were premeditatedly provoked by the British ruling circles and the local reactionary as a protest movement. In June 1947, the Communist Party of India also was not able to give a correct evaluation of the Mountbatten Plan and characterised it not as an imperialist manoeuvre but as a certain step forward. It did not immediately understand the treachery of the leadership of the National Congress and the counterposed its Right to its Left wing as though the latter was a progressive one. Therefore, it called upon the masses to rally around Nehru and assist him to get rid of Patel. All this shows the illusions about the unity of national interests and the influence of the Congress were still strong not only among the backward peasantry and the petty bourgeois masses, but also among a certain section of the working class and that the Right opportunist mistakes had not been overcome within a Communist Party.

It was only in December 1947,<sup>1</sup> that the Communist Party of India gave a correct estimate of the Mountbatten Plan as a new imperialist manoeuvre and characterised the Nehru Government as a whole as a Government of the Indian big bourgeoisie, which had entered into an agreement with British imperialism and formed an alliance with the Indian princess and landlords.

The acceptance of the Mountbatten Plan was the greatest treachery on the part of Gandhi and the entire leadership of the National Congress. All the same, the masses did not come out against this treacherous act which reveals particularly clearly the baneful influence of Gandhi and his associates in the leadership of the National Congress on the development of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of India. Gandhi's utilisation of religious prejudices of the peasant masses, his playing upon their downtrodden and backward conditions, upon their being accustomed to implicit obedience to the Congress and to its leaders and in particular to Gandhi himself (whom the backward masses considered to be a saint) fettered the activity of the masses, demoralised them and once again made them victims of the

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a minor error for the actual date is December 1947.—Ed.



treachery of the bourgeoisie and landlords. Also the demagogy of Nehru, to a considerable extent, helped the Congress to dupe the vigilance of even the politically more experienced Indian working class.

After the partition of India and the creation there of two Dominions—the Indian Union with a Government led by the National Congress and the Pakistan with a Muslim League Government—the process of the emancipation of the masses from the influence of the bourgeoisie and of the landlords developed within a more rapid speed. This was particularly so in respect to the Indian Union.

The formation of the Governments of the Indian Union and Pakistan was not a rare judicial act. Politically it signified that the Indian landlords and the big bourgeoisie, represented by the National Congress, as well as the Muslim landlords and bourgeoisie, whose interests were represented by the Muslim League, had openly gone over to the camp of imperialism and reaction. This does not mean that in the first days after the formation of these Dominions in India and particularly in Pakistan, there were no illusions among the masses that now India had become an independent country, the Congress and League would implement all the reforms that they had earlier promised and that the conditions of the masses would improve. However, even the first steps of the Governments of the new Dominions gave a big blow to these illusions. The reactionary character of the Government of the Indian Union was expressed even in the first stages in the fierce repression against the working class movement, in the sabotage of the introduction of land reform and in the repression against the peasantry; in the virtual refusal to nationalise industry, in the policy of strengthening feudal and semi-feudal princely states, and in its resistance to the attempts of the people of the princely states, and in particular the peasantry, to introduce a democratic regime in the princely states; in the refusal to reorganise the administrative and political divisions of India in conformity with the distribution of her nationalities.

Instead of the policy of abolishing the princely states, the Government of the Indian Union began to pursue a policy of compromise with the princes on the basis of drawing in the bourgeois-landlord elements into the administration of the States. With the assistance of the Indian Union Government, and particularly of its acting Prime Minister Patel, certain small princely states were amalgamated and big unions of states were created. In these amalgamated the princes formed an upper house of all the legislative institutions and from among these were chosen the common rulers of the unions of the states. It was in this way that the unions of the princely states were formed; Rajasthan from all the princely states of Rajputana; Saurashtra—the union of all the states of Kathiawar; Madhyabharat in Central India, etc. Certain princely states including even big ones (Baroda and Kolhapur) were merged with provinces with the consent of the princess.

The Pakistan Government did not carry out even such insignificant “reforms” in those princely states which had joined Pakistan.

The formation of the big unions of princely states and the inclusion of parts of the princely states in the provinces pursued the aim not of weakening but of consolidating the positions of the princess and of creating reactionary blocs of princess, landlords and the bourgeoisie in these princely states and also of preventing the princely states from becoming transformed into centres of peasant movement. The reforms introduced by the Government of India in the princely states did not in any measure affect the very powerful survivals of feudalism which were dominant in these princely states. The peasants continued to remain as before the tenants of the princes and landlords, deprived of all rights and victims of the exploitation of the moneylenders.

The Government of the Indian Union and Pakistan not only did not want to fight for the complete independence of India but attempted in every way to strengthen the ties of India with Britain. Although the National Congress proclaimed the struggle for complete independence as its basic aim, nevertheless, in 1949 it declared openly that henceforth India would remain in the British empire; it was only in order

to dupe the masses that an “independent” Republic was proclaimed with the British King as a symbol of the “unity of the Commonwealth of Nations”.

The economic links of India with Britain strengthened considerably in the course of 1948-49. The position of British capital in the economy of India which was partially weakened during the Second World War began to be won back by it. India’s dependence on Britain is manifested particularly clearly in the fact that just as before India cannot create her machine-building industry and that even in the joint companies with Indian signboards, the leading position belongs to British capital on whom depends the supply of equipment to enterprises in India.

The penetration of American capital into India has increased considerably. Already, at the time of the Second World War the share of the USA in Indian imports was more than 25 per cent. After the war and in particular after the partition of India, American capital began to penetrate into Indian industry. By utilising the financial difficulties of the Indian Government, the monopoly combinations of the USA (for example, the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development) demanded, as a condition for the granting of credits, that the constitution of the Indian Union guarantee immunity to foreign capital investments in case of nationalisation of certain branches of industry; the Government of the Indian capitalists and landlords agreed to these demands.

The economic influence of the USA in Pakistan also increased. In April 1949, a treaty was concluded between Pakistan and the MacArthur administration in Japan on the supply of equipment from Japan for enterprises in Pakistan. However, neither Britain nor the USA gave up the policy of hampering the industrial development of India. The former American Ambassador to India, Grady, openly declared this in a gathering of industrialists in Delhi and at the Conference of the Economic Commission of UNO in Ootacamund in 1948. The dependence of the Indian union on Britain found a clear expression in the act of devaluation of the Indian rupee following the devaluation of the pound, dictated by the USA.

Both the Indian Dominions are very greatly dependent upon Britain and the USA in political and military-strategic respects. As before, the governors of certain provinces, a number of leading officials in the State apparatus of India and Pakistan and instructors in the armies are British. The dependence of the foreign policy of India and Pakistan on the Anglo-American bloc of the instigators of war found its expression in the non-official agreements which were concluded between these Dominions and Britain at the Empire Conferences in October 1948. At this conference, it was decided that in the first place, Liaquat Ali Khan and Nehru would take measures so that Pakistan and the Indian Union would remain within the British empire. In order to facilitate Nehru’s securing consent of the Indian Constituent Assembly to this, it was decided that in future the British empire was to be called the Commonwealth of Nations without any mention of Britain, India and Pakistan declared that they would support Western Union and the North Atlantic bloc. Moreover Pakistan and the Indian Union pledged to assist Britain in crushing the people’s movement in Malaya and in Burma. The dependence of the Indian Union and of Pakistan on the Anglo-American bloc increased after the Conference of Prime Ministers of the “Commonwealth of Nations” which took place in London in April 1949. In order to raise the declining authority of the Nehru Government among the masses the British Government agreed to proclaim India as a “Sovereign Republic within the Commonwealth of Nations” and recognise the British King not as head of a State but only as a “symbol of the unity of the Commonwealth of Nations”.

However, this does not signify the absence of contradictions between Britain and the USA in India. The penetration of the USA in the economy of India disturbs the British imperialists greatly and while Britain has succeeded in making the Nehru-Patel Government its agent, rather influential circles linked with the Hindu Mahasabha have oriented themselves towards the USA and have demanded India’s separation from Britain, etc., her leaving the “Commonwealth of Nations”. The Indian Government has become the main agent of Anglo-American imperialism in South-East Asia. Thus, the Governments of the

Indian Union and Pakistan, while continuing the old line of British policy, directed towards supporting and preserving remnants of feudal relations in India, in their foreign policy they have completely entered the Anglo-American bloc of the instigators of a new war.

The National Congress has openly become a party of the reactionary bloc of the Indian big bourgeoisie and landlords. In spite of the assassination of Gandhi, which was perpetrated by representatives of the Hindu Mahasabha with the connivance of the Indian authorities, Gandhism continues to remain just as before the most important ideological weapon of the Indian bourgeoisie in order to retain the masses under its influence. Moreover, after the partition of India, the reactionary nature of Gandhism has only been strengthened. The leaders of the Congress are implementing the so-called testament of Gandhi, in which he proposed to convert the Congress into a general organisation and to divide its members into two groups—the ordinary members without any rights and the leaders in whose hands is concentrated the entire power within the Congress organisation. All the active democratic elements have already been expelled or are being expelled from the Congress in conformity with Gandhi's testament.

The attempts to utilise the authority of Gandhi for a “defence of democracy” in India are extremely harmful and dangerous. Gandhi has never headed the armed struggle against imperialism and has never come out against traitors from among the Indians. On the contrary, he has always been the principal traitor of the mass national liberation movement. The struggle against Gandhism—the ideology of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie of India—is impossible without a struggle against the authority of Gandhi, against the Gandhi cult, without an exposure of all the activities of Gandhi who has constantly betrayed the popular movement and by this rendered tremendous services to the British enslavers of India.

As a result of the agreement between the wealthy classes of India and British imperialism, no solution has been found for even a single one of the problems of the national liberation movement. India and Pakistan continue to remain colonies as before—their feudal divisions have not been liquidated, and the national question has not been solved within the Indian Dominion, the land reforms that have been carried out are not liquidating the feudal survivals which continue to be dominant in the Indian countryside, the agrarian question and the question of the indebtedness of peasants to the moneylenders has not been solved; Indian industry continues to remain in the hands of British capital or in the hands of the Indian big bourgeoisie dependent upon it. American capital is penetrating more and more in industry and as before strangles the industrial development of India. The condition of the working class has worsened strongly. It is, therefore, after its partition, that a mass movement directed against the bloc of foreign imperialists, the big bourgeoisie, the princes and the landlords is becoming more powerful.

After the division of India into Pakistan and the Indian Union the fomenting of Hindu-Muslim difference by Anglo-American imperialism mainly continued in the form of provoking collisions between the two Dominions in Kashmir, the conflicts provoked by the links of the Nizam of Hyderabad and the prince of Junagadh with Pakistan, the question of the settlement of the refugees, etc., are characteristic. But all the same, immediately after the pogroms and massacres, which raged at the time of the demarcation of the boundaries of the two Dominions subsided, the Hindu-Muslim conflicts were relegated to a second place. It is true that the reactionary religious communal organisations (*e.g.* the Muslim National Guard in Pakistan and the Hindu Mahasabha and Rashtriya Sevak Sangh in the Indian Union, as well as the Sikh communal organisation of the Akalis) continue the all policy of fomenting religious differences and there is no doubt that secret agents of British and American imperialisms are active in their ranks. On the other hand the national question has become one of the most important questions of the political life of India and Pakistan.

We have already said that the Indian Government has refused to carry into practice its national programme *i.e.* it has refused to create linguistic provinces. Both in the Indian Union as well as in

Pakistan, the old administrative, political division has in the main, been preserved. Thus, the most elementary demands of the various nationalities of India have not been satisfied. However, the Indian Union Government and the National Congress have openly declared that they consider the formation of linguistic provinces as inopportune and they are not mentioned at all in the Indian constitution.

The creation of the autonomous linguistic provinces would have strengthened the position of the democratic elements in some of these provinces. Thus, for example, the secession of the national provinces of Kerala and Andhra from the Madras province would have completely altered the correlation of forces in the provinces in favour of the democratic elements since the main support of the Congress in the Madras province is the Tamil bourgeoisie and the landlord elements of the backward nationalities. After the demarcation of the Madras province on the basis of nationalities into the provinces of Andhra and Kerala, the base of the Congress would have been sharply narrowed down and it would have had to rely only upon the landlords. Exactly the same thing would take place as a result of the demarcation of the Central provinces and the Bombay province on the basis of nationality. However, the movement for the creation of linguistic provinces has very deep roots and the National Congress has no power of restraining it, while the demand of this movement is the unification of all the national territories of the peoples of India within the bounds of a single administrative unit, it is natural for this movement to be directed also against the feudal princes. Thus, the demand for the creation of a united democratic Kerala presupposes the liquidation of the princely states of Travancore and Cochin. The formation of a united Karnataka is impossible without the liquidation of the princely states of Mysore and Hyderabad; the creation of the provinces of united Andhra and united Maharashtra is also impossible without the liquidation of Hyderabad.

In the national liberation movement various elements are taking part—from workers and peasants to the intelligentsia and the middle national bourgeoisie. The movement bears particularly sharp forms where there exist already developed nations, where the divisions of their territories by the old administrative boundaries are interlinked with elements of national oppression and the most unbearable forms of the domination of feudal elements as well as friction between the propertied upper strata of the various nationalities. Therefore, this movement is distinguished by greatest acuteness in the bounds of the national regions of Andhra, Maharashtra, Kerala and Karnataka. It is much weaker in Tamilnad and in Gujarat.

The movement of the various nationalities bears an anti-feudal character and, therefore, the most important driving force is the peasantry, which is fighting under the leadership of the working class. It is only the Communist Party of India which has put forward the slogan of a consistently democratic solution of the national question, *i.e.*, the right of all the nationalities of India to self-determination, including the right to secession and the formation of independent states. But even bourgeois elements, which fight only for the implementation of the former national programme of the Congress, *i.e.*, for the creation of linguistic provinces, without broaching upon as far as possible the interests of the princes and the landlords are also participating in the movement. The national bourgeoisie of the peoples mentioned above is very weak and is an extremely unreliable ally in the struggle of the peoples of India for the liquidation of the survivals of its feudal divisions and for national self-determination.

As a result of the development of the movement for self-determination of the various nationalities, there has taken place a sharp weakening and in places even a disintegration of the Congress organisations and a sharp sifting of these organisations to the Right. Thus, in the Andhra districts, the national organisation of the Andhra Mahasabha began to grow rapidly and according to certain figures, its membership reached 700,000 in 1948. This organisation has in the main a peasant composition. The intelligentsia plays a big role in it. The Communist organisation of the Andhra districts and the trade unions play a leading role in the peasant movement in the parts of Hyderabad which are in revolt against

the Nizam. In the Andhra districts, the Congress has been converted into a landlord's organisation, has been virtually merged with the Justice Party of the landlords.

In the national region of Maharashtra, a broad national organisation—the “Maharashtra Conference”—has been formed. This organisation has not broken its connections with the Congress formally but it has advanced demands which are directed against the national policy of the Indian Government. It demanded the creation of a United Maharashtra, including the region of the Central Provinces of the Bombay Province (including Bombay City) and of the princely states of Hyderabad which are inhabited by the Maharashtrians. The leadership of this organisation is less democratic than the leadership of the Andhra Mahasabha, but considerably more progressive than the leadership of the Congress organisation of Maharashtra and Bombay. The Communists are taking part in the work of this organisation and are attempting to revolutionise it. They support energetically the demands for the creation of a United Democratic Maharashtra including the City of Bombay.

In Kerala, a significant section of the Congressites has broken off from the Congress organisation and formed an independent organisation, the “Kerala Socialist Party”. This organisation was not connected with the Socialist Party of India and it has come out jointly with the Communists against the Governments of the princely states of Travancore and Cochin and against the Congress organisations of the Kerala province. The Communist Party of India and the Socialist Party of Kerala have advanced the demand for a union of the Malayali territories of the princely state of Travancore, of the entire state of Cochin of the Malabar district and a part of the district of South Kanara within the bounds of the Union of Kerala.

Although in general the national movement of the peoples of the Indian Union is progressive, since it is directed against the reactionary Government of the Indian Union and the Governments of the princes nevertheless, reactionary elements are attempting to utilise it in their own interests. For example, one of the bourgeois leaders of the princely state of Mysore put forward the demand for the creation of a United Karnataka under the aegis of the Maharaja of Mysore. The prince of Cochin put forward similar idea about the formation of a United Kerala under the aegis of the princely families of Cochin and Travancore. The big bourgeoisie of Travancore demands the inclusion of even the Tamil districts of this princely state into Kerala. Even members of the Hindu Mahasabha and other organisations are taking part in the movement for a United Maharashtra.

The national movement in Pakistan is of no less significance than in the Indian Union. Of particular serious political significance is the struggle of the Red Shirts organisation in alliance with the tribes of the Frontier regions for the creation of an independent Pathanistan. This movement is receiving the secret support of the Government of Afghanistan. The Bengali problem also is of serious importance. East Bengal is separated from the Western part of Pakistan by a distance of 1,500 kilometres. There exist no economic, cultural nor historical links between these two parts of Pakistan. The attempt of the Pakistan Government to strengthen these ties through propaganda of Pan-Islamism and the introduction of Urdu as the state language has only given rise to sharpening of the relations between the Pakistan Government and East Bengal. Even within the Muslim League organisation, West Bengal constitutes a powerful opposition to the policy of the Central Government of Pakistan. In Bengal a movement has begun for her unification. However, at present, it has not assumed such an acute character, as the Pathan movement or the movement in South India because the representatives of the Muslim League who head it in the East Bengal demand her unification within the bounds of Pakistan and in West Bengal the Bengali nationalities are demanding the unification of Bengal within the boundaries of the Indian Union.

The most characteristic and distinctive feature of post-war India is the tremendous growth and intensification of the peasant movement. The last years were years of almost uninterrupted famine, the condition of the peasantry worsened sharply and the process of their being rendered landless has been

accelerated. The position of the peasantry in the princely states in particular has deteriorated. It is precisely in view of this that in the princely states and in particular in the particular states in the south of India as well as in Kashmir the peasant movement has assumed the widest sweep and as a rule it is in these revisions that higher forms of peasant movement prevail. The fact of the peasant question in the south of India and in Kashmir being linked with the national question contributed to the broad sweep of the peasant movement and of the democratic movement in general. In Kerala, the agrarian question cannot be solved without the abolition of the princely states of Travancore and Cochin and of the land relations dominating there since these princely states embrace more than 70 per cent of this national territory. At the same time, the union of the Malayali people within the boundaries of a united national democratic state cannot be accomplished within the abolition of these princely states. In Kerala, the peasant movement directed against the remnants of feudalism is closely interlinked with the national movement which also bears an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist character. In the south India, the big bourgeoisie, in the main the Gujarati and also the local and in particular the Tamil bourgeoisie, is often closely linked with the princes and is not interested in the solution of the national question and in changes in the existing administrative and political division. The peasantry represents the motivating force of the national movement in Kerala and more and more the working class is winning a leading role in it. Such is also the situation in Andhra.

The Hyderabad question is not merely the question of the relations of the princely state of Hyderabad with the Indian Union. The Hyderabad question is above all the question of the abolition of feudal relationships in the countryside and of the feudal division of the national territories of a number of peoples of South India. Hyderabad is a multi-national princely state. Fifty per cent of her population is Telugu or Andhra, 25 per cent Marathi and 15 per cent Kannada. The inhabitants of Hindustan, who represent the ruling nationality in this state, constitute not more than ten per cent of its entire population and live in the main in the towns; the landlord-feudal elements of the other nationalities of Hyderabad, who have accepted Islam are also counted among them. The anti-feudal peasant movement in Hyderabad, which has assumed particularly sharp forms in Telengana, is at the same time a national movement. The demand of the popular masses is not merely for the abolition of the Nizam's power but also for the abolition of the princely state of Hyderabad as an administrative unit and the unification of different national territories of this princely state with the territories of the corresponding nationalities of the Indian Union.

The Congress in the princely state of Hyderabad represents a section of the big bourgeoisie and a section of landlords of this princely state; it only fights for the restriction of the rights of the Nizam and for the entry of the princely state into the Indian Union. The more democratic organisations of this princely state, for example, the Andhra Mahasabha, the Maharashtra Conference, which are numerically much stronger and more influential among the masses than the State Congress, demand the abolition of feudal land relationships and the complete liquidation of the princely state.

The particularly sharp form of the peasant and the national movement in Telengana is explained by the fact that the process of the peasants being deprived of land has proceeded more rapidly in this region of Hyderabad than in the remaining parts of this princely state, as a result of which there the movement has assumed the form of a peasant uprising. The peasants in revolt have captured the land of the landlords and in 3,000 villages with a total population of more than five million, they have created committees of people's power and armed detachments for self-defence. It was on the territory of Telengana, in the districts of Nallgonda, Warangal and Karimnagar that a people's power was created for the first time in the history of as a result of the revolutionary organised movement of the masses. In Telengana, it was the Communists who stood at the head of the peasant and the national movement. Thus, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry has been established here with the leading role of the working class.

The joining of Hyderabad to the Indian Union could not substantially alter the set-up of class forces which existed in the south of India after its partition. In spite of the efforts of the Indian authorities, they did not succeed in liquidating the uprising in Telengana even till the middle of 1949. In order to disrupt the ranks of the people in revolt, they went in for a partial liquidation of landlordism; nevertheless, even after this the uprising was not crushed. But the peasant movement has not embraced only the south of India. The struggle for the reduction of rents and for the liquidation of indebtedness to the usurers also assumed wide dimensions in Bengal, Bihar, Punjab and in the northern part of the Bombay province (Gujarat). The peasant movement is developing in different forms in all the provinces of the Indian Union and in Pakistan.

The demands of the peasant movement and its level are not uniform in the different regions of India. Thus, in West Bengal, the main demand is the reduction in rents and taxes to one-third of the income of the peasants (that is why the movement bears the name of the “*Tebhaga*”); the movement in the United provinces and in Bihar bears approximately the same character. In Gujarat and in Assam the sharecroppers from the backward and most exploited tribes (Bhils, etc.) are playing a big role in the movement. In East Pakistan, the peasant movement bears an organised and very sharp character. There the peasants are fighting for the complete liquidation of landlordism, by capturing land of the Hindu landlords who have run away from Pakistan.

The working class is as yet in 1948-49 far from fulfilling the task of emancipating the peasant masses from the influence of the treacherous national bourgeoisie and the landlords in all the regions of India. This task has been fulfilled to a greater extent in the south of India and in East Pakistan and to a lesser extent in the northern provinces of the Indian Union, where the Congressites and the Socialists still retained quite strong positions in the leadership of the peasant organisations. A great weakness of the peasant movement in these years was the inadequate organisation of the agricultural workers and semi-proletarian elements in the countryside. In spite of the disruptive policy of Congressites and of the Socialists, the peasant movement in India is growing and the present stage of the national liberation struggle can be correctly characterised as agrarian.

After the partition of India, the working class movement assumed a very broad sweep. In 1947, more than ten million working days (according to official figures) were lost as a result of strikes. Not only the workers, but even employees of banks, state institutions, post and telegraphs, etc, took an active part in the working class movement. The railway workers who have been on strike more than once after the partition of India have displayed special activity. The strike movement was led by the All-India Trade Union Congress which had a membership of above 800,000 in 1949. In spite of government repression and the banning of strikes on the railway and in a number of branches of industry, the strike movement has not ceased. The plantation workers of Assam, who have been mainly recruited from the backward tribes of Central India's highlands, have also been drawn into the strike movement.

Mass trade unions of the agricultural workers have been created for the first time in India and have been special development in the south of India. Workers of not only the big industrial centres but also of the less important ones have displayed great activity. In 1947-48 the textile workers of Coimbatore who were on strike for many months displayed particular staunchness and heroism. The workers of the industry for the extraction and manufacture of coir in Travancore were transformed, thanks to their organisation, into the advanced detachment of the struggle not only for an improvement in the conditions of the working class, but also for the democratisation of the structure this princely state. The heroic struggle of the workers of Punnappra and Vayalar arouse the whole of India. The Indian Communists have achieved great successes in organising the workers also in other princely states.

In 1947 and 1948, many strikes took place in the princely states of Indore, Bhopal, etc. The working class movement was led by the Communist Party of India whose influence is growing

ceaselessly not only among workers but also amongst employees, peasants and students. The Communist Party of India, which in 1942 comprised of a total of 2,000 members, increased its membership to 16,000 in 1943 and towards the beginning of 1948 to 90,000. The working class and its vanguard the Communist Party have become the leading force in the national liberation movement. The Communist Party heads the struggle of the working class and the peasantry in the national movement and the struggle of the democratic strata of the intelligentsia. In Pakistan, there has been formed a separate trade centre. The dockers of Karachi and the railway workers of Pakistan in particular of East Bengal, have participated actively in the strike movement. In 1948, the communist organisations in Pakistan, one of which even existed in such a backward province as the North-West Frontier have been united into the Communist Party of Pakistan.

The democratic movement is engulfing even the princely state of Nepal which has joined neither India nor Pakistan. This princely state, which was till a short time ago a feudal reserve and a base for the recruitment of Gurkha soldiers was an obedient weapon of the imperialists in order to crush the people's liberation movement which has been stripped from its century-old slumber. A mass organisation called the "Congress of the State of Nepal" has been created in this State. It has put forward the demand for "the overthrow of the autocratic Government of the Maharana and the expulsion out of the princely state of those Americans who were penetrating there". In a few industrial centres of the State trade unions have been formed and strikes have taken place for the first time in the history of this State. Communist organisations were created in this State. The development of Nepal has assumed such dimensions that the Maharana was forced to utilise a part of the Gurkha battalions from the Indian Union in order to suppress the movement.

The democratic movement in India is embracing altogether new regions which had not taken part in the movement earlier and new elements that had earlier been politically passive. It is necessary to note that the untouchables of whom a considerable section followed Gandhi or even Dr. Ambedkar (the British protegee who claims to the title of the leader of the untouchables) are being drawn in more and more into the working class and peasant movement and the influence of the Communist Party is increasing among them. Nevertheless, the dispersed character of the working class movement and unsystematic planless methods of work have not completely been liquidated. Till now there existed small groups who had influence in industrial localities and among workers of different enterprises, who pursued a disruptive policy and were after directly linked with the agents of the reactionary bourgeoisie—the Trotskyites.

The reactionary leaders of the National Congress were able to bring about a split in the trade union movement though the All-India Trade Union Congress is the only fighting and trade class organisation of the workers and enjoys authority among them, still a section of the backward strata of the workers was drawn in by the leaders of the Congress in the so-called National Congress of Trade Unions, working under the control of the Vice-Premier and Minister for Internal Affairs in India, Patel. This organisation serves as a weapon in the hands of the reactionary bourgeoisie and many honest deluded workers have joined it because the policy of the leadership of the Congress is still far from exposed in the eyes of the more backward strata of the working class.

In 1948, the Socialists formed their trade union organisation—the Hind Mazdur Sabha and in 1949 the liberal trade union leaders. Mrinal Kanti Bose and his group created the United Congress of Trade Unions. All these trade union organisation are aimed at splitting the working class and strengthening the influence of the bourgeoisie in the ranks of the Indian proletariat. This disruptive activity of the Indian bourgeoisie is directed by the leaders of the American federation of Labour and the British General Council of Trade Unions.

The unity of the peasant movement has been won to an even lesser. In India there are two peasant unions (kisan sabhas). The Communists direct one of these and in the other it is the various petty-



bourgeoisie elements have often come out against the Communist and are linked with the National Congress that enjoy influence.

The influence of these elements is still stronger among the democratic strata of the intelligentsia. The Socialist Party has been transformed into a direct agent of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Its leaders are conducting a furious baiting of the Communist and specialise in anti-Soviet speeches. Another organisation influential among the intelligentsia is the Forward Bloc, which represent an extremely amorphous group and very heterogeneous groups have entered it. In certain provinces (Bombay, Central Provinces) the Forward Bloc organisation has sometimes come forward jointly with the Communist; in other provinces and in particular in Bengal, where the adherents of Subhas Chandra Bose predominate in this organisation, the Forward Bloc like the Socialist Party comes out as the advanced detachment of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the working class movement.

There is a yet no unity in the student movement too. Along with the All-India Students' Federation which is led by elements close to the Communists, a student organisation led by the Congressites is also operating. On an All-India scale, there exists no youth organisation, unifying all strata of democratic youth (working class, peasant, student etc.). A revolutionary youth organisation of this type exists only in Andhra Desha, where it is called the Andhra Yuvak Sabha. This organisation takes active part in the working class, peasant and national movement of the Andhra people.

In spite of difficulties and fierce persecutions, the influence of the Communist Party is growing rapidly and its organisation is being strengthened. The terror and persecution in respect of the active workers of the working class, peasant and student movement testify to the weakness of the Government of the Indian Union.

Towards the end of February, 1949, the Minister for Internal Affairs, the reactionary Patel, addressing a joint conference of the Chambers of Commerce of Madras declared: "The workers are not under the influence of those persons who would be able to guide them correctly." He admitted through this the failure of the attempts of the National Congress to split the Indian working class. Patel repeated the very same thing in May 1949 speaking at the session of the National Trade Union Congress. This proves that the policy of splitting the working class had yielded no success. The Indian bourgeoisie also did not succeed in the attempts to crush the peasant movement. In those areas of Telengana in revolt that have been occupied by the Indian troops, they have not succeeded in returning the land to the landlords. Moreover, the punitive expeditions have not liquidated the uprising but only altered its localisation.

The recent events in India show that after its partition, the struggle of the Indian people has entered a new phase. The distinctive features of this phase or stage are the following:

In India, as well as in Pakistan, there has been formed finally a reactionary bloc of the big bourgeoisie, landlords and princes, which has concluded an alliance with British and American imperialism. This bloc is interested in the retention of existing relationships both within India and Pakistan as well as the relations of these countries with Britain and USA.

At present the struggle against imperialism and for the liberation of India and Pakistan is impossible without a struggle not only against the Indian feudal princes and landlords but also against the Indian big bourgeoisie. Without the abolition of the princely states and landlordism and without the nationalisation of large industry, not only that belonging to foreign capital but also to the 'national' bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, without the struggle for People's Democracy, the complete liberation of India is impossible.

It is the Indian working class headed by the Communist Parties of India and Pakistan which constitutes the leading force in the struggle for the complete liberation of India from the rule of foreign imperialism and for a liquidation of all the remnants of feudalism and the economic positions of the big bourgeoisie. The active struggle of the peasantry, passing over to an uprising in places and headed by the working class, against all survivals of feudalism and against the bourgeoisie landlord Governments of the Indian Union and Pakistan which are attempting to preserve them—is the most characteristic feature of the new stage and as a result of this it can be termed as an agrarian stage with complete justification.

The national question has not been solved in India and in Pakistan, even in the form of creating national autonomous provinces. It is, therefore, that the middle and petty-bourgeoisie of those nationalities of India which are suffering most from the feudal survivals and the domination of monopoly capital which exists in the main the Gujarati and Marwari hands, can be a wavering ally of the democratic camp. The progressive role of these national bourgeois strata is extremely relative and short-lived and on no account must it be overestimated.

The new stage in the people's liberation struggle in India is an expression of the sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system of imperialism after the Second World War. The distinctive features of this new stage in India are to a considerable extent analogous to the distinctive features of the new stage and development of the liberation movement in other colonial and semi-colonial countries. In China, Burma, Indonesia, Indo China and Philippines, as well as in India, not only the feudalists but even the big bourgeoisie has at this stage gone over even more openly to the camp of imperialism.

In the struggle against the forces of reaction there is emerging at present a People's Democratic Front. The task of struggle for complete liberation of these countries from colonial dependence is closely linked with the struggle for People's Democracy in these countries, for the victory of People's Democracy in India. In March 1948, at its Second Congress, the Communist Party elaborated such a programme of struggle for People's Democracy in India:

1. A complete break with the British empire and the severance of ties with the aggressive Anglo-American bloc and the establishment of close ties with the democratic countries in the world, in the first place with the USSR, which is fighting against the instigators of a new war.
2. Democratisation of the political structure of India. Recognition of the right of all nations to self-determination and the conversion of India into a voluntary union of national, People's Democratic Republics. The liquidation of the princely states and protection of the rights of authorities and backward tribes.
3. Establishment of friendly relations between the Indian Union and Pakistan.
4. The abolition of landlordism without any compensation and land to the peasants and agricultural workers.
5. Nationalisation of the main branches of industry; establishment of eight-hour working day and a minimum wage for all workers and employees.

The programme is supported by the broadest strata of the population and the Communist Party has all objective conditions for rallying all the democratic strata of the population of India for a struggle for its realisation for the struggle against British and American imperialism and their Indian allies—the big bourgeoisie, the landlords and the feudal princes. The world-historic victory of the Chinese People, and the formation of the People's Republic of China, the uprising in Burma and Malaya, the struggle of the peoples of Viet Nam and Indonesia, the strengthening of the democratic anti-imperialist camp headed

by the Soviet Union are causing alarm among the native and foreign exploiters of the Indian Popular Masses and are strengthening the determination of the fighters for People's Democracy in India.

## SHARPENING CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM AFTER WORLD WAR II

The victory over Hitlerite Germany, fascist Italy and militarist Japan, led to a deepening of the general crisis of the capitalist system, to a serious weakening of the imperialist front and to the strengthening of the forces of democracy and Socialism over the entire world. The weakening of the imperialist camp was manifested above all, in the consolidation of the strength and the might of the Soviet Union, in the dropping out of the capitalist system of a number of countries, where People's Democracy was established. It was also demonstrated in the intensification of the struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries for liberation from imperialist oppression and in the victory of People's Democracy in China.

In spite of the extremely important differences in the concrete situation and in the conditions of victory of People's Democracy in a number of countries of Central and Eastern Europe, the intensification of the national liberation struggles in the colonies after the termination of the Second World War and the successes of this struggle have been conditioned a great deal by the very same factors that have also operated in Europe.

These general and decisive factors were the military defeat of the bloc of aggressors, the moral and political defeat of fascism and of its accomplices, the great victory of the Soviet Union which in the course of the war demonstrated the superiority of the Soviet Socialist system over the capitalist system.

The great victory of the democratic forces headed by the mighty Socialist power over German, Japanese and Italian imperialism inspired the colonial peoples to intensify the struggle against imperialist oppression and exploitation, and strengthened their faith in the ultimate triumph of their just cause.

At the end of the Second World War there took place a sharp aggravation of the crisis of the colonial system. The colonial world became a source of serious anxiety for the imperialist camp.

Imperialist rule in the colonies and semi-colonies dooms tens of millions of people to poverty, hunger, epidemics and systematic death. Ruthless exploitation of labour, and in particular of child and female labour, is the inevitable concomitant of imperialist oppression in the colonial world.

The broad masses of the exploited in the dependent and colonial countries of the entire world are rising to wage a struggle against the oppressors and are demonstrating by their actions that the colonial peoples no longer wish to live in the old way. The sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system has assumed forms which threaten the imperialists.

More and more broad popular masses in the colonies and semi-colonies are being drawn into the national liberation movement. Even in the most remote corners of the colonial world, where till recently the civilised colonial 'rulers'—the imperialists openly plundered, perpetrated the blackest deeds, ruthlessly dealt with the 'natives' and felt themselves to be completely beyond punishment for this,—popular indignation is maturing now and the pre-requisites are being created for an organised rebuff to the colonisers. The armed uprising of the Malagasy people against the French imperialists in Madagascar testifies to this. A strike wave has spread in the most backward regions of the so-called "Black Continent",—Africa. The struggle against British imperialism is assuming a mass character in the colonies of the Gold Coast, in Nigeria, in Uganda and in South Rhodesia.

The armed struggles of the people of the colonial and dependent countries against imperialism and its local agents has assumed the broadest sweep in Burma, in Viet Nam, in Malaya, Indonesia and in the Philippines. The toiling masses in the various corners of multi-national India are organising

themselves in order to defend their legitimate rights against the imperialists, the feudal Princes, the landlords and the usurers, the local capitalist-exploiters and the police and officials subservient to them.

The greatest successes have been achieved by the national liberation struggle in China. During 1948-49 American imperialism and its Kuomintang agent sustained an unprecedented defeat there; the Chinese people won a great historic victory and created the People's Republic of China.

Never yet in history have such great masses of toilers in the colonies and semi-colonies been drawn into the struggle against imperialist oppression as at the present time. The imperialists cannot cope with the indignation of the colonial peoples by the former methods of rule. They are compelled to seek new means in order to retain their tottering positions in the colonies.

“.... The ruling classes of the metropolitan countries can no longer govern the colonies on the old lines. Attempts to crush the national liberation movement by military force increasingly encounter armed resistance on the part of the colonial peoples and lead to protracted colonial wars. (Holland-Indonesia, France-Viet Nam)....”

(A. Zhdanov—*The International Situation*—Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1947, p.11)

\* \* \*

The process of the sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system found its clearest expression in the countries of the Pacific basin. This is explained by the fact that it was precisely here that the liberation role of the Soviet Union which defeated the Japanese aggressors on the plains of Manchuria and Korea was graphically demonstrated. The defeat of militarist Japan which for decades had been the bulwark of imperialist rule and the gendarme of East Asia stimulated to a very great degree the mass upsurge of the democratic national liberation movement in the Pacific countries. In the course of the Second World War, the prestige of the imperialist powers in the colonies and semi-colonies declined sharply. The peoples of the colonial and dependent countries witnessed the military incapacity, the impotence, cowardice of the representatives of the colonial authorities of the imperialist powers—Britain, Holland, France, U.S.A. The intention of the colonisers who had proved themselves bankrupt during the war period, to return to their former possessions after the defeat of fascism and once again to sit on the necks of the people who had participated in the common struggle against the fascist aggressors, could not but evoke indignation and rebuff.

Alongside this, the general upsurge of the national liberation movements in the colonies and semi-colonies after the Second World War was marked by essentially new factors, expressing the *qualitative* changes in the character of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Comrade Palme Dutt,<sup>2</sup> gave the following definition of the new features of the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies, features which were not to be observed after the First World War:

“First, the establishment of independent National Republics in former colonial territories, in Viet Nam and Indonesia, maintaining themselves in armed struggle over a period of years against the assault of imperialism.

---

<sup>2</sup> Member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Great Britain, and the author of a number of studies on colonial problems.—E.M.Z.

“Secondly, the increased political maturity and the higher level of the liberation struggles in colonial territories; notably, the advance to armed struggle of the national liberation movements in Malaya and Burma, and the local peasants’ uprising and States peoples’ revolts in Indian States reaching to occupation of the land and armed self-defence in such a considerable region as Telengana in Hyderabad.

“Third, the geographically wider extension of colonial revolt and organised movements of mass struggle, as in the tropical African colonies.

“Fourth, the advance in the role and leadership of the working class in the colonial countries, the development and strengthening of the trade union movement and of the alliance of the working class with the peasant movement, and above all, the existence of Communist Parties exercising mass influence and political leadership in a number of colonial countries, and in certain countries at a highly developed stage of struggle, as in Viet Nam, Malaya and Burma, directly leading the national liberation movement....”

(R. Palme Dutt—“Struggle of Colonial Peoples Against Imperialism.” *For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy*, October 15, 1948).

The most important changes that have taken place consist in that the broadest popular masses are drawn into the struggle against imperialism and that it is the working class which stands as the vanguard of this struggle leading the peasantry and other strata of the people behind it.

In China, in Indonesia and in a number of other countries, the Communist Parties have become the acknowledged leader of the millions of toilers and have won their confidence as political parties, conducting the most consistent and self-sacrificing struggles for the national independence and sovereignty of their countries. In many colonial and dependent countries it was precisely the Communists who headed the broad front of toilers unified on the basis of a programme of implementing radical and consistently democratic changes. The leading role of the Communists in the national liberation movement of the overwhelming majority of colonial and dependent countries, is an expression of the leading role of the working class in the anti-imperialist liberation struggle in the postwar period.

This important change in the character of the struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies by itself testifies to the deepening of the crisis of the colonial system. The broadest popular masses have joined the movement and their leadership has passed over into the hands of the most reliable class forces that are interested in the quickest and the most complete elimination of imperialist exploitation, of the poverty and the down-trodden condition of the popular masses.

It goes without saying that the passing of the leadership to the working class and its vanguard of the national liberation struggle in the majority of colonial and semi-colonial countries is not an accident. It is historically conditioned by the increasing role of the proletariat in the colonies and is linked with the growth in the organisation and consciousness of the working class and the political experience acquired by the non-proletarian toiling masses in the entire preceding period of the general crisis of capitalism; and also as a result of the economic upheavals that took place during the Second World War, the exposure of the treacherous antinational role of the semi-feudal elements and the big bourgeoisie of the colonies who made a deal with the imperialists of the metropolitan countries with the aim of retaining their class privileges.

The economic enslavement of the colonial and dependent countries is the main content of colonial exploitation. The colonial policy of metropolitan countries operates in the direction of arresting the development of productive forces in the colonial and dependent countries. The very backwardness of

the colonies is favourable to the imperialists, because it facilitates the possibility of exploitation by retarding the development of the anti-imperialist national liberation movement and makes it possible for the imperialist bourgeoisie of the metropolitan country to utilise the cheap or even the free labour power of the population of the colonies. Imperialism is interested in the colonies being without industry which creates the pre-requisites of economic independence, and which is capable of throwing goods on the market competing with the goods produced by the metropolitan country. There is no doubt that the rule of the imperialists in the colonies is linked with encouraging certain types of industrial production there. But it is invariably directed into that channel and permitted only to that extent which corresponds to the interests of the metropolitan country.

The capital imported into the colonial and semi-colonial countries is usually concentrated in the sphere of extractive industry and is utilised for the seizure and extraction of raw materials or for their preliminary manufacture. For example, in Burma, where according to a recent admission of the London journal *The Economist*, “the Burmese people have remained a poor people in their own country which is so rich in natural resources.” British capital has been invested and continues to be invested almost exclusively in extracting oil, lead, zinc, wolfram, tin, and also in the rubber plantations. Thus, imperialism only contributes towards a one-sided and dependent development of production in the colonies and semi-colonies. Industrialisation of the colonies is incompatible with imperialist rule. Neither in the countries of Latin America nor in the countries of Asia and even more so in Africa, are the imperialist states permitting the advance of heavy industry, the development of those branches of production which could serve as the basis of acquiring economic independence. Those individual instances of the growth of industrial development which are to be observed in some dependent and semi-colonial countries do not alter anything in the general correlation between the dependent country and the imperialist country in respect of the slavish and oppressed position of the colonies and semi-colonies. Real industrialisation, the key to which lies in machine-building and in the production of the means of production, is hindered in every way and not allowed by the imperialist metropolis.

The imperialist countries refuse to export industrial equipment to the dependent and colonial countries. The head of the British Department of Foreign Trade, Bottomly, “explained” in June 1948 that even if the production of steel-casting industry were to increase in Britain, Britain would not increase the volume of the present insignificant supplies of capital equipment to India and Pakistan. The Indian bourgeoisie which at one time entertained big hopes that the USA would help in ‘industrialising’ India has been cruelly deceived. In spite of the general increase in trade between India and the USA, the Americans do not wish to export machine tools and intricate machines into India. American imports into India consist of foodstuffs, and also typewriters, electric apparatus, toothbrushes, and other consumer goods. The Americans export from India for the most part jute, leather, skins, tea, cotton, and other types of raw materials. Thus American-Indian trade bears as typical a colonial character as British-Indian trade. The Indian bourgeois Press has more than once complained about the fact that the Americans are refusing to import capital equipment and technical material into India. “The entire foreign-economic policy of the USA is disadvantageous to the Asiatic countries like India,” noted the paper *Indian News Chronicle*. Of course, the external trade policy of the USA is an expression of the general course adopted by the imperialist powers to hinder the industrial development of the colonies and semi-colonies.

Capitalism which is developing (though at a slackened tempo), in the colonial agrarian countries, does not emancipate the peasantry from the yoke of pre-capitalist forms of bondage and oppression. As a rule, it only gives a monetary expression to these pre-capitalist forms of exploitation. Corvee and natural rent is replaced by money-rent, and natural tax by money tax. This does not ameliorate the conditions of the peasant masses, but only brings their ruin nearer. At the same time, the poverty-stricken position of the peasantry hampers exceedingly the growth of an internal market for industries and is the most powerful obstacle standing in the path of the development of capitalism.

This impedes the national bourgeoisie from extending the sphere of exploitation and of its influence. It is natural that the national bourgeoisie in the colonial countries is interested in restricting or in weakening the feudal survivals since they fetter its hands. But on the other hand—and this is decisive—the introduction of serious agrarian reform frightens the national bourgeoisie since in the Asian countries the bourgeoisie as a rule is itself closely linked with big landlordism, with the mercantile class and the money-lenders.

The growth of capitalist relations in the colonial countries inevitably opens up a sharp contradiction between the development of industry in the colonies and the interests of the metropolitan countries who would wish to retain unaltered the low level of economic development of the colonies.

The growth of industrial production in the colonies brings out on to the political forefront a new class—the proletariat. And it is here that a new stage in the development of the colonial countries commences. While the national bourgeoisie is incapable of consistently fighting for the real emancipation of the colonies from the imperialists and from the feudal survivals hindering the development of the countries, the colonial proletariat is the real revolutionary force capable of rallying under its leadership many millions of peasant masses in order to put up an organised opposition not only to imperialism but also to its internal agents, and above all, to the feudal elements and the reactionary top stratum of the bourgeoisie.

Already in 1920 at the Second Congress of the Comintern, V. I. Lenin gave a number of very important directives on the role of the bourgeois elements in the colonial movement. Lenin said:

“Every nationalist movement (in the colonial and dependent countries—E. Zhukov) can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, for the bulk of the population in backward countries are peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relations. It would be utopian to think that proletarian parties, if indeed they can arise in such countries, could pursue Communist tactics and a Communist policy in these backward countries without having definite relations with the peasant movement and without effectively supporting it.”

At the same time V. I. Lenin emphasised that—

“A certain rapprochement has been brought about between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting countries and those of the colonial countries, so that very often, even in the majority of cases, perhaps, where the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries does support the national movement, it simultaneously works in harmony with the imperialist bourgeoisie, *i.e.* it joins the latter in fighting against all revolutionary movements and revolutionary classes.”

(V. I. Lenin: *Selected Works*—Lawrence & Wishart, London, Vol. X, p. 241)

Lenin taught the Communists to educate the proletarian revolutionary cadres in the colonial countries to be conscious of the fact that they possess their own aims as distinct from the aims of the movement bearing a bourgeois democratic character.

Lenin emphasised that it is necessary to act jointly with the bourgeois democratic elements of the colonial movement only on the condition that the revolutionary proletariat is able to fight for its own special programme, its own policy without merging or dissolving itself in the general stream.

This directive of Lenin is all the more important since it is well-known that the national bourgeoisie of the colonial countries does not wish to renounce its leading role and always endeavours to



secure it for itself. It attempts to hold back the masses under its influence, and sometimes disseminates false illusions about “its irreconcilability” in relation to the foreign imperialists.

However, experiencing the dual pressure—on the one side of the popular masses whose activity it fears, and on the other of the imperialists whom it courts—the bourgeoisie inevitably arrives at a policy of compromise with imperialism.

The events after the Second World War, have graphically demonstrated to what extent the reactionary nature of the national bourgeoisie has intensified and how the activity of the workers and peasants in the colonial countries has increased. As the activity of the toiling masses directed against the imperialists becomes broader, the big bourgeoisie conducts itself in a more cowardly and baser manner, and it more openly forms a bloc with the forces of feudal reaction. The example of the biggest Pacific country—China, is extremely characteristic in this respect.

In China, in the years of the Japanese imperialist aggression, the landlord-capitalist ruling top stratum, in spite of the existence of a national anti-Japanese front, sabotaged every kind of cooperation with the democratic elements headed by the Communist Party. The reactionary Kuomintang chiefs reflecting the class interests of the semi-feudal landlords and also the clique of “Four Families” welded with foreign capital, did not organise and did not wish to organise an effective nation-wide rebuff to the Japanese invaders insofar as this demanded the activity of the broad masses of the Chinese people, the development of the productive forces in the country and consequently the introduction of elementary democratic reforms (agrarian reform, the liquidation of the Kuomintang dictatorship, the formation of a coalition government etc.). In many areas the Chinese ruling classes directly collaborated with the Japanese imperialists and took to the path of direct national betrayal. But even those leading Kuomintang circles which in words stood for an armed struggle against Japan, at the height of this struggle devoted their main attention to blockading the regions that were under the control of the People’s Liberation Army, *i.e.* the regions where democratic changes had been introduced.

And more than this, since this diverted the military forces of the Kuomintang from the struggle against the Japanese invaders, it was as though the Japanese imperialists were invited to deal with the democratic forces of China. The reactionary Kuomintang Generals systematically provoked armed conflicts between the Government troops and the People’s Liberation Armies. The attitude of the Chiang Kai-shek Government to the partisan movement in those regions that were for the time being occupied by the Japanese was one of open hostility. Not only were the partisans not rendered any assistance, but on the contrary measures were undertaken to crush the partisan movement since it was fostered by the growing political activity of the workers, peasants, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, *i.e.* it was profoundly democratic.

The defeat of imperialist Japan intensified the anti-national reactionary character of the policy of the Kuomintang. Immediately after the capitulation of Japan, the Chiang Kai-shek Government screening itself behind a hypocritical readiness to conduct negotiations with the Communist Party, began preparing feverishly for a treacherous armed invasion of the Special Border Regions and other bases of the Anti-Japanese liberation struggle. The Kuomintang leaders broke all the promises solemnly made by them in the war period about renouncing dictatorship and implementing the necessary democratic reforms.

While in the war period the ruling bloc of semi-feudal and big capitalist monopolist cliques in China did not accede to the introduction of reforms under the false excuse that the military situation “did not permit” the implementation of any serious measures of a social, economic and constitutional character, after the capitulation of Japan Chiang Kai-shek advanced as a “condition” for the democratisation of the country the preliminary disarming of the democratic forces—the disbanding of the People’s Liberation Army. Kuomintang reaction whose many conspicuous representatives had earlier

flirted with the Japanese now wholly and completely orientated itself towards American imperialism. Through this it finally exposed the treacherous anti-national character of its policy.

Immediately, after the termination of the Second World War, American imperialism took to the path of intervention in China, and assumed the role of protector of Chinese reaction. By actively assisting in the instigation of civil war in China the ruling circles of the USA reckoned on defeating the organised forces of Chinese democracy and converting China into an American colony.

However, these calculations did not come true.

In the period of the Civil War unleashed in 1946 by the Chinese reactionaries under the leadership of American imperialism, the democratic forces of China rallied still more closely around the Communist Party since this Party, being the vanguard of the working class, is at the same time the only mass party which holds aloft the banner of national liberation of China from foreign imperialist oppression. The broad popular masses of China marched behind the Communist Party which as the vanguard of the working class demonstrated the spirit of sacrifice and patriotism and its ability to carry to the end the task of liberating the Chinese people.

As a result of this the forces of Chinese democracy have grown and continue to grow immeasurably, and its enemies have suffered and continue to suffer one defeat after another. In the middle of 1949 already one half of the population of China was leaving on territory liberated from the oppression of the Kuomintang and the American imperialists.

The creation of the People's Republic of China which was proclaimed on October 1, 1949, crowned the historic victory of the Chinese people.

Evaluated from the international plane, the events in China are of great fundamental importance. They have shown that in the biggest semi-colonial country it was precisely the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party—who headed the victorious people's emancipatory revolution. With respect to the Chinese big bourgeoisie and the landlords who "fought" in the period of the Second World War in an extremely nominal and peculiar way in the ranks of the National Front against the Japanese by splitting and breaking this front in essence, in the post war period they openly took to the path of shameful subservience to imperialism and wholly and completely renounced the defence of the national interests of China and betrayed it.

The international significance of the development of the revolutionary events in China consists in the fact that the victory of the democratic forces over Kuomintang reaction was at the same time a defeat of the relatively more powerful American imperialism and thereby disclosed the adventurism of American claims for world domination. Already during the years of the Second World War the American imperialists had looked upon China as a very important object for expansion and, therefore, supported in every way the reactionary top stratum of the Kuomintang.

The complete failure of the policy of USA in China revealing the bankruptcy of the strategy of American imperialism, the adventurism of its policy which was wholly orientated towards supporting the reactionary forces in China by methods of economic, diplomatic and military intervention, has become all the more evident. The active assistance of the USA in fomenting civil war in China, its active help to the Kuomintang led not to the defeat of the democratic forces but to their victory.

China which appeared to the men of Wall Street as the future inexhaustible source of super-profits for American monopolists, as a new military satellite and as a supplier of cannon-fodder for the

American militarists, as a gigantic spring-board “favourably” situated on the borders of the Soviet Union—this China has upset all the plans and all the calculations of the imperialists.

There is no doubt that the defeat of the American imperialists’ plans in China and the bankruptcy of the top stratum of the Kuomintang is the biggest factor in the further sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system as a whole. Historic experience teaches the masses to understand that national liberation cannot be attained without the most active participation of the people themselves, that the parties of the exploiting classes are interested not in liberation but in crushing the workers, and therefore, hinder and disrupt the introduction of urgently necessary democratic reforms. Already in 1927, Comrade Stalin pointed out from the example of China the restricted and the nominal character of the participation of the bourgeoisie in the national liberation movement and in the colonial revolution. In the works on the Chinese Revolution, Comrade Stalin gave a number of very valuable directions arming us with an understanding of the basis of the strategy and tactics on the questions of the national and colonial revolution as a whole, not only in China but also in other countries.

The essence of Comrade Stalin’s teachings on the stages of the Chinese Revolution comes to the following. The first stage of the Chinese Revolution—it is “a revolution of a *general national* united front” when “a powerful movement of the workers and peasants has not yet succeeded in developing, and the national bourgeoisie (non-compradore) sided with the revolution.” At the first stage the revolution for the most part directed its blow against foreign imperialism. Comrade Stalin teaches: “This does not mean that there was no contradiction between the revolution and the national bourgeoisie. It only means that the national bourgeoisie by supporting the revolution endeavoured to utilise it for its own aims in order that by directing it mainly along the lines of territorial conquests to restrict its sweep.” The counter-revolutionary coup of Chiang Kai-shek in 1927 denoted that “the revolution entered the second stage of its development, that a *turn* has commenced from a revolution of a *general national* united front, to a revolution of the many million masses of *workers* and *peasants* to an *agrarian* revolution which intensifies and extends the struggle against imperialism, against the gentry and feudal landlords, against the militarists and the counter-revolutionary Chiang Kai-shek group.” (J. V. Stalin—*Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. 9, p. 223-26)

Thus the first stage of the colonial revolution is mainly directed against foreign imperialism; the second stage, above all, against the internal enemies, against the feudal regime. However, if the first and the second stages do not entirely succeed in completing the task of overthrowing the power of the imperialists, then it is bequeathed to the following, the third stage, the Soviet stage.

Comrade Stalin’s teachings on the stages of the Chinese Revolution theoretically revealed the role of the national bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the working class on the other in the struggle of the colonies and semi-colonies for their emancipation.

The main task of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies in their liberation struggle is expressed in two demands: 1) the overthrowing of the power of imperialism, and 2) the carrying out of the agrarian revolution. It is that common element which unites the national liberation movement embracing *all* the colonial countries which lie under imperialist oppression.

The historical experience of many countries confirms the treachery and the cowardice of the national big bourgeoisie which recoils from the national liberation movement and enters into an agreement with imperialism just when the broad masses of toilers who are trying to accomplish the agrarian revolution and rally under the leadership of the working class, are drawn into the struggle.

The situation in India and Indonesia speaks eloquently of this. The Indian big bourgeoisie which has formed a bloc with the semi-feudal landlords has brought dishonour to itself by a deal with

imperialism at the expense of the basic national interests of its country. Having attained formal autonomy it has taken to the path of dealing ruthlessly with the working class and peasant movement, with all the progressive forces fighting against imperialism and reaction.

A clear illustration of the collaboration of the Indian national bourgeoisie with rank reactionary feudal elements were the events in Hyderabad, in the autumn of 1948. The Government troops of the Indian Union entered within the bounds of the Princely State of Hyderabad as though to abolish the regime of feudal despotism—the rule of the Nizam—and to render assistance to the local population which was terrorised by the bandit gangs of the princely guards, the Razakars. However, in actual reality the bourgeois government of India rushed to assist the Nizam and the local landlords who were frightened by the great sweep of the mass popular progressive movement in some districts of Hyderabad. The Indian big bourgeoisie feared that the Nizam would not cope independently with the popular democratic movement, and therefore hastened to his aid, or otherwise the flames of the revolutionary actions of peasantry would spread from the Hyderabad territory to other parts of India. With the entry of the Indian troop in Hyderabad, the Indian bourgeois Press pressed for the carrying out there of purely police functions—for “the curbing” of the democratic forces “that had dared” in the areas of Telengana to encroach not only upon the rule of the Nizam, but also upon the feudal privileges of the local landlords. The occupation of the territory of the Princely state by the Indian troops did not in the least bring about the elimination of the feudal rule of the Nizam. The Indian Government officially confirmed that the Nizam of Hyderabad would retain a considerable part of his former prerogatives.

As regards police vengeance against the working class movement, the Nehru Government can hardly be surpassed by all the rest of the Dominions of the British empire. Not satisfied with the reaction raging within the country, the Nehru Government orientates itself in its policy not only towards London, but also towards Washington, and is participating actively in the formation of the Pacific or the East-Asian Bloc which is to be a continuation of the aggressive North Atlantic Pact which serves the aim of preparing for a new world war. The Pacific Bloc as a union of all the reactionary forces in Asia under the supreme leadership of American imperialism apart from its anti-Soviet aims, is specially designed for a struggle against the national liberation movements of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies.

Thus the Indian big bourgeoisie has become a specially trusted gendarme at the service of the Anglo-American imperialist masters. The development of historical events in Indonesia after the Second World War show that the Indonesian bourgeoisie is also taking to a similar path.

Bourgeois leaders like Sukarno and Hatta who for the time being headed the Indonesian Republic, from the very beginning orientated themselves towards the attainment of a “decent” compromise with imperialism.

As a consequence of this, an “agreement” between the Indonesian Republic and the imperialists has invariably been attained at the price of a consistent renunciation of the most important gains of the national liberation movement.

In the measure of the growth in the activity of the toiling masses of Indonesia and in particular the working class led by the Communist Party, the bourgeois top stratum more and more comes to a rapprochement with the imperialists on the basis of the common enmity towards the democratic forces. Aiming at not allowing the transformation of the Indonesian Republic into a People’s Democratic Republic, the bourgeois nationalists were making preparations to deal a blow to the democratic forces and reckoned on buying the favour and the support of the USA.

By hindering the national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people, by sabotaging the carrying out of the promised democratic reforms, by making advances to the American colonisers, the bourgeois

nationalists of the type of Sukarno and Hatta have prepared for the conversion of Indonesia into an ordinary bourgeois republic, as much enmeshed in the network of political, economic and military dependence on USA as 'independent' Philippines.

The efforts of the bourgeois nationalists directed towards taking the Indonesian Republic along the beaten track of Burma and the Philippines, that is, on the path of fictitious 'independence' have evoked the legitimate indignation of the toiling masses of Indonesia. The People's Democratic Front led by the Communist Party has come out against the treacherous policy of the Hatta Government. The popular masses of Indonesia have demanded a breaking off of the Renville Agreement thrust upon them by the imperialists and the realisation of the necessary democratic reforms in the country ensuring the possibility of mobilising all the national forces and resources to repulse the imperialists. The nationalisation of industry, the transfer of land into the hands of those who till it, the arming of the people, such were the main demands of the popular democratic front headed by the Communists.

The bourgeois Ministers of the Hatta Government, who had sold themselves to the imperialists replied to these demands of the Indonesian workers with bloody provocations and unbridled police terror. Civil war commenced inside the country.

Orientation towards American imperialism did not save the Indonesian bourgeois nationalist top stratus from Dutch intervention. The capitulatory and treacherous line of Hatta and Sukarno jeopardised the very existence of the Indonesian Republic.

However, the stubborn struggle of the Indonesian people against imperialism and its internal bourgeois-feudal nationalist agents is a guarantee of the fact that imperialism will never succeed in restoring its domination over Indonesia in the former forms.

At the same time, the more than three years' experience of the existence of the Indonesian Republic demonstrated the impossibility of ensuring a real victory of the national liberation movement, the attainment of independence, till the leadership of this movement, passes over firmly into the hands of the working class, till genuinely democratic changes take place inside the country. The class interests of the bourgeois nationalists and the feudal-landlord top strata in the emancipatory anti-imperialist front impel it on the path of betrayal and compromise with imperialism.

Democratic reforms ensuring the advance of the activity of the popular masses and enabling them to free themselves from the clutches of want and backwardness are the only serious guarantee of the success of the national liberation struggle as a whole.

The hegemony of the proletariat and leadership of the Communist Party are a decisive condition for the victorious development of the national liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries.

\* \* \*

Seeing how the mass movement against imperialism led by the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party is growing, the imperialists are strenuously mobilising bourgeois nationalism with the aim of disorganising the national liberation movement and establishing the hegemony of the bourgeoisie in this movement.

The example of Indonesia shows how the imperialists are utilising bourgeois nationalism. Mobilising bourgeois nationalism is typical of the present-day ideological forms of struggle of imperialism against the people's democratic movement in all the dependent and colonial countries.

In Indonesia, Indo-China, India, Palestine, and in other countries, the imperialists are sedulously attempting to set various nationalities one against the other with the aim of weakening the anti-imperialist struggle and disrupting the united liberation front of the people.

Bourgeois-nationalist agents of imperialism deny the operation of the general laws of social development and demand the determination of special “paths and laws” for every country, arising from its specific features.

These “special paths and laws” of development of countries are utilised in order to counterpose the national movement in every individual country to the general anti-imperialist struggle of the people and to poison the people with chauvinism.

An exaggeration of the specific features of the development of individual countries is directed straight towards attempting to tear away the colonial and dependent countries from the democratic and anti-imperialist forces headed by the Soviet Union.

Sometimes, in order to mask themselves, the bourgeois nationalists advance the idea of “neutrality” or the so-called middle course, the middle path between imperialism and Communism. However, this false theory has been upset by reality. The champions of bourgeois nationalism invariably end up with slandering the USSR and Communism, thus exposing themselves as agents of imperialism.

Lenin and Stalin teach us that it is absolutely necessary to take into account the national specific distinctive features of development of every country, but this does not at all mean that the specific features ought to be raised to the absolute. Comrade Stalin says for example:

“It would be incorrect not to take into account specific features of American **capitalism**. The Communist Party must take them into account in its work. But it would be still more incorrect to base the activity of the Communist Party on these specific features since the basis of the activity of every Communist Party—including even the American—on which it must base itself are the general features of capitalism, identical for all countries and not its specific features in a given country. It is on this that the internationalism of the Communist Parties is created. Specific features are only a complement to the general features.”

(J. V. Stalin “On the Right Factionalists in the American Communist Party”, Bolshevik, 1930)

Communist Parties in the colonial and dependent countries in waging a struggle against the various manifestations of ideology hostile to the working class are justly developing special attention to a exposure of bourgeois nationalism (Gandhism, Pan-Islamism, Zionism, etc.) and are taking into account the fact that it is being utilised by imperialism as the most important ideological weapon in the colonial world. To the international unity of the workers, imperialism attempts to counterpose the line of dividing peoples. Experience however, shows that when the leadership of the liberation movement passes firmly into the hands of the working class, national divisions cease to play the role of a hindering factor in the development of the anti-imperialist struggle. An example of this is the struggle in Malaya. Till the war, British imperialism in Malaya utilised with great advantage to itself the existence there of three compact national groups—Malay, Chinese, and Indian. These groups—not without incitement from British imperialism—were in a constant state of antagonism against each other. During the Second World War, in the course of the struggle against Japanese imperialism, when the leadership of this struggle in Malaya passed into the hands of the underground organisations of the working class, close cooperation was established between these three national groups—the Malaysians, Indians and Chinese. After the war the three trade union centres in Malaya, led by the Communists began to operate as a single force rallying

workers of Malaya against the imperialists. The passing over of the leadership of the Malayan national liberation movement to the working class has led to this—the former imperialist game of playing upon the national differences of the Malayans, the Chinese and the Indians is played out.

\* \* \*

The national liberation struggle in those dependent and colonial countries where its leadership belongs to the working class, is inevitably growing over into the struggle for People's Democracy.

In North Korea and over a considerable part of the liberated territories of the People's Republic of China this struggle has already been crowned with big successes. A number of measures have been carried out ensuring the passing of real power into the hands of the people, the expropriation of the landlords has been realised, "local" capitalist exploitation has been seriously restricted and imperialist oppression has been abolished. New People's Democratic power in North Korea "backed by the mass of the people was able within a minimum period to carry through progressive democratic reforms such as bourgeois democracy is no longer capable of effecting." (A. Zhdanov, *The International Situation*, Moscow 1947, p. 9)

The experience of Viet Nam, India Burma, Philippines, Indonesia shows that the anti-imperialist struggle generally tends to grow over into a struggle for new People's Democracy, corresponding to the interests of those classes which are prepared in reality to fight to the end against imperialism. For the majority of dependent and colonial countries complete separation from the imperialist system is only possible on the basis of the triumph of the principles of People's Democracy. This means that the real national independence of the former colonial and dependent countries can be achieved only through a transfer of power into the hands of the people.

Facts show that the attempts to restrict the national liberation movement within the narrow framework of formal bourgeois-democracy inevitably lead to the retention and consolidation of imperialist domination. This is explained by the fact that the national bourgeoisie which in the present instance pretends to the role of a leader, not only fetters and artificially retards the revolutionary activities of the popular masses, but even seeks for a "business contact" and for bargains with imperialism. This is confirmed by the entire course of postwar development in many colonial and dependent countries both in the Near and in the Far East.

The external forms clothing colonial exploitation may be different. A colonial position, *i.e.* above all the economic enslavement of a country imperialism is completely compatible with its formal equality or even with "independence". Quite often formal state independence only screens actual colonial bondage, since its essence which consists in the artificial retarding of the economic development of the country by imperialism and in its retention in the position of an agrarian and raw-material appendage to the metropolitan country remains unchanged.

The granting of formal "independence" to Burma by Britain is a clear example of this. The British-Burmese Agreement of 1948 talks about granting "independence" to Burma, but it simultaneously provides for the training of the Burmese army by British officers, the sojourn of British Military missions on the territory of Burma., the servicing and utilisation of aerodromes "jointly" with Britain on the territory of Burma, etc. Britain retains the most important economic positions in Burma.

It must be emphasised that the essential pre-requisite for granting Burma formal illusory independence was the temporary advent of unstable vacillating elements to the leadership of the national liberation movement of Burma. It was precisely this which conditioned the reformist path, the renunciation of consistent resolute forms of struggle against British imperialism. This led to a hindrance

and a forcible suppression of the revolutionary activity of the popular masses. This resulted in capitulation before imperialism under the guise of compromise with it, and the establishment in Burma of a bourgeois “democratic” regime called upon to defend the imperialist interests was a screen for capitulation.

The entire “operation” for converting Burma from a colony into first a Dominion, and then into an “independent” republic under conditions suitable only for British imperialism shows that reformist petty-bourgeois nationalist organisations are incapable of fighting for the cause of national liberation. They cannot ensure successful leadership to the struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries against imperialist bondage. Their path inevitably leads to capitulation. Hardly six months passed since the proclamation of the ‘independence’ in Burma and the popular masses in that country were convinced about the illusory character of the changes that had taken place.

The continuation of the brutal exploitation in the enterprises, mines, plantations belonging to the British, the subservience of the “left” Government of foreign imperialism, the retention of British military bases, the persecution of the workers for participating in strikes, the dealing with the Communists—all these have overfilled the cup of sufferings of the Burmese people.

The great uprising which commenced in 1948 and which embraces a considerable part of the country was the reply of the popular masses to the activities of the “Socialist” puppet Ministers of British imperialism, the pitiable epigones of bourgeois “democraticism” in a colonial country. The attempts of the imperialists to utilise the national movement of the Karens against the democratic forces has ended in a complete failure. The anti-imperialist front in Burma has only expanded. The dimensions of the national liberation struggles in Burma are now so great that they cause acute anxiety to the entire imperialist camp.

At one time referring to the “experience” of Burma the British imperialists tried to affirm that the sprouts of democraticism were “maturing” gradually and “unimpeded” within the bounds of the British empire. The Labourite apologists of imperialism idyllically represent the state of affairs as though complete freedom is being granted to the fully ‘matured’ colonies of Britain. In actual practice both the British and the American imperialists are implanting the evil of formal bourgeois democraticism in the dependent countries with the sole aim of disorganising the mass national liberation anti-imperialist movement. The imperialists and their agents aim at utilising the restricted character and the hypocrisy of bourgeois pseudo-democracy in the dependent and colonial countries as a method of disarming the national liberation movement and as a means of directing it into reformist channels safe for the imperialists.

But the Burmese ‘experience’ shows that even this path is not safe for the imperialists. The popular masses discern the hypocrisy of the imperialist manoeuvres and demand not fictitious independence under the figleaf of a bourgeois republic but are fighting for real emancipation.

The struggle for national liberation can only be successful when it is accompanied by a struggle for democratic reforms, not only for formal “independence” and formal-juridical liberties but for genuine democracy for the people. This is inseparably linked with the passing of the vanguard and the leading role in the national liberation movement into the hands of the working class and the Communist Parties, because it is only the working class and not the bourgeoisie which is capable of conducting a consistent struggle for the emancipation of the great masses of the people—the toilers from the oppression of the foreign imperialists, the landlords and the money-lenders.

It goes without saying that in the East, in the colonial and semi-colonial countries it is possible to have a broader national front against imperialist forces than in the West. It can certainly include those strata of the bourgeoisie which have suffered from the ruin of local industry as a result of the flooding of the market by goods from the metropolitan country. However, the basis of this front here as in the



European countries is the bloc of toiling classes—the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty-bourgeoisie under the leading role of the working class.

The struggle for new People's Democracy in the East has its distinctive features reflecting the specific features of the colonial countries where it is taking place. And in so far as here the question is of colonial and semi-colonial countries, people's democratic power here is confronted to a much greater extent with bourgeois democratic tasks which demand a solution first. Consequently, the victory of People's Democracy in the colonial and dependent countries cannot forthwith lead to a solution of Socialist tasks to the same extent that it is taking place in the People's Democracies in Europe, since the economic backwardness of these countries is the direct result of their recent colonial past. It is in this that the main distinction between People's Democracy in the East and People's Democracies of Central and Eastern Europe consists.

The struggle for People's Democracy in the colonial and dependent countries is a specific form of the colonial revolution with all the features inherent in it. However, the circumstance that the colonial revolution has become possible in precisely a new and qualitatively higher form by itself testifies to the greatest sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism. In the East, the people's democratic system which is being born out of the national liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle does not merely eliminate the cultural and economic backwardness of the countries whose development has been artificially retarded and hindered by imperialism. This system is also called upon to create the prerequisites for a further progressive development of these countries on the path to Socialism.

The possibility of such a development has been conditioned here just as in Europe by reliance on the Soviet Union, by the support of the mighty camp of democracy and Socialism by the general correlation of the forces of democracy and imperialism on a world scale.

\* \* \*

The main enemy of the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies is aggressive American imperialism.

The termination of the Second World War led not only to the strengthening of the forces of democracy, but also to a consolidation of the forces of reaction around American imperialism, which heads the antidemocratic camp. American capitalist monopolies which enriched themselves on the war are seeking for a way of retaining and multiplying their fabulous profits and do not stop at anything in order to achieve this. The Hitlerite plans of establishing "world hegemony" have been fully inherited by the American financial magnates. Militarism has become the most active factor of American policy. American imperialism has openly come forth as an international gendarme, consistently following a line of crushing every activity of the popular democratic forces.

The American imperialists see in the growing political activities of the popular masses in the colonies and semi-colonies a serious obstacle in the realisation of their adventurist plans of fighting for world domination. Therefore, US imperialism appears in the role of leader of the colonial powers heading the campaign against the national liberation movements of the peoples of all the dependent and colonial countries.

The colonising policy of the USA in South Korea can serve as an example of the attitude of American imperialism to the national liberation struggle of the people. American imperialism attempts not merely to hold back the Korean people from realising their national aspirations by impeding the unification of North and South Korea into a united and independent people's democratic State, but has

even impudently thrust upon the Koreans a semi-colonial puppet regime of Li Sin Man, guarded by American bayonets.

In the Philippines the granting of fictitious ‘independence’ was accompanied by the promotion of arrant reactionaries and collaborationists to the local government by the Americans. The American military authorities in the Philippines are exerting all their efforts in order to assist their proteges to deal with the peasant movement and the partisan detachments which had played a heroic part in the struggle against the Japanese invaders.

All the postwar activities of American imperialism in China bear witness to the fact that the USA pursued a policy of intervention and aimed in every way at crushing the democratic movement of the Chinese people and retaining in power in China the reactionary Kuomintang clique which obediently fulfilled the orders of the Americans.

The aggressive plans of the American monopolists thrust them towards a still more intensive and predatory utilisation of the human and material resources of the colonies both those which are directly subject to the USA as well as those belonging to the Marshallised counties (Britain, France, Holland, Belgium). The colonial policy of the USA subordinated to the plans of aggression, *i.e.* to the struggle for world domination, for the oppression of all mankind is directed towards establishing American control over as large a number of foreign lands as possible, with the aim of monopolising the extraction of strategic raw materials and of gaining the possibility of exploiting the cheap or free labour forces for all kinds of military construction.

During the Second World War, American propaganda devoted great attention to making display of the so-called progressive aims of American policy which was ostensibly trying everywhere to support the democratic principles and in particular was ready to assist in the liberation of dependent and colonial countries. The activities of the USA showed the hypocrisy of this propaganda, which served to screen the struggle that was actually going on for a division of the world in the camp of the imperialist states—the partners of the anti-Hitlerite coalition—and acted as a smokescreen for the agents of American monopolies in the colonial and dependent countries. However, the American imperialists have even now not given up making demagogic “promises” to the colonial peoples.

Just as after the First World War, American imperialist politician devised the term “mandate” with the object of masking the division of the colonies, after the Second World War the USA is cynically utilising the institution “trusteeship” provided for by the Charter of the United Nations Organisation in order to distort the principles of the Charter and screen and justify the crude colonising practice of the imperialist powers in the colonies and semi-colonies. The hypocritical plans of American “aid” in the work of “economic development of backward territories” advanced by President Truman are also calculated to serve as a screen for the predatory activities of the USA in the colonies.

However, the hypocrisy of American demagogic promises is being exposed in practice. The postwar policy of US in all its aspects is a policy of preparation for a new war, seizure of colonies, crude militarism, encouragement to reactionary forces, suppression of free peoples and their conversion into an object of imperialist exploitation. The postwar colonising practice of the USA has sown the seeds of hatred towards America imperialism among the people of the colonial and dependent peoples not only in the Western Hemisphere which has already become the preserve of the North American monopolies but also in Asia.

\* \* \*

The historic experience of the recent years has strengthened the close links of the national liberation movements in the colonies with the struggle of the working class of the metropolitan countries and with the general struggle for democracy and Socialism. Leninism disclosed the revolutionary possibilities contained in the national liberation movements directed against imperialist oppression and towards the overthrow of imperialism as the common enemy of the toilers of all lands and peoples.

The most important factor contributing to the general advance of the national liberation struggle was the Great October Socialist Revolution and the birth of the Soviet State. Comrade Stalin said that the October Revolution by laying the foundation of a new epoch of colonial revolutions conducted in the oppressed countries in alliance with the proletariat ushered in the era of emancipatory revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies conducted under the hegemony of the proletariat. (J.V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russia Ed. Moscow, Vol. X. p. 243)

The influence of the historic experience of carrying into practice the Leninist-Stalinist national policy in the USSR for more than 30 years on the process going on in the colonial world is of the greatest historic significance.

Comrade Stalin in his classical work on the national question (1913) pointed out that “Russia stands between Europe and Asia”, and, therefore, her role as a factor in awakening Asia is exceedingly great. This was still in respect of pre-revolutionary Russia.

And what can one say now when Russia has shown to the people of the entire world the path to Socialism, when the theoretical formulations of the founders of Communism have been transmuted into life and confirmed by reality!

The creation of a working class and an intelligentsia and the passing over to a realisation of the programme of unprecedented economic and cultural advance of the country on the basis of the five year plan in the Mongolian People’s Republic, in a country which till quite recently served as an example of economic and political backwardness is only one of the many factors which confirm the great influence of the victorious building of Communism in the USSR on the countries of the East.

This is also intensifying the general crisis of capitalism, aggravating the crisis of the colonial system, and bringing near the liquidation of imperialist oppression over the entire colonial world.

\* \* \*

The successful national-liberationist anti-imperialist struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies is inspired by the world-historic victories of the USSR, by the example of the great power which has built a Socialist society to whom national or racial oppression and class exploitation is unknown.

The national liberation movement in the dependent and colonial countries is getting welded with the democratic and anti-imperialist camp headed by the mighty Soviet Union. It is impossible to look at the successes of the struggle of the peoples of the colonial and semi-colonial countries in isolation from the growth of the might of the USSR and the consolidation of the anti-imperialist camp of democracy and Socialism. “The USSR and the People’s Democracies pursue a policy of undeviating support to the colonial and dependent countries fighting for their national liberation from imperialist yoke.” (G. M. Malenkov: Report to the Information gathering of the representatives of the Communist Parties in Poland, 1947).

The successes of the struggle in the colonies are possible, thanks to the ideological and political support from the USSR, thanks to the support from the mighty camp of democracy and Socialism. This

determines the entire development of the national and colonial struggles after the Second World War and is conditioning the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

The victory of People's Democracy in China, the successes of the Korea People's Democratic Republic, the sharpening struggle in Viet Nam, Malaya, Indonesia and Burma and in the other countries of the East—bears witness to the impending collapse of the colonial system. The victorious outcome of the liberation struggle of the millions of masses who were till recently colonial slaves of imperialism is so heavy a blow to the entire system of imperialist oppression that it is impossible to overestimate its historic significance.

# CHINA: FROM A SEMI-COLONY TO A PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY

## INTRODUCTION

The creation of a People's Republic of China, which was proclaimed on October 1, 1949 at the People's Political Consultative Conference which for the first time expressed the free will of the peoples of the whole of China is an outstanding historical event. It constitutes the victorious completion of the long heroic struggle of the Chinese people for national liberation and democracy and puts an end to the more than a century-old domination of foreign capitalist pirates of China.

China, one of the biggest countries in the world, with a population of nearly 475 million and a territory of 10 million square kilometres, continued to remain in the position of a semi-colony even till the beginning of the Second World War. In spite of being a formally independent state, China was economically dependent on three big imperialist powers—Britain, USA and Japan who carried on a fierce struggle among themselves and against other capitalist countries for the “right” to exploit exclusively the human and natural resources of this very rich country and to convert it into their own colony.

Comrade Stalin's words which in 1927 pointed to “the semi-colonial position of China and the financial and economic domination of imperialism” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. IX, p. 221), as one of the basic factors determining the situation in China, continued fully to preserve their importance even in 1937 when Japan invaded North and Central China.

The heroic struggle waged in the course of ten years by the advanced sections of the Chinese people who were headed by the proletariat, under the leadership of the Communist Party against the combined forces of imperialism and domestic reaction was still not able to bring about the downfall of imperialist rule in China.

In 1937 “the main threads of industry in China—the railways, factories and mills, mines, banks, etc.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. VIII, p. 358) continued to remain in the hands of foreign imperialists. Just as before, they widely utilised the so-called “treaty rights” extorted by force from China with the help of the predatory wars and “expeditions” frequently undertaken against China ever since 1842 and which were fortified by numerous unequal agreements in order to consolidate and extend their domination. These “treaty rights” included apart from the direct seizure under the form of leasing a part of the territory of China, the numerous settlements and concessions which were under the administration of foreign powers, the right of extraterritoriality for foreign subjects (outside the jurisdiction of Chinese laws), the right of navigation in the territorial waters and rivers of China, the opening up of the numerous Chinese ports for free foreign trade and permission for foreign ships to call in at these ports, the rights of foreign troops and warships to be stationed in China, the right of control over the State revenue of China.

But the main role in ensuring foreign domination in China in the period of imperialism was played not so much by the “treaty rights” as the actual position in the economy of China seized by the imperialists.

Further, depending on these positions, the imperialist powers, under the pressure of the national liberation movement and with the aim of supporting the reactionary dictatorship of the Kuomintang in China, from time to time “consented” even to a withdrawal of one or the other of the treaty rights, without causing any big injury to their domination in China.

The economic position of the imperialists are based above all on their monopoly position which they occupied, in the main key branches of Chinese economy—in foreign trade, finance, transport and factory and mill industry.

## CHAPTER 1

### **The Character of the National Liberation Movement in China & the Influence of the October Revolution upon It**

Imperialism accomplished its domination in China by relying upon the so-called compradore bourgeoisie, which is the intermediary between foreign capital and the Chinese market and upon the semi-feudal classes and strata, the landlords, the merchants and usurer bourgeoisie, the military and non-military bureaucracy which enjoyed economic and political power in China and exploited the toilers by means of feudal and mediaeval methods.

In characterising this power of the landlords and the bureaucracy, which combines peculiarly with the existence of commercial capital, as feudal remnants, Comrade Stalin pointed out that they constitute the prominent factor of oppression in China and that it is precisely against them that the agrarian revolution—the basis and the content of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in China—is directed:

“If in a number of provinces, 70 per cent of the peasant incomes belongs to landlords and gentry, if the landlord enjoys actual authority in both the economic, administrative and judicial sphere, if to this day the practice of buying and selling women and children prevails in several provinces—then it must be admitted that the dominant force in this mediaeval situation is the force of feudal survivals, the power of the landlords, the power of the landlord bureaucracy, both military and non-military, combining in a peculiar way with the power of commercial capital.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. IX, p. 241)

“It is just because of this that feudal survivals with all their military and bureaucratic superstructure are the main form of oppression in China and it is precisely because of this that China is now living through an agrarian revolution—which is extremely great in its force and sweep” (*Ibid* p 285)

The force of feudal survivals in China, their persistence is to a great extent determined by the fact that

“in China, imperialism with all its financial and military might .... supports, inspires, cultivates and conserves the feudal survivals with all their bureaucratic and military superstructure.” (*Ibid* p. 286)

This combination of semi-colonial and semi-feudal oppression, the interlacing of the interests of imperialism and the landlord-bourgeois military top stratum on the basis of the joint exploitation of the toilers—is one of the characteristic peculiarities of China. This in a considerable measure pre-determined the character, direction and stage of the national liberation struggle of the Chinese people, which became directed at one stroke against two forms of oppression—imperialist and feudal. Comrade Stalin notes this as the most important distinctive feature of the Chinese Revolution.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the workers' and peasants' State—the Soviet Union—created by it had a tremendous and decisive influence upon the development of the national liberation movement in China as also on the whole world.

The October Revolution broke the imperialist chains which had engirdled China in a firm grip. It inspired the Chinese working class in the struggle against imperialism and guaranteed to them not only the all-sided moral support and assistance of the USSR but also the passing on of the tremendous revolutionary experience of the Russian proletariat and its Party. Comrade Stalin has more than once noted all these circumstances as one of the basic facts facilitating the development of the Revolution in China. (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*) Russian Ed. Vol. VIII, p. 336, Vol. IX, p. 221)

In his article on the occasion of the twenty-eighth anniversary of the foundation of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung writes that it was only thanks to the October Revolution that “the Chinese discovered the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism.”

“Before the October Revolution, the Chinese did not know who Lenin and Stalin were; neither did they know of Marx and Engels. The salvos of the October Revolution brought us Marxism-Leninism. The October Revolution helped the progressive elements of the world and of China as well, to apply the world proletarian outlook in determining the fate of the country and in reviewing their own problems. The conclusion reached was that we must advance along the path taken by the Russians.” (Mao Tse-tung: “The Dictatorship of People’s Democracy”—from *For A Lasting Peace, For a People’s Democracy*, July 15, 1949)

## CHAPTER 2

### **The Development of the Proletariat & the Disposition of Class Forces in the National Liberation Struggle.**

In spite of the fact that the industrial development of China bore a one-sided character and increased its dependence on imperialism, it led to the fact that after the First World War, alongside the two main classes that had been left over from feudal China—the peasantry and the landlords—a big economic and political role began to be played by the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie.

Under the revolutionising influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the class battles against foreign capital, the industrial proletariat, in spite of its comparative numerical weakness organised itself rapidly. The advanced section of the proletariat created by the Chinese Communist Party, heading the national liberation struggle of the Chinese toilers against foreign imperialism and domestic reaction. Strong trade union organisations were created—the All-China Federation of Labour and the industrial trade unions based themselves upon the principles of class struggle.

Thanks to its revolutionary spirit its consciousness and its organisation the Chinese proletariat attained tremendous influence amongst the urban poor and the peasantry and already in 1919 emerged in the front ranks of the anti-imperialist movement, and in the revolutionary period of 1925-27 became its leading force.

“The Shanghai and Hongkong political strikes of the Chinese workers (June-September 1925) marked a turning point in the struggle of the Chinese people for emancipation from the foreign imperialists. The political action of the proletariat served as a powerful impulse to the further development and consolidation of all the revolutionary democratic organisations in the country” (Resolution of the Sixth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International—quoted by J. V. Stalin in *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1947, p. 241)

This was the reason why in 1927 Comrade Stalin considered as one of the main factors determining the situation in China.

“the growing revolutionary activity of the proletariat, the growth of its authority among millions of the masses of toilers” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. IX, p. 221)

The Chinese bourgeoisie was composed of several strata, which in the first period of the national liberation movement occupied different positions in relation to foreign imperialism and feudal reaction.

After World War I the importance of that stratum of the bourgeoisie which was linked with national industrial production increased.

The industrial bourgeoisie, as distinct from the compradore bourgeoisie, which is closely linked with imperialism, and as distinct from the semi-feudal merchant and usurer bourgeoisie which is closely linked with the landlords, is that stratum of the bourgeoisie whose interests in a certain measure are also affected by imperialist oppression, which hampers the development of national industry and impedes the acquisition of the national market by the bourgeoisie.

This point at a definite stage of the national liberation movement was the cause of the participation of the national bourgeoisie in it, which as demonstrated by the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the national and colonial revolution is the distinctive feature of the national liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries as distinct from the imperialist countries, where the bourgeoisie is throughout counter-revolutionary.

“Revolution in colonial and dependent countries is another thing: in these countries the oppression exercised by the imperialism of other states is one of the factors of revolution; this oppression cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie also; the national bourgeoisie, at a certain stage and for a certain period, may support the revolutionary movement of its country against imperialism, and the national element, as an element in the struggle for emancipation, is a revolutionary factor.” (J. V. Stalin: *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*: Lawrence and Wishart, 1947, p. 233)

But to the extent that the national liberation movement draws in ever broader masses of the toilers and demands certain concessions from the bourgeoisie, the class interests of the latter come into conflict with the national interests and push the big bourgeoisie into an agreement with imperialism and the feudal-landlord reaction at the expense of the interests of the masses. In the epoch of imperialism it is the proletariat alone that is the real defender of the national interests of any country.

It was “the political weakness of the national bourgeoisie, its dependence on imperialism, its fear of the sweep of the revolutionary movement” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. IX, p. 221) which also represent, in the words of Comrade Stalin, one of the basic factors determining the character of the Chinese Revolution and facilitating “the task of the hegemony of the proletariat, the task of the leadership of the Party of the proletariat with respect to the Chinese peasantry.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. VIII, p. 366)

The Chinese peasantry which comprises more than 80 per cent of the entire population of China and which in the main has been deprived of land, was subject to a dual oppression—the oppression of the landlords, the merchant and usurer capital, the militarists, who savagely exploited the peasants by means of pre-capitalist enslaving rents, usury and taxes and the colonial oppression by imperialism, which destroys the peasants’ domestic industry and plunders the peasants by means of monopoly price on raw materials and manufactured goods and by transferring the consequences of economic crises onto the shoulders of the peasants by reducing the prices of raw materials.



In China it is, therefore, the peasantry that is the main mass force in the national liberation struggle against imperialist oppression and feudal exploitation and the agrarian revolution—the main content of this national liberation struggle in the period between 1925-27.

But in its struggle against imperialism and against feudal remnants, the peasantry did not come forward as a monolithic force. The process of its differentiation as a result of the implanting of commodity and money relationship in the countryside had led to its stratification into kulaks, middle peasantry, the landless poor and the farm labourers. The farm labourers and the poor peasants and to a certain extent even the middle peasants are exploited not only by the landlords but even by the kulaks who employ the very same feudal methods of exploiting the peasants that are employed by the landlords. This causes a demarcation of forces among the peasantry and the unification of the kulak strata of the peasantry with the landlords and the merchant and usurer capital on the basis of the joint exploitation of the middle and the poor peasantry and the farm labourers.

In China there exists, apart from the peasantry, a numerous urban petty-bourgeoisie, which is composed of different strata—the artisans, the petty traders, the unemployed intelligentsia, the ruined peasantry and the urban-poor, out of whom one part directly joins the proletariat and another gravitates towards the bourgeoisie.

In China an exactly similar position is occupied by the strata of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, of which a part comes forth onto the side of the proletariat and another part becomes closely linked with the landlords, the bourgeoisie and various imperialist circles.

The double oppression of imperialism and the remnants of feudalism was experienced to a full extent above all by the Chinese proletariat and the peasantry. To a certain extent it was even felt by the urban petty-bourgeoisie and a section of the bourgeoisie (the industrial stratum).

All the facts that have been pointed out pre-determined the basic disposition of class forces in China in the beginning of the national liberation movement when “the bloc of workers, peasants, petty-bourgeoisie intelligentsia and national bourgeoisie” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works* Russ. Ed. Vol. X, p. 16) united politically in the Kuomintang and in the Canton Government, developed the struggle against foreign imperialism and military-feudal dictatorship of the militarists. But even then

“the national bourgeoisie while supporting the revolution attempted to utilise it for its own aims limiting its scope by directing it in the main along the line of territorial conquests.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. IX, p. 223)

In April 1927, the national bourgeoisie betrayed the cause of national liberation and entered into an agreement with the imperialists and the landlords. It was so on followed by the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia which also went over into the camp of reaction. The Kuomintang from an anti-imperialist party and anti-feudal bloc of revolutionary classes was transformed into a party of the reactionary landlord-bourgeois bloc, which with the help of the imperialists, established its dictatorship inside the country and unleashed a civil war against the, workers and peasants.

The reason for the betrayal of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia and their going over into the camp of reaction were the changes in the content and direction of the national liberation movement, to the extent of its development and the drawing in of the broad masses of toilers into it. Their essence has been dealt with exhaustively and fully in the works of Comrade Stalin.

### CHAPTER 3

## Comrade Stalin on the Stages of the Chinese Revolution

In pointing out that the Chinese Revolution, like every revolution, must in its development pass through several stages, Comrade Stalin characterises its first stage as a revolution of a general national united front, directed in the main against foreign imperialist oppression.

“In the period of the first stage of the revolution, when the revolution was a revolution of a national united front (Canton period), the allies of the proletariat were the peasantry, the urban poor, the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia and the national bourgeoisie.”

“These allies were not and could not be uniformly reliable. Some of them were more or less reliable allies—the peasantry and the urban poor, the others less reliable and vacillating—the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia and still others altogether unreliable—the national bourgeoisie.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed, Vol. IX, pp. 223, 340)

By isolating the national bourgeoisie and utilising the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, the proletariat at the first stage of the national liberation movement, rallied round itself the peasantry and the urban poor and expanded still more the sweep of the mass movement, which evoked fear in the national bourgeoisie and resulted in its capitulation to imperialism and the feudal landlord elements.

The national liberation movement entered “a higher phase of its development—the phase of agrarian revolution”—the second stage. The mass movement extended still more. It included millions from among the Chinese peasantry. The distinctive feature of the second stage is “the fact that the edge of revolution is now directed mainly against the internal enemies, and primarily against the feudal lords and the feudal regime.” (J. V. Stalin: *Marxism and the National and the Colonial Question*, Lawrence & Wishart, 1947, pp. 243-44), maintaining at the same time its anti-imperialist edge. The task of the struggle against imperialist oppression which could not be completed in the first stage was “bequeathed to the second stage of the Chinese revolution.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russian. Ed. Vol. X, p. 25) and was the distinctive feature of the agrarian revolution in China as a semi-colonial country, in which “the feudal remnants could not be eliminated” without waging at the same time a revolutionary “struggle against imperialism.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. IX, p. 286)

Pointing out that the agrarian revolution is none other than “the basis and content of the bourgeois-democratic revolution” (*Ibid.*), Comrade Stalin defines the essence of bourgeois-democratic revolution in China as the “confluence of the struggle against feudal remnants and the struggle against imperialism.” (*Ibid.*, p. 287)

At the second stage of the revolution, “the allies of the proletariat were the peasantry, the urban poor and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.” (*Ibid.*, p. 341)

The unfolding of a powerful peasant movement as a result of which “millions and tens of millions of peasants” were drawn into “the greatest of agrarian revolutions in such provinces as Hunan, Hupeh, and Yenan, etc., where the peasants established their own power, their courts, their self-defence, banished the landlords and dealt with them in the plebian way” (*Ibid.*, p. 289), frightened the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, which, under pressure from the feudalists and imperialism followed the national bourgeoisie and crossed over into the camp of counter-revolution.

Comrade Stalin explains the betrayal of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia by

“firstly, the fear of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia in face of the growing agrarian revolution and the pressure of the feudalists on the Wuhan leadership, secondly, the pressure of

the imperialists in the districts of Tientsin, demanding from the Kuomintang a break with the Communists as the price for being allowed to go to the North.” (*Ibid.*, p. 343).

After the departure of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, the allies of the proletariat remained the peasantry and the urban poor who rallied closely round the proletariat “having created at the same time, the basis for proletarian hegemony.” (*Ibid.*, p. 343)

The departure of the national bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, thus did not weaken the national liberation movement, but on the contrary, strengthened it by ridding it of vacillating elements.

In the first two stages of the revolution, the toilers of China, under the leadership of the Chinese Communists, achieved great successes:

1) In this period, the direction of the national liberation movement was finally determined as anti-feudal and anti-imperialist, and whose edge was simultaneously turned both against internal reaction and external imperialist oppression;

2) It revealed its character as an agrarian revolution, i.e., a bourgeois-democratic revolution, directed against the survivals of feudalism in all spheres of social life, economic, political, ideological, and for its democratization;

3) Its mass basis was extended to a very great extent by drawing into the agrarian movement tens of millions of peasants and into the working-class movement—millions of workers and urban poor;

4) The class composition of the movement was consolidated by weeding out the wavering elements (the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia) and rallying millions of masses of peasants and the urban poor around the proletariat;

5) Leadership passed over into the hands of the proletariat, which occupied the position of the hegemon of the revolution, capable of carrying to the end the bourgeois-democratic revolution and ensuring the democratisation of the country and leading China further on the path of Socialism;

6) A mighty Communist Party—the reliable leader and head of the Chinese toilers was forged in the fire of revolution ensuring a correct Marxist-Leninist leadership to the national liberation struggle.

And though as a result of the treachery of the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 sustained a temporary defeat, the struggle of the Chinese people for national liberation and for ending the feudal oppression did not cease and soon developed with renewed force.

It was under the conditions of fierce civil war unleashed against the Chinese people by the reactionary bourgeois-landlord bloc, enjoying the direct support of the imperialists and assuming the character of an intervention, that round about 1933-34 the workers and peasants under the leadership of the Communist Party of China liberated from under the rule of reaction 600,000 sq. kilometres of Chinese territory with a population of 60 million; they created on this territory six stable democratic districts and in them they put into effect the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in the form of Soviets which was presaged by Comrade Stalin already in 1926 as the future political form of power in China.

Comrade Stalin in his speech *On the perspectives of the Revolution in China* on November 30, 1926, speaking of the character of the future power in China pointed out that it would represent

“something in the nature of a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, with the difference, however, that it will be directed predominantly against the imperialists.”

“It will be a power marking a transition to China’s non-capitalist, or more exactly, Socialist, development.” (J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 366: As quoted in *New Times* No. 13 in “*China’s Economic Problems*” by G. Astafyev)

Under the banner of the Soviets, the Chinese workers and peasants foiled the numerous attempts of reaction to suppress the Chinese democratic movement with arms. Led by the Chinese Communist Party, the workers’ and peasants’ Red Army successfully repelled six punitive campaigns of Chiang Kai-shek, which were organised and armed with the participation of all imperialist powers.

While leading the operations against the military campaigns of counter-revolution, the Communist Party of China conducted at the same time an irreconcilable struggle against all open and secret traitors, who had made their way inside the ranks of the Party—the Trotskyites and the Right deviators and also the “Leftists”: who had caused great harm to the struggle for democracy in China.

The works of Comrade Stalin on the Chinese Revolution are an invaluable contribution to the theory of the national and colonial question and have rendered exclusive assistance to the Chinese Communists in mastering both a correct application of Marxist-Leninist theory to the concrete historical conditions in China as well as the tremendous experience of the struggle against the Right and the “Left” deviators, borrowed from the CPSU (B) and enabled the Communist Party of China to cope with the deviation in its ranks and ensure the development of the democratic movement on the correct path.

Fighting on two fronts—against the united camp of internal reaction and foreign imperialism from outside and against its agents, the traitors and deviators from within—the workers and peasants of the Soviet regions of China, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and its leader Mao Tse-tung and with the support of the toilers of the whole of China, continued from 1928-36 to deepen the agrarian revolution which was directed both against feudal survivals and against imperialist domination.

Over the territory of the Soviet region of China, agrarian reform was completely carried out; land and the means of production belonging to the landlords and partly to the kulaks were confiscated and distributed for use among the peasants. Colonial exploitation and imperialist oppression were also completely eliminated over the territory of the Soviet regions.

## CHAPTER 4

### **The Organisation by the Communist Party of Armed Resistance to Japanese Aggression The Creation of a United Anti-Japanese National Front.**

The intensification of Japanese aggression in China, which was marked by the seizure of Manchuria in 1931 and the invasion of North China and Inner-Mongolia threatened the national independence and the national existence itself of the Chinese people. It sharpened the anti-imperialist direction of the national liberation movement and created the conditions for reforming a united national front. The Chinese Communist Party emerged as the leader and the organiser of a united front, directed against Japanese aggression.

Immediately after the commencement of Japanese occupation of Manchuria, the Communist Party demanded that the Japanese invaders be driven out of China by the forces of an armed people.

With the extension of Japanese aggression over the territory of Jehol, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and the Revolutionary Military Council of the Chinese Red Army at the end of 1932 and at the beginning of 1933 approached the Kuomintang troops with a proposal to conclude peace with the Red Army to wage a joint struggle against Japanese imperialism.

With the increasing danger of the seizure of North China, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and the Central Executive Committee of the Chinese Soviet Republic in August 1935 published an appeal to the Chinese people, to all political parties and groups with a call to create an all-Chinese Government of national defence and an all-Chinese united anti-Japanese army (on the basis of cooperation between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang) for joint resistance to Japanese aggression.

In November of that very same year, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party once again appealed to all political parties, groups and military units, proposing to summon an all-Chinese conference of “national security” with the aim of forming a united national anti-Japanese front.

In 1936, with the further intensification of Japanese aggression in North China, the Communist Party continued, alongside repulsing the attack of reaction, to wage an energetic struggle for the creation of a united anti-Japanese front and ceaselessly turned towards the Nanking Government and to the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang with the proposal to cease the civil war and unite forces for a struggle against the Japanese invaders.

In order to prove its resolute determination to render armed resistance to Japanese aggression the Communist Party in the beginning of 1936 transferred the main forces of the Chinese Red Army to the North-west of China in the border regions of the provinces of Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia which stood in the path of the Japanese advance into the heart of China. Here was created the border region of Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia which in the course of the following ten years, was the main base and centre of the people’s liberation movement in China.

These appeals of the Communist Party to the Nanking Government, as well as the attempts to conduct direct negotiations with the Kuomintang did not lead to any agreement, but by assisting in the exposure of the reactionary position of Kuomintang they increased the influence of the Communist Party. The movement for the creation of a united national front received wide support from all progressive organisations and the broad masses of the Chinese people.

Towards the end of 1936, there took place the so-called “Sian Incident” in Sian, when General Chang Hsueh-liang arrested Chiang Kai-shek, who had attempted to compel his army to attack the Chinese Red Army and the border Regions. These events could have led to the outbreak of a new and still bigger civil war, which would have only been in the interests of Japan, since it threatened to disrupt the creation of a united national front. The representatives of the Communist Party, taking this into consideration, intervened in the conflict and secured its peaceful solution. Through this, the Communist Party once again proved its firm desire to create a real national united front, in spite of the hostile attitude of the Kuomintang.

On February 10, 1937, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party appealed telegraphically with concrete proposals for the creation of a united front, to the Third Plenum of the Central Executive Committee of the Kuomintang which was meeting just then. The Kuomintang Plenum left these proposals unanswered and it was only the treacherous attack of Japan on China on July 7, 1937 and the tremendous outburst of popular indignation, testifying the determination of the people to render effective resistance to the Japanese aggression, which compelled the Kuomintang to give up a policy of sabotage and with great unwillingness and considerable delay, agree to recognise a united front. This was done through the publication on September 24, 1937, of the official interview of Chiang Kai-shek, which was a reply to the declaration of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China of July 14, 1937 on cooperation between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang in the anti-Japanese struggle.

Though a formal agreement on the creation of a united front as such was not concluded, a united front was created on the basis of mutual concessions. As is seen from the declaration of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party of September 23, 1937, the Chinese Communist Party on its part took upon itself the following obligations:

(1) To fight for an effective implementation of the three principles of Sun Yat-sen, which the Communist Party considered in the existing situation to be acceptable as a programme of struggle for national independence, democratic liberties and improvement in the condition of the people.

(2) To cease the struggle for the overthrow of the Kuomintang rule, to give up the slogan of “Sovietising” China and to cease the confiscation of landlords’ land.

(3) To re-name the border Soviet Regions of Shensi-Kansu-Ninghsia as a special Border Region and re-organise the Soviet organs of power into local organs of power subordinate to a Central Government but as distinct from the Kuomintang regions, elected in the most democratic manner with the participation of the entire population.

(4) To change the name of the Red Army and include it into a united people’s revolutionary army, subordinate to a united War Council.

All the obligations which the Communist Party undertook were fulfilled by it extremely punctually and without delay.

For the sake of creating national unity and the struggle for democracy on a China-wide scale, the Communist Party agreed to substitute the Soviet forms of power on its territory by all-national organs of power, created on a broad democratic basis.

Mao Tse-tung, in explaining the reason for giving up the Soviet form of power pointed out:

“Why have the Communists given up further organisation of the Soviets? It is not because they think that this system is unsuitable but because the armed invasion of Japanese imperialism has given a rise to a change in the co-relation of classes inside the country, the unification of the entire nation for the struggle against Japanese imperialism became necessary and possible. Today, throughout the world, a united democratic front for the struggle against fascism is being organised. The formation of a national and democratic united front is necessary for present-day China and hence the Communists have put forth the slogan of a democratic Republic instead of the slogans of Soviets.” (Mao Tse-tung: “Tasks of the Chinese Revolution after the Creation of a United Front between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party”—from the Collection: *The Chinese People are Victorious*, Moscow, 1938, pp. 13-14)

The upsurge of the national liberation movement and the stages it passed through in the course of its development could not but be reflected in the character of the united front.

Its main features consist in the following:

1. By its betrayal of the cause of national liberation and by its compromise with imperialism and the landlords, the bourgeoisie showed its unwillingness to lead an active national liberation struggle and lost the confidence of the broad masses of the Chinese people.

As a partner in the ruling bourgeois-landlord bloc, it took up a stand of actively opposing the creation of a united front and persecuted those in the ranks of the Kuomintang who supported it (*i.e.*, united front—Trans.) and right upto 1937 it continued the policy of capitulating before Japanese imperialism and extending the civil war against the national liberation movement under the reactionary slogan “First appeasement and then resistance”.

It was only after the unleashing of a big war in China in 1937 by the Japanese militarists that the national bourgeoisie, fearing to lose completely the remnants of its influence among even the backward but patriotically-inclined circles, was with great reluctance forced to agree to the formation of a united front which a year later (towards the end of 1938) was once again split in effect by the landlords and the big bourgeoisie.

2. The proletariat, which by this time had under the leadership of the Communist Party finally won the hegemony of the national liberation movement and strengthened its ties with the peasantry, emerged as the organiser and the leader of a united anti-Japanese front.

3. The programme and the tasks of the general nations united front now became of a higher level than at the first stage of the revolution 1925-27. Apart from the tasks of the struggle against imperialism, the united front now advanced as fundamental demands the democratisation of the country and improvement in the position of the broad masses of the toilers.

## CHAPTER 5

### **The Monopoly of the ‘Four Families’ and the Intensification of the Oppression of the Landlords in the Years of the Second World War**

#### **Extension of the United Front and the Growth in the Forces of Democracy.**

In the course of the anti-Japanese war, the leading role of the Chinese proletariat and the Communist Party and their authority among the broad masses of the Chinese people continued to grow. The might and the importance of the united national anti-Japanese front headed by the proletariat, and the successes achieved by them in the armed resistance to the Japanese invaders and in democratic construction in the territories liberated from Japanese occupation, grew correspondingly.

The big changes in the economic and political situation of China brought about by the war contributed to this. Some of these changes were of a temporary and passing significance but some were of lasting importance, determining the direction of the development of events in the postwar period.

The seizure of the economically developed maritime provinces by the Japanese and the restrictions of the territory of Kuomintang China to backward and agrarian provinces led to a change in the correlation of forces in the ruling camp and precisely, to a decline in the role and influence of the industrial bourgeoisie and to a still great increase in the role and influence of the class of landlords and the merchant and usurer bourgeoisie closely linked with it. The intensification of the economic and political influence of the landlords in the ruling camp inevitably must lead and did lead to an intensification of reaction, to an attack on the democratic elements and finally to attempts at an agreement with Japanese imperialism.

An expression of this reactionary course of policy was the slogan of “passive defence” against the Japanese, with extremely active and hostile operations against Chinese democracy—in the form of an offensive on the People’s Revolutionary New Fourth Army and on units of the People’s Revolutionary Eighth Route Army, blockade of the Special Border Regions, persecution of democratic elements and suppression of civil liberties all over Kuomintang China.

Along with the weakening of the influence of the national bourgeoisie and the increase in the influence of the landlords, an ever-increasing role in the economy of Kuomintang China began to be

played by the monopoly of 'Four families' whose heads Chiang Kai-shek, Chen Li-fu, Soong Tse-wei, Koong Hsiang-hei headed the Kuomintang and the Government controlled by it.

Immediately after the advent of the Kuomintang to power in 1927, these four dynasties of China, as they are commonly called, began utilising it for personal enrichment. During the period of their rule even before the war, they had accumulated enormous capital with the support of the imperialists and were in possession of a number of extremely important positions in the various branches of the economy of China. But the war period afforded these 'Four families' especially great opportunities for enrichment. Screening themselves behind military requirements, they not only established rigid State control over the economic life of the country, but even utilised this control to subjugate Chinese economy to their influence.

It was for this purpose that they utilised the wartime regulations on control over external trade, currency and bank operations, industry and internal trade as well as to government organisations like Commissions on external trade and the government trade commission Fu-sin, subservient to it, the commission for national resources, the commission for rendering assistance to the restoration of industry, etc., which were created in order to implement this control.

The representatives of the 'Four families' utilised their position in the State economic organs for preferential financing and the distribution of government orders and other encouragement of the firms and companies belonging to them personally or to those in whom they were interested.

In order to enrich themselves they did not even stop at such a vile source of income as contraband trade with the enemy which finally assumed open legal forms.

In his speech of December 25, 1947, Mao Tse-tung gives the following characterisation of the economic domination of the 'Four Families':

"'Four Families' Chiang Kai-shek, Soong Tsi-wei, Koong Hsiang-hei and Chen Li-fu, during their twenty years' rule, have accumulated enormous capital running into some ten to twenty thousand million American dollars and have monopolised the economic life of the entire country." (Mao Tse-tung: Report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China: From *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!*, dated January 15, 1948)

The monopoly capital of the 'Four Families' as they are usually called in China is of a semi-feudal and compradore character and is essentially different from monopoly capital in imperialist countries, peculiar to imperialism as the 'highest stage of capitalism'—a stage which China has not reached and which it is eschewing, since the People's Democratic system ensures to it the possibility of going over to Socialism by avoiding this stage.

The political and economic domination of the 'Four Families' was indissolubly linked with the semi-feudal structure existing in China and with the imperialist oppression, carried out by foreign capital.

The semi-feudal character of the monopolies of the 'Four Families' was expressed in its close links with the class of landlords without whose support they would not have been able to accomplish their dictatorship and the plunder of the people with the object of accumulating wealth.

The compradore *i.e.*, dependent on foreign-capital, character of the monopolies of the 'Four Families' was expressed above all in that the very process of "their formation was rendered possible only as a result of the direct political and economic support of the imperialist States. The imperialists looked upon Chiang Kai-shek, Chen Li-fu, etc. and on the Kuomintang headed by them, as the main weapon of



struggle against the national liberation movement of the people and as the main vehicle of the influence of foreign and mainly American monopoly capital. Therefore, beginning with 1927, they rendered them every possible assistance through their political instrument—the Kuomintang and the Kuomintang State—and made various political “concessions”, calculated towards intensifying their economic and political influence.

The same policy was pursued by Anglo-American imperialism in respect of the ruling Kuomintang top stratum even in the period of the Second World War. Imperialist loans and in particular, American loans, instead of strengthening the military potential of China served as the biggest source of enrichment to the monopolies of the ‘Four Families’ and as a means of the further enslavement of the country by Anglo-American capital. The monopoly of the ‘Four Families’, which is the direct agent of foreign imperialism was profoundly anti-national and was directed against the interests of the entire Chinese people.

These distinctive features of the monopoly of the ‘Four Families’ were the reason why Chen Po-ta and other Chinese progressive scholars and political leaders have characterised it as “monopoly capital of a feudal and compradore type”.

As a result of the intensification of the power of the landlords and the monopoly of the ‘Four Families’ in the years of war there was a tremendous increase in the exploitation of the broad masses of the toilers of Kuomintang China on whose shoulders fell the enormous war expenses and the costs of the unprecedented predatory enrichment of the exploiting top stratum. This enrichment was carried out by means of inflation, speculative rise of prices and the tax imposition on the entire population by means of lengthening the working day and lowering the wages for workers and employees, by increasing rents, interests on loans, by all possible exactions and finally by the direct confiscation of the land from the peasants. The interweaving of feudal and capitalist methods of exploitation, the combination of the ‘latest’ monopoly methods with methods of primary accumulation of capital and the general increase in the exploitation of the broad strata of toilers—the workers, the peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie—by the landlords and the ‘Four Families’ monopoly, as well as the exceedingly unfavourable conditions in which the petty and the middle bourgeoisie were placed increased the dissatisfaction with the Kuomintang regime among the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people. At the same time, the anti-feudal stand of the Kuomintang on questions of organising a rebuff to the Japanese aggressors emerged all the more clearly. All this led to the gradual narrowing down of the social base of the Kuomintang dictatorship, as a result of the departure from the landlord-bourgeois bloc of the petty and the middle bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, student youth, petty officials and other patriotically-inclined elements, connected with the Kuomintang and as a result of the conversion of the Kuomintang in essence into a bloc of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie. Their departure from the bloc had already begun during war time and in fact was expressed in the amalgamation of the bourgeois-liberal oppositional parties and the organisation of, first, the Federation of Democratic Parties and later into the Democratic League and the incorporation of the League into the democratic camp, headed by the Communist Party and advancing its programme of the democratic re-organisation of China.

At a time when the class and social base of the landlord-bourgeois bloc became strongly restricted during war time, the social base of the democratic national liberation movement, assuming in this period the form of a united national anti-Japanese front, became still broader.

In the beginning of the war, the territory of democratic China liberated from the regime of the Kuomintang dictatorship and carrying out a policy directed in the interests of the broad masses of toilers, was limited only to the special Border Region of Shensi-Kansu-Ningsia, with an area of less than 10,000 sq. kilometres and with a population of one and half million people.

In the measure of the consolidation of a united anti-Japanese Front and the unleashing, under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Eighth Route and the New Fourth Armies, of popular partisan warfare against the Japanese invaders, the territory of democratic China, as distinct from the territory of Kuomintang China, expanded unceasingly in the course of the whole war by creating newer and new and liberated regions in the rear of the Japanese. Towards the end of 1944, these liberated regions numbered 15 with a territory of 859,000 sq. kilometres and a population of 95,500,000 people.

The liberated regions created in the course of the war in mountainous regions, which were difficult to reach (*e.g.*, Yutuhsien Taishan-hsien), initially played the role of operation bases for the regular units of the People's Revolutionary Army and the partisan detachments operating in the rear of the Japanese.

In the measure of the drawing in of the broad masses of the population in the anti-Japanese struggle and the driving out of the Japanese troops, the territory of the liberated regions expanded gradually and finally only the towns, the thickly-populated centres and the railway and high-road routes linking them remained in the hands of the Japanese occupation troops.

In the measure of the expansion of its territory, the liberated regions, while retaining their importance as operation bases, acquired new importance as large political formations in whose bounds the programme of the united anti-Japanese front had been carried out in practice, not only in the sphere of the armed struggle, but also in the sphere of introducing the democratic changes provided for by this programme.

The strengthening of democracy told above all on the fact that it acquired a big military, political and economic base in the form of the People's Revolutionary Armies and the liberated areas, on whose territories it was able to implement its programme and demonstrate in practice to the broad masses of the Chinese people the superiority of the democratic system.

The Vice-Governor of the North-west Financial and Economic Bureau, Chen-yun pointing to the enormous difference in solving an economic problem in Democratic and Kuomintang China declared—

“While in Kuomintang China it is solved by means of increasing the burdens of the peoples which leads to the impoverishment of the ordinary people and to draining away of the financial resources of the nation, in democratic China, it is solved by implementing the task of ‘eating and dressing well’ on the basis of every kind of development of production.”

“Between these two methods, the Chinese people can certainly distinguish clearly which is the good and which is the bad, which has to be adopted and which rejected.” (“Our Tasks in 1945”, January 1945, p. 33)

The strengthening of democracy was manifested particularly sharply towards the end of 1944 when with the big defeats suffered at the front, the inconsistency and the negative consequences of the reactionary policy of the Kuomintang were revealed fully.

The concessions which Kuomintang reaction was forced to cede and the negotiations with the Communist Party that began in 1944 for the solution of differences and the unification of military efforts were a demonstration of the strength of the democratic front. In commencing the negotiations, reaction had no intention of renouncing dictatorship or of democratising the regime. It pursued the aim of securing the disarming of democracy and the consolidation of its own dictatorship with the assistance of “political means”.

## CHAPTER 6

### **The Programme of the Communist Party in the Sphere of the Democratic Changes in China.**

The programme of a united anti-Japanese national front created on the provisional political basis of rendering resistance to Japanese aggression and uniting not only the toilers but also the exploiting classes could not set itself the task of a fundamental reconstruction of Chinese society.

As was pointed out above, one of its main demands was the carrying out of definite democratic changes in the field of administration (democratisation of the political regime) and improvement in the conditions of the working people.

Mao Tse-tung, in his speech on the tasks of the general united national front already pointed out in May 1937:

“The struggle against Japan and the struggle for democracy are interdependent tasks. Democracy is the guarantee of an effective struggle against Japan and the struggle against Japan creates favourable conditions for the development of a democratic movement.”

Hence Mao Tse-tung draws the conclusion that “the most central and essential task at the present stage is democracy and freedom.” (Mao Tse-tung: *Tasks of the General National United Anti-Japanese Front*. COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, 1937 No. 9, p. 73)

In his other works, Mao Tse-tung also repeatedly emphasised the importance of democratic changes not only for the success of the war against Japan but also for the postwar development and the international position of China.

During the process of the war against Japan, the broad masses of the toilers of China—the workers, peasants, artisans, intelligentsia who actively joined it had necessarily to begin the struggle for their democratic rights, for an improvement in their position. The words of the leader of the people, Comrade Stalin, that “the Second World War against the Axis powers, unlike the first World War, assumed from the very outset the character of an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation, one of the tasks of which was to restore democratic liberties,” (J. V. Stalin: *Speech delivered at an election meeting in the Stalin Election District, Moscow*: February 9<sup>th</sup>, 1946) characterise also the main distinctive feature of the struggle of the Chinese people for liberation since the latter fought during the war for the attainment of elementary democratic rights.

For the Chinese toilers, the struggle against Japanese aggression denoted at the same time a struggle for a new; democratic China, and under the leadership of the Communist Party, they succeeded already during wartime to realise partially even though over the limited territory of the liberated regions, their aspirations and hopes.

The political and economic achievements of the liberated regions proved the possibility of introducing democratic reforms even under the difficult conditions of war and showed the toilers of China the necessity of urgently transmuting into life the tasks of democratic reconstruction of the entire country as the sole condition for the liberation of the Chinese people from imperialist and feudal oppression, an improvement in the conditions of the toilers and a solution of the numerous difficulties confronting the country.

Corresponding to this task, the Communist Party in the course of the war put forth in the development of a programme of united anti-Japanese front, the programme of democratic changes for the whole of China which was based on the political and economic changes carried out in practice over the territory of the liberated regions. This programme came into practice not at once but gradually in the measure that its various elements were crystallised in practice, proved in reality their vitality and received recognition from the people.

The programme of new democracy was initially set forth in the two works of Mao Tse-tung: *The Chinese Revolution and the Communist Party of China* (published on December 15, 1939 and *New Democracy* (published on January 1, 1940) and most completely in his speech on *The Coalition Government* at the Seventh Congress of the Chinese Communist Party on April 24, 1945.

In his speech on *The Coalition Government*, Mao Tse-tung in defining the present stage of the revolution in China as a bourgeois-democratic revolution considered the programme of the Communist Party at this stage in relation to the final aim—the building of Socialism—as a minimum programme.

This programme puts forward the task of overthrowing the dictatorship of the big landlords and the big bourgeoisie and the building of an independent, free, united, democratic China in which power must be based on the support of the overwhelming majority of the people and a coalition of democratic parties and groups established, land must belong to those who till it and the decisive branches of industry controlled by the State. The main emphasis of the programme was on the liquidation of imperialist and feudal oppression.

“The New Democracy we uphold politically demands the expulsion of imperialist oppression and the overthrow of feudalistic, fascist oppression.” (Mao Tse-tung: *The Way Out of China's Civil War*, PPH, Bombay, p. 33)

The general programme was a programme of bourgeois-democratic revolution and intended for a prolonged period (“throughout the whole stage of bourgeois democratic revolution for a long time to come our new democratic general programme will remain unchanged”—Mao Tse-tung, *Ibid.* p. 41) and in its main outlines is not different from the programme of 1939-40 with the exception of certain points (the formation of a Coalition Government, the creation of three sectors of economy).

In the war period, the Communist Party in its specific programme, which was set forth by Mao Tse-tung in his speech on “*The Coalition Government*”, put forward still more curtailed demands. In the political sphere, the specific programme demanded the complete-expulsion of the Japanese invaders and the prohibition of compromise with them, an end to the Kuomintang dictatorship and the creation of a democratic Coalition Government, the granting of democratic liberties to the people and their unification.

In the sphere of liquidating the feudal survivals, the specific programme during the war period and even during a definite postwar period demanded only reduction of rent and interest on loans under the condition of introducing them all over the country so that in the future, the main slogan of “Land to the Peasants” would be realised in a normal (constitutional—G. Astafyev), order i.e. by implementation of Land Reform.

In the sphere of the industrial development of China, the specific programme put forward the task of creating in the course of a number of years a light and heavy industry on the basis of private capital and even drawing in foreign capital. (Mao Tse-tung: —*The Coalition Government*)

In the majority of its demands, this programme did not go beyond the bounds of the programme of a united front.

The specific programme as a programme intended for the war period, envisaged definite concessions even to feudal and imperialist forces in the form of giving up, during the period of war and of a certain post-war period, the slogan of confiscation of land and restriction of the activities of foreign capital in China.

Under conditions of war, this programme was fully justified. It arose not only from the necessity of maintaining a united front within the country but also from a recognition of the fact that USA and Britain were partners in the war against Japan.

But even this programme was completely unacceptable for the ruling landlord-bourgeois bloc. It aimed at the complete retention of its political domination and the monopolisation of the entire economic life of the country in the interests of an unhindered exploitation of the toilers. By means of terror and of undeclared war against the liberated regions and the People's Liberation Armies, the reactionary landlord-bourgeois bloc even during the period of the anti-Japanese war was attempting to consolidate its dictatorship and smash the democratic forces of the country.

After sustaining a failure, the Kuomintang by utilising the tactic of political manoeuvres and conducting negotiations on democratising the country, aimed at playing for time, in order to strengthen its military position through American aid and then with the help of American imperialism put an end to the democratic movement with armed force. The whole course of negotiation between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party in 1944-45 clearly bears witness to these intentions of reaction.

## CHAPTER 7

### **The Defeat of the Japanese War Machine: The Activisation of American Imperialism After the Second World War**

The entry of the USSR into the war in the Pacific in August, 1945, and the rapid defeat of the Japanese war machine and the capitulation of Japan which followed as a result of this, smashed the plans of international and Chinese reaction, directed towards defeating the democratic movement of the Chinese people and created enormous possibilities for a further growth of the democratic forces in China.

Availing themselves of the victorious assaults of the Soviet and Mongolian troops against the Kwantung Army, on 10<sup>th</sup> August, 1945, the Eighth Route People's Liberation Army in North China and the New Fourth People's Liberation Army in Central China with the support of the partisans and the detachments of peasants' self-defence began the counter-offensive against the Japanese troops and within a short time liberated a large number of towns, railways and 350,000 square kilometres of territory with a population of 20 million.

Together with Manchuria, the total area of liberated democratic regions of China by 13<sup>th</sup> January, 1946 was 2,376,000 square kilometres with a population of 148 million (*Tsunch jun*—4-2-1947 No. 4—5). Over the liberated territory democratic rule was established, freely elected by the people and democratic reforms of the war period (the lowering of rents and of interests on loans, an improvement in the condition of workers, etc.) were realised. Following on the victory of the heroic Soviet people over German Fascism and the entry of the USSR in the war against Japan, the swift defeat of Japanese imperialism entrenched strongly the military and political position of the democratic camp and placed the task of democratising the whole of China on the order of the day.

Immediately after the capitulation of Japan, the Communist Party entered into negotiations with the Kuomintang and advanced its own programme of democratic changes. The internal political situation

in China made it possible to count up on the realisation of these democratic changes. However, the intervention of American imperialism changed the situation.

The activation of American imperialism which pursues the aim

“of establishing United States political and economic domination in all countries marked out for American expansion, to reduce these countries to the status of satellites of the United States, and to set up regimes within them which would eliminate all obstacles on the part of the labour and democratic movement to the exploitation of these countries by American capital,” (A. Zhdanov: *The International Situation: Report at the Informative Conference of Representatives of a number of Communist Parties—For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy!*, Nov. 10, 1947)

took place in China already during the war years and after its termination increased sharply and assumed the character of direct intervention.

Immediately after the capitulation of Japan units of the naval force of the USA under the pretext of the necessity of disarming Japanese troops, occupied ports, railways and the key-points of North China and having created a vast jumping off ground in the centre of the liberated democratic regions began immediately transferring Kuomintang troops by American ships and aeroplanes. Under the cover of American troops and “negotiations” on democratisation, Kuomintang reaction concentrated enormous military forces (49 armies, 127 divisions, numbering 1,200,000 men) on the borders of the liberated regions and on the jumping-off ground seized by the Americans and in October, 1945, it began a determined attack on the liberated regions. For its attack, reaction utilised not merely American weapons and the Chinese divisions, prepared by the Americans for an invasion against the Japanese but also Japanese and puppet troops numbering five hundred thousand. According to press reports American units also participated in the attack on various parts of the front; the American navy and air force supported the offensive operations of the Kuomintang troops.

Thus, in the struggle against Chinese democracy even in the first months after the termination of the Second World War, all the forces of reaction were united—American imperialism, its former enemy, Japanese imperialism and the Chinese landlord-bourgeois reaction which did not stop at fomenting civil war on an enormous scale.

But it was precisely here that the fact of the weakening of the forces of reaction and the growth in the forces of democracy was revealed fully. In spite of their military and technical superiority, the united forces of Kuomintang, Japanese and American troops sustained defeat. The soldiers did not wish to fight for the interests of reaction. From among the Kuomintang detachment an entire army (the New Eighth) with the officers at its head crossed over to the side of the democratic troops. The first offensive of the Kuomintang troops was repulsed, and this fact which revealed the strength and the might of the democratic camp forced reaction to change its tactics, temporarily give up its military measures and return to the tactics of political manoeuvres.

The provocative actions of the American military authorities in China immediately after the termination of the war, evoked tremendous indignation of world and American democratic public opinion. The latter was still under the influence of the democratic slogans under which the war ‘had been waged and was not prepared for the struggle for world domination in the interests of American monopoly-capital. The Truman Government was forced to begin a retreat. In December, 1945, first Byrnes and then Truman published a declaration on American policy in China and at the end of December Byrnes signed in Moscow the declaration on China of the meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

In all these documents, the central question was the question of democratising China; although Truman and Byrnes through their declarations pursued the same aim as Chinese reaction—the disarming of democracy in exchange for the granting of a few seats to democratic elements in the Kuomintang Government the need for the retention of which was persistently emphasised in the American declarations—even the very posing of this problem testifies to the weakness of the reactionary forces, their lack of confidence in themselves and the impossibility of resorting to brute force and the need to utilize the tactics of political manoeuvres.

The decisions of the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers on December 26, 1945, as distinct from American declarations, demanded a real democratisation of the political regime of China by including democratic elements in all the Government organs and proclaimed the principle of non-intervention in its internal affairs of China. Thanks to this, they represented an enormous international support to the forces of democracy in China.

The negotiations between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang which had begun already in the beginning of January, 1946, before the decisions of the Moscow Conference, led to the conclusion of important political and military agreements, directed towards the cessation of the civil war and democratisation of the political system of China.

But as further events showed, the landlord-bourgeois bloc did not intend to implement these agreements. Relying on the military aid which the USA was rendering on as vast a scale to Chinese reaction under the cover of “mediation”, the Kuomintang prepared for a new military offensive. The offensive began in April, 1946, in South Manchuria and very soon passed over into a bitter civil war on all fronts.

## CHAPTER 8

### **The Leading Role of the Communist Party in the New Stage of the National Liberation Struggle.**

The struggle for the democratisation of the country, for the implementation of agrarian reform after the termination of the Second World War, in spite of the defeat of Japan was once again closely interlaced with the task of the struggle against imperialism—this time American imperialism.

As before, the task of the struggle against imperialism as the condition for the success of the struggle against internal reaction remained the most important task of the national-liberation movement of the Chinese people. But while retaining its anti-feudal and anti-imperialist character, the national-liberation struggle, after the Second World War, is taking place under the new international and internal political conditions, which determine its higher level and its more successful results. The new features consist in the fact that this struggle is a part of the general struggle between the camp of democracy and the camp of reaction, embracing the entire world and is taking place “in a situation marked by a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, the weakening of the forces of capitalism and the strengthening of the forces of Socialism and democracy.” (Declaration of the Informative Conference of Representatives of a number of Communist Parties: from *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* November 10, 1947). It is taking place under the hegemony of the proletariat, an expression of which is the leading role of the Chinese Communist Party, which unites broader masses of the toilers and the intermediary classes representing the interests of the overwhelming sections of the Chinese people and is taking place under conditions of a sharp change in the co-relation of forces between democracy and reaction in favour of democracy over the entire world, and in particular, in China.

The fact that the liberation movement in China is developing in direct struggle against the bulwark of international reaction—American imperialism—is an expression of this first distinctive feature. Any military, political, economic and ideological victory of the united national democratic front led by the Communist Party of China is a defeat, and a weakening of American imperialism and of the camp of reaction which serves it.

It is not surprising that the heroic people's liberation struggle of the Chinese people evokes the admiration, sympathy and moral support of all democratic progressive elements over the entire world and is also an expression of the ties of the Chinese people's liberation movement with the general struggle of the world camp of democracy.

The Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung had spoken with pride of these ties: "The great People's Democratic Revolution in China which is being carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party of China is an integral part of the forces of the international anti-imperialist camp." (Mao Tse-tung: "Revolutionary Forces of the World Rally to Combat Aggression"—*For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* November 1, 1948)

In leading the struggle of the Chinese people against the fierce aggression of American imperialism the Chinese Communist Party emerges as the true defender of the independence and sovereignty of China as distinct from the reactionary Kuomintang Government "which has betrayed the fatherland and the interests of the people." (*Ibid.*)

The fact of the hegemony of the proletariat in the national liberation movement of the Chinese people finds its expression in the leading role of the Chinese Communist Party. The policy of the Communist Party played a tremendous role in the change which took place in China in the period of the Second World War in the co-relation of forces between democracy and reaction. The consistent Marxist-Leninist policy of the Communist Party not only helped the Chinese people to hold out in the war against Japan and smash the designs of reaction and of American imperialism after the war, but also led to a recognition by the majority of the Chinese people of the democratic programme, advanced by the Chinese Communist Party as the only correct path leading to the liberation of the country from imperialist chains and the feudal fetters and towards the building of an independent, free, democratic, united, prosperous and strong China.

In the words of Mao Tse-tung, "The Communist Party of China is a Party built on the example of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)" (*Ibid.*) It widely utilised the revolutionary experience accumulated by the Russian Bolsheviks and in its activities is guided by the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle elaborated by the great leaders of the world proletariat—Lenin and Stalin. Its policy has from the very beginning been based upon Leninist teaching on imperialism and on the distinctive features of the revolution in colonial and dependent countries. The works of Stalin in particular his works on the Chinese question were of great significance in the task of formulating a correct Marxist-Leninist policy of the Communist Party. In his works, Comrade Stalin, on the basis of a profound theoretical analysis of the situation in China defined the distinctive features of the Chinese Revolution and brilliantly foresaw the course of its development and noted the conditions under which it could be successful.

The most important among these conditions, pointed out by Comrade Stalin, is the observance of the general dialectical principles of Leninism, which have been formulated with exceedingly great clarity and simplicity in the work, "Comment on Current Affairs".

"1. The principle of the necessity of taking into account the national peculiarities and the national characteristics of each nation ....



“2. The principle of the necessity for the Communist Party in every country to utilising the smallest possibility of securing mass allies for the proletariat, even if they are temporary, vacillating, wavering or unreliable.

“3. The principle of the necessity of taking into account the truth that propaganda and agitation alone are not enough for the political education of millions of the masses, but that this demands the political experience of the masses themselves.” (J. V. Stalin: *Comment on Current Affairs* as quoted by Chen Po-ta in *Stalin and the Chinese Revolution—China Digest*, No. 7, 1949)

A most brilliant example of the application of these principles is the post-war policy of the Chinese Communist Party.

In the consistent change in the tactical slogans of the Communist Party we see how in the measure of the broad masses acquiring experience, in the measure of the entire Chinese people understanding the reactionary and treacherous character of Kuomintang dictatorship and the aggressive designs of American imperialism, the Party rallied the broad masses of the toilers and the entire Chinese people for a still more decisive struggle against them and on the basis of this strengthened the united democratic front and won newer and newer successes.

As has been pointed out above, during the war period the activities of the Party were built on the basis of the programme of New Democracy and in particular of its specific programme, that are perse from the necessity of consolidating a united front of struggle against Japanese aggression. It was this very same programme by which the Communist Party was guided during the negotiations with the Kuomintang with the “mediation” of the USA till April-May, 1946.

Such a position was caused by the circumstance that the broad masses of the toilers of China, after eight years of an exhausting war against Japan, yearned for Peace and hoped that the democratic re-organisation of China and an improvement in the conditions of the masses could be achieved by an agreement between the Communist Party and the Kuomintang. And though it was clear to the Communist Party even immediately after the beginning of the negotiations that it was impossible to achieve an agreement with Kuomintang reaction, which aimed at retaining its dictatorship, a change in programme in this period would have been mistaken and would have meant isolation from the masses. It was necessary to give the masses an opportunity of being convinced through their own experience that their hopes were unreal, that the task of the democratic re-organisation of China could not be solved through an agreement with reaction and with American imperialism.

As is well-known, all the attempts of the Communist Party to reach an agreement with the Kuomintang failed. Kuomintang reaction, inspired by American aid, passed over to the offensive against democracy and started the conflagration of an unprecedented civil war. The anti-popular character of reaction, as well as the real aims of American “mediation” became clear to everybody.

Under these conditions, the programme of New Democracy in its former form ceased to correspond to the political situation inside the country and needed to be revised. A proof of this was the change in the mood of the broad masses and was expressed in the mighty agrarian movement among the peasantry of the liberated regions, “which having lost hope of realisation of their” aspirations began spontaneously to carry out the agrarian reform from below. In conformity with this, in May, 1946, the Communist Party adopted the decision on the introduction of agrarian reform on the basis of a partial confiscation of land from the landlords in the form of the so-called “settling of account” with the malicious landlords, who had exploited the peasants and misappropriated their land.

The worsening of the condition of the peasants, the workers and the intelligentsia, the petty and the middle bourgeoisie on the territory controlled by the Kuomintang, as a result of an intensification of the economic crisis caused by the civil war and American expansion also led to an enormous increase in dissatisfaction against the Kuomintang regime and to the growth of the mass movement of the peasants, the workers, the students and the urban poor.

Not being in a position to cope up with the economic crisis Kuomintang reaction, relying on the unlimited support from USA alongside the civil-war, resorted to a policy of terror and suppression of the discontent of the masses by armed force and took the course of completely exterminating every democratic movement.

In the face of the civil war and the furious offensive of reaction, the Communist Party had to adopt determined measures for a defence of the democratic gains and for giving a rebuff to reaction by deepening and an extending of the democratic movement and satisfying the most urgent needs of the masses, strengthening of the army and implementation of measures to undermine the economic and political base of reaction.

With these aims, the Communist Party not only forced the passing of agrarian reform and the transfer of landlords' land to the peasants, but even put forward more resolute tasks:

1. The complete liquidation of the economic basis of the landlord class and the kulaks supporting it—which was the support of reaction in China.
2. The liquidation of the economic base of monopoly capital, which headed reaction.
3. The defeat of the reactionary regime of Kuomintang dictatorship.
4. A resolute struggle against American imperialism which inspired its agent reaction, and the liquidation of their economic positions in China.

All these tasks confronted Chinese democracy gradually and in the measure of the sharpening of the struggle against reaction, they were more and more dearly placed before the masses by the Communist Party.

The development of the policy of the Communist Party of China for the last 3–4 years shows how the Chinese Communists gradually, step by step, on the basis of the political experience of the masses themselves led by the Chinese people to an understanding of the necessity of overthrowing the Kuomintang regime, of liquidating the economic base of the feudal classes and of the struggle against American imperialism.

In this respect, the events in the period from August 1945, to August, 1947 were a particularly serious political school for the broad masses of the Chinese people. During these two years, the masses were convinced about the impossibility of a democratic reorganisation of the country and of liberation from imperialist oppression through agreement with reaction. Moreover it was precisely in this period that the anti-popular treacherous character of the dictatorship of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie, its complete conversion into a puppet of American imperialism was expressed particularly sharply. Having learnt from their own experience that the domination of American imperialism and internal reaction threatens China with being converted into an American colony and a big military springboard in Asia and being convinced at the same time through the example of the liberated regions about the correctness of the policy of the Communists, the broad popular masses all over China rallied still more closely around the Chinese Communist Party and unreservedly supported the political and economic tasks in the sphere of democratic changes in China advanced by it.

The rallying of the broad masses of the Chinese people for the carrying out of these tasks is the clearest example of the hegemony of the proletariat and the leading role of the Chinese Communist Party and the all-conquering power of the teachings of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin.

The fact of the increase in membership of the Communist Party from 1,210,000 in 1945 to 3 million in 1948 testifies to the tremendous growth in the influence of the ideas and authority of the Communist Party.

Thanks to its policy of struggle against American imperialism and internal reaction, directed towards the defence of the interests of the toilers, the Communist Party won tremendous authority not only in the liberated regions, but also among the broad masses of the working people all over China.

The leading role of the Communist Party was recognised not only by the working masses of China but also by the petty and even the middle bourgeoisie. “The aggression of American Imperialism, the oppression of Chiang Kai-shek and the correct policy of our Party, directed towards resolute defence of the interests of the masses of the people—all this has contributed to our Party acquiring the sympathy of the broad masses of the working class, the peasantry, the petty, and the middle bourgeoisie in the regions where Chiang Kai-shek governs.” (Mao Tse-tung: Speech of 25-12-1947 from the collection “Very Important Documents...” Harbin, 1948)

Their recognition of the leading role of the Communist Party is a result of the tremendous successes achieved by the people’s liberation movement under its leadership.

Mao Tse-tung, in his speech of December 25, 1947 said:

“Our new democratic revolutionary united front today has a broader base and is more consolidated than ever before. This is the result not only of our agrarian policy and policy in relation to the urban population. It is also the result to a great extent of the general political situation characterised by the victories of the People’s Liberation Army.... and by the new period of upsurge of the Chinese Revolution. The people now see that the downfall of the Kuomintang is inevitable and they are, therefore, placing all their hopes on the Chinese Communist Party and the People’s Liberation Army.” (Mao Tse-tung: Report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China—*For A Lasting Peace, For A People’s Democracy!* January 15, 1948).

The close rallying of the broad masses of the Chinese people into a united democratic front under the firm leadership of the Communist Party is an expression of the post-war alignment of class forces over the entire world which is characterised not only by polarisation but even by a further change in the co-relation of forces in favour of democracy.

The victories of the Soviet people achieved in the war against German Fascism and Japanese imperialism were of decisive significance in the change of co-relation of forces between the camp of democracy and of reaction. These victories not only increased immeasurably the international role of the USSR but also the changes of the victory of democratic forces in the countries enslaved by Fascism and in the whole world.

Contrary to the calculations of imperialist circles and in the first instance of the USA and Great Britain, who relied on weakening the USSR and all the democratic forces during the war period, the forces of the democratic camp headed by the USSR grew immeasurably. This was a direct consequence of the military, political and economic victories of the Soviet people, proving the tremendous superiority of the Socialist system and strongly discredited the capitalist system in the eyes of the working masses.

These circumstances as well as the general weakening of the camp of imperialism during the war period could not but assist to a tremendous extent in the consolidation of the democratic forces in China, their unification and their close rallying together.

This international factor, which was manifested in the weakening of the positions of imperialism in China and consequently also in a weakening of the position of the Kuomintang as an imperialist agent, played a very important role in changing the co-relation of forces between democracy and reaction at the end of the war. The defeat dealt by the Soviet troops to the Japanese occupation army on Chinese territory played a big role in this. The defeat by the Soviet Army of the Japanese war machine, the entry of Soviet troops into Manchuria and the liquidation of Japanese occupation power helped the Chinese working masses to set up their people's power and transform Manchuria into the main supporting base of the democratic movement.

The victorious offensive of the Soviet Army in August, 1945 on Manchuria also created the conditions for a passing over by the Chinese People's Liberation Army into the counter-offensive against the Japanese and for the liberation of considerable territory and a number of big centres in North and Central China.

Thus, the victories of the Soviet Army over German Fascism and Japanese imperialism were a decisive factor in changing the co-relation of forces in China, the most important pre-requisite for strengthening the camp of democracy and its preponderance over the camp of reaction. This fact has also been noted by the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung and Chu Teh. Mao Tse-tung in his article on "The Dictatorship of People's Democracy" points out:

"Had there been no Soviet Union, had there been no victory in the anti-Fascist Second World War, had Japanese imperialism not been defeated—which is particularly important for us (i.e. for China—G.A.) ... had none of these factors existed, then the pressure of the international reactionary forces would, of course, have been much stronger than it is today. Would we have been able to achieve victory in those circumstances?" asks Mao Tse-tung and replies categorically "of course, not." (Mao Tse-tung; *The Dictatorship of People's Democracy* from *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* July 15, 1949)

Chu Teh in his speech at the inauguration of the movement Friendship Society, said:

"Without the Soviet Union, without the victory of the anti-Fascist forces during the Second World War headed by the Soviet Union and without the unparalleled growth during the last four years of the international democratic camp of the world headed by the Soviet Union—the Chinese Revolution would not have won its present great and speedy victory and the consolidation of victory, even when won would be impossible." (General Chu Teh's speech at the Inauguration of Sino-Soviet Friendship Society: from *ISJ* (August 19, 1949)

A realisation of the advantages gained by the democratic camp in China as a result of the victory of the USSR in the war and the consolidation of the world camp of democracy required still considerable time for the creation of internal political conditions necessary for a complete defeat of reaction and for inflicting a defeat on American imperialism. This time was utilised not only for repulsing the attack of reaction but also for the consolidation of the democratic regime, accumulation of forces and then for the creation of a decisive turn in the civil war and the going over of the People's Liberation Army into a determined counter-offensive. In this respect a tremendous role was played by the correct policy of the Communist Party, which was directed towards helping the masses, to arrive through their own consciousness, to an understanding of the necessity of a decisive struggle against reaction and imperialism, and to an understanding of the need for basic changes in the political and economic sphere.

The victory of the USSR, the strengthening of the world democratic camp, the favourable post-war disposition of class forces in China and the correct Marxist-Leninist policy of the Communist Party led to the fact that the national-liberation movement of the Chinese people was strengthened, deepened and transformed into a genuine people's liberation movement into a united anti-Japanese national front, into a united democratic national front.

This signifies not only an increase in the might of the democratic camp and in its chances of victory in the struggle against reaction but also the transition of the democratic movement of the Chinese people to a higher stage, whose characteristic feature is the struggle for People's Democracy, for the creation of the pre-requisites for a transition to Socialism.

The clearest expression of the fact of the transition to a struggle for People's Democracy was to be found in the slogan of the Chinese Communist Party on the basic questions of the strategy and tactics of the struggle. In place of the slogan of struggle against imperialism and feudal remnants, a slogan which expressed the former disposition of class forces and the direction of the main blow, the Communist Party towards the end of 1947 put forward the slogan of struggle against imperialism, feudalism and big capital.

In conformity with the change in the main strategic line, there was a change in the formulation and in the content of the question of the character of power within the Coalition Government. While the programme of New Democracy permitted the possibility of a sharing of power with the Kuomintang, i.e. with the big bourgeoisie and even with the landlords and demanded merely the abolition of their dictatorship, the present programme, reflecting the new co-relation of class forces and rallying the broad popular masses around the Communist Party resolutely adopted the course of concentrating decisive power in the hands of the working class, supported by a close alliance with the toiling peasantry.

Hence, the line of excluding all reactionary parties, groups and elements from the composition of the Coalition Government.

A broad definition of the general line of the Chinese Communist Party at the present stage was given by Mao Tse-tung in his speech to the cadres of the Shensi-Suiyuan liberated area.

“What is the general line of the Communist Party? It is a line of the New Democratic Revolution of the great masses of the people, led by the working class against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capital.” (Mao Tse-tung: Address to Cadres of Shensi-Suiyuan Liberated Area)

This revolution must lead to the creation of a Chinese People's Democratic Republic and a democratic Coalition Government representing “the joint sovereign rule of all the democratic classes.” (Mao Tse-tung, *ibid.*)

In the New Year appeal of the Communist Party which contains the conditions for peace with Kuomintang the People's Democratic character of New China is defined still more clearly.

“The Chinese people under the leadership of the Communist Party, are demanding a genuine democratic peace that will ensure the end of the old regime and the birth of a new People's Democratic China, where the decisive power will be in the hands of the working class, firmly allied to the peasantry.” And further, “This means overthrowing the reactionary rule of the Kuomintang throughout the country and establishing a republic of the People's Democratic Dictatorship over the entire country under the leadership of the proletariat with an alliance of the workers and peasants as the main body. (*People's Age*, 23-1-1949)

In the economic sphere, the present programme of Chinese democracy instead of the former policy of lowering rents and interests on loans and the extremely general Sun Yat-sen slogan of “to every ploughman, his field”, has, posed the question of wide agrarian reform and even carried it out.

In, its resolution of 10<sup>th</sup> October, 1947, the Central Committee of the Communist Party put forward the slogan of a change in the agrarian system of China which was “the main obstacle in the democratisation, industrialisation, independence, unity and prosperity of our country.” (Decree of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China 10-10-1947 “Very Important Documents....”, Harbin, 1948)

The resolution demanded the implementation of the draft of the agrarian law adopted on September 13, 1947, by the National Agrarian Conference which was summoned at the initiative of the Communist Party. This law is of tremendous importance not only as a measure directed towards the solution of the agrarian question, but also as the first legislative Act of Chinese democracy undertaken on a nationwide scale. The law envisages the confiscation of the landed property of the landlords, temples, monasteries, schools, institutions and organisations and also the means of production from the landlords and their surplus from the kulaks.

The confiscated land is distributed among the landless peasants and peasants with little land in accordance with the quality of the land. Land is received on an equal basis by all the dwellers in the countryside, irrespective of sex and age and excluding the betrayers, the traitors to the country and the war-criminals. The landlords, the kulaks, their families and also the families of the officials of the Kuomintang apparatus, the officers and soldiers of the Kuomintang army who live in villages and are engaged in agriculture and are not guilty of any crimes, also receive land.

The means of production confiscated from the landlords and the kulaks are distributed among the needy peasants and other poor peasants. The land and the means of production received by the peasants are the private property of their new owners and can be sold and in some cases even leased on rent. The property and the legal operations of the industrialists and the traders are not subject to confiscation and are safeguarded by law.

The organs, which carry out the agrarian reform are the peasants’ and poor peasants’ meetings and committees and also the canton and district and other territorial conferences of the peasants and their committees.

The importance of this law lies not only in the confiscation of landlords’ land and the means of production, but also in the complete breakup of all land, relationships in the countryside, which will exclude a return to the old forms of land-ownership.

The agrarian reform which has been carried out on the territory of the liberated regions was of the greatest importance in the task of rallying the main section of the Chinese population—the peasantry—around the Communist Party.

As a result of this reform the land question was already solve or one hundred million peasants who received land and the means of production and raised their living standard and productivity of labour considerably, in Manchuria alone, six million landless peasant households or households with little land (*i.e.*, 24-30 million people) received 50 million *mu* (more than 3 million hectares) of land, 400,000 heads of cattle, agricultural implements and grain.

The landlords and kulaks completely lost their economic monopoly on the means of production and the possibility of exploiting the peasants on this territory and besides, also lost their political influence which consolidated very greatly the rear of the liberated regions.

The peasantry under the Kuomintang regime and the soldiers of the Kuomintang armies which for the most part comprised of landless poor peasants, saw in concrete example, the way out of want. The numerous facts of the mass surrender (as captives) and the crossing over of Kuomintang soldiers to the sides of the People's Liberation Army speak of how their example found a response in their hearts.

In his speech of 1st April, 1948, Mao Tse-tung dwelt specially on the most important question of the introduction of agrarian reform. Having pointed out that the task of the agrarian reform is the liquidation of the system of feudal and semi-feudal exploitation, the satisfaction of the demands for land on the part of the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers and the development of agricultural production, Mao Tse-tung emphasises that the agrarian reform can be implemented only in alliance with the middle peasantry. Without this, the poor peasants and the farm labourers will be isolated and the reform will suffer a failure. Hence, alongside satisfying the land hunger of the poor peasants and the farm labourers, the task of the reform is the satisfaction of the demands of the middle peasantry and the preservation by them of the allotments of land which exceed a little the average allotment of land.

After pointing out that the demand for an equal distribution of the land is not propaganda for complete equalisation, Mao Tse-tung exposes the policy of equalisation as wrong, reactionary and backward condemns its supporters. In conclusion, Mao Tse-tung put before the party and the democratic powers a number of concrete tasks for the improvement of agricultural production and the organisation of peasant cooperation on the basis of private property in land and also as regards the development of industry on the basis of a growth in agricultural production.

The agrarian reform is of enormous significance not only from the point of view of liquidating the political support of reaction and improving the position of the peasants. It has tremendous economic significance as a factor unleashing the productive forces of agriculture that have been fettered till now and creates one of the pre-requisites for the industrialisation of the country and its transition on to Socialist lines.

The development of agriculture and industry must create the condition for converting China into an industrialized country which, in the words of Mao Tse-tung, is the ultimate aim of a New Democratic Revolution. Besides agrarian reform and the development of agriculture on the path to collectivisation, the confiscation of bureaucratic capital is the most important of the economic changes which lay the economic basis of the system of People's Democracy.

The monopoly capital of the Four Families having carried out a centralisation of capital with quite a high standard of concentration of production in a number of branches (gained in the war years in Japanese enterprises in Manchuria and North China)—a centralisation that was unprecedented for China—created a certain minimum prerequisites for carrying out big economic changes in the interests of the toilers.

This signifies that after the confiscation of the property of monopoly capital, which has already been realised in Manchuria, in North and Central China and is now being realised in South China, the main and decisive role in the economy of China will be played by and is already being played by the socialised sector in the form of State industry, transport and banks. Its specific weight in the various branches comprises 50-100% and it will be precisely this sector which will determine the development of the economy of China in the future. This development will be directed on the path of the greatest increase in the State socialised sector. The programme of industrial construction set forth in the report of Jen Pi-

shi, which envisages as the primary task “the creation of all conditions for the rapid development of State enterprises, bearing a Socialist character”, can serve as an example of this.

The Communist Party of China is already now setting the people a still broader task—to lend a planned character to the development of the whole national economy and by increasing the productivity of labour gradually improve the living standards of the workers and of the people and strengthen in this way the alliance of the workers and peasants and ensure the role of the town in the leadership of the countryside and lay the economic foundations for the transition to Socialism. The gradual implanting of planned foundations in the economy of China is only possible on the basis of the decisive role of the State-socialised sector, which represents one of the forms of the emergence of Socialist foundations in the economy of New China.

The success of the struggle for People’s Democracy does not signify that all the questions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution have already been solved in China. The overthrow of the imperialist rule and the destruction of feudal survivals on an all-China basis remains as before the urgent and the most important task of the Chinese democratic movement.

## CHAPTER 9

### **The Military and Political Successes of People’s Democracy. The Creation of a People’s Republic of China.**

The rallying of the broad masses of the Chinese people under the leadership of the Communist Party on the basis of the programme of People’s Democracy put forth by it has led to the great military successes of the People’s Liberation movement in the struggle against reaction, for the political transformation of the country and to the creation of a People’s Republic and also to the considerable achievements in the sphere of economic construction in the liberated regions.

Having exhausted the forces of the Kuomintang army by its dogged defence in the first years of the war the People’s Liberation Army went over to a determined offensive in September 1947 and completely liberated the territory of Manchuria and having cleared the whole of Northern China of Kuomintang troops, inflicted the heaviest defeat on them in the Central plains, appeared on the Yangtse river, forced it and occupied the biggest political, and economic centres—Nanking, Wuhan, Nancheng, Shanghai, Changsha and is now waging battles in South China.

As pointed out by Mao Tse-tung in opening the People’s Political Consultative Conference of China on October 2, 1949, troops of the People’s Liberation Army numbering several million men, had reached the area in direct proximity to Formosa and the provinces of Kwangtung, Kwangsi, Szechwan, Kweichow and Sinkiang and had liberated the majority of the Chinese people.

In the beginning of October, 1949, the People’s Liberation Army waged battles on the approaches to Canton and on October 14, 1949 liberated this important centre of South China. Another unit of the People’s Liberation Army cleared the whole of the North-west of Kuomintang troops and liberated Diuha (Sinkiang).

The Kuomintang army, having lost in the battles for Changchun, Mukden, Tienstsin, Peiping, Suichow, Nanking, Wuhan and Shanghai a great number of soldiers and officers and a great part of their equipment, were almost incapable of resistance. The People’s Liberation Army which had even earlier under an unfavourable co-relation of forces inflicted defeat after defeat on the Kuomintang troops is now in a position to smash the remnants of the Kuomintang army in a short period.



Under the powerful blows of the People's Liberation Army, the reactionary camp is undergoing a process of internal collapse.

At present the outcome of the struggle is already pre-determined. It is pre-determined by the rallying of the Chinese people round the Communist Party and by its firm determination to attain the victory of democracy; it is pre-determined by the support to the Chinese people's liberation movement from the world democratic camp, of which it is a part and whose strength "is superior to that of the imperialist camp" (*Pravda*, Jan. 6, 1948)

It was this which gave the basis for Mao Tse-tung to declare firmly that

"it will not be long before all the reactionary Kuomintang forces are finally smashed by the Chinese people." (Mao Tse-tung: "Revolutionary Forces of the World Rally to Combat Imperialist Oppression"—from "*For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!*" November 1 1948)

The tremendous successes gained by the democratic forces in China in the political and military spheres—the unity of the Chinese people under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and the freeing of the greater part of the territory and population of China from the oppression of reaction, resulted in the creation for the first time in the history of China of conditions for national unification, the achievement of complete independence and for the creation of a genuinely People's Democratic structure.

All these tasks were accomplished by the People's Political Consultative Conference, which was summoned in conformity with the proposal of the Communist Party of May 1, 1948, after long negotiations and consultations with all the democratic parties, groups, people's organisations and progressive leaders.

The Conference opened on November 21, 1949 in Peiping. More than 600 people from 45 organisations representing all the democratic parties and groups of China, popular organisations, the People's Liberation Army, various districts and nationalities as well as Chinese citizens abroad took part in it.

The Conference proclaimed the formation of the People's Republic of China and elaborated and adopted three fundamental constitutional documents—The Organic law of the Central People's Government of China, the Statute and the Common Programme of the People's Political Consultative Council and also elected the National Committee of the People's Political Consultative Council and a Central People's Government Council.

The leader of the Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung, was elected as the Chairman of the Government Council and of the National Committee of the People's Political Consultative Council.

The Conference also adopted a decision that the capital of People's Republic was to be Peking (in Chinese—Peiping) and confirmed the Red Flag with five golden stars as the National Flag and adopted a provisional national anthem (March of the Volunteers) and the solar calendar (in place of the former lunar one).

The People's Government Council on October 1, 1949 published a People's declaration—signed by Mao Tse-tung—on the creation of a Central Government, on the adoption of a common programme of the People's Consultative Council as the political programme of the Government and on the creation of organs of Government and the nomination of:

CHOU EN-LAI: The Prime Minister of the State and Minister for Foreign Affairs.  
MAO TSE-TUNG: Chairman of the National People's Revolutionary War Council.  
CHU-THE: Commander-in-Chief of the People's Liberation Army.  
SHEN CHUN-JU: Chief Justice of the People's Supreme Court.  
LO JUAN-HYAN: Procurator-General of General People's Procuracy.

At the same time, the Government announced in its declaration that it was the only lawful Government, representing the entire People's Republic of China and pointed out that it was prepared to establish diplomatic relations with any foreign Government which would observe the principles of equality, mutual advantage and mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, break off relationship with Kuomintang reaction and take up a friendly position towards the Republic.

The proclamation of the People's Republic of China was the victorious culmination of the long and dogged struggle waged by the democratic forces of China against the united forces of internal reaction and international imperialism which always acted in conjunction with each other. It crowned the 28 years' heroic struggle of the Communist Party of China, which from its very foundation was the inspirer and organiser of the national liberation struggle of the Chinese people. It was at the same time a clear demonstration of the all-conquering forces of Marxist-Leninist teachings and a new and very powerful blow to imperialism and a new defeat for the camp of world reaction and the instigators of war.

It is not surprising that the birth of the new People's Republic evoked tremendous enthusiasm and happiness not only among the free Chinese people but also in the entire camp of peace and democracy and among its friends over the entire world.

The Soviet Union which has invariably followed the struggle of the Chinese people with warm sympathy was the first to respond to the formation of the People's Republic of China and in greeting it, rendered the new Republic tremendous moral support by establishing diplomatic relations with it, which was declared in the Note of the Soviet Government of October 2, 1949.

After the Soviet Union, in the course of 3-4 days, the People's Republic of China was recognised by Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Korea and the Mongolian People's Republic.

The people of all these New Democratic Republics greeted warmly the creation of a People's Republic of China, as a fact of the enormous strengthening of the international camp of democracy and peace, headed by the Soviet Union.

After the incorporation of the 475 million Chinese people in it, the camp of democracy and peace within the limits of the State boundaries of the USSR and the People's Democracies alone unites one-third of the population and nearly one-fourth of the territory of the entire globe (excluding the vast number of the supporters of the democratic camp in the capitalist countries and many hundreds of millions of the population of the colonial and dependent countries, oppressed by imperialism who are also close to the camp of peace and democracy).

The expression of the united sovereign will of the Chinese people, which was manifested in the fact of the proclamation of the People's Republic inflicted a very powerful blow to the machinations of international reaction and led to a further disintegration of its camp.

The Chinese people as a result of their heroic struggle, under the leadership of the Communist Party have already achieved independence and freedom, howsoever much the worst enemies of progressive mankind—the American imperialists—and their proteges—burnt with malice and attempted

to hinder it. The People's Republic of China, with the support of the democratic forces of the whole world, headed by the USSR occupies a worthy place in the family of nations.

“The Chinese nation”, as Mao Tse-tung pointed out, “will henceforth join the big family of peace and freedom-loving nations of the world.” (*Pravda* of the 23-9-1949)

## CHAPTER 10

### **The Distinctive Features of the System of Chinese People's Democracy.**

As in the countries of Eastern Europe, the system of People's Democracy developing in China is laying basis “for a transition to a Socialist path of development.” (*Pravda*, 22-10-1947)

Comrade Zhdanov in characterising the distinctive features of the People's Democratic system, pointed out:

“The new democratic governments..... backed by the mass of the people, were able within a minimum period to carry through such progressive democratic reforms as bourgeois democracy is no longer capable of effecting. Agrarian reforms turned over the land to the peasants and led to the elimination of the landlord class..... Together with this, the foundation was laid of government, national ownership and a new type of State was created—the People's Republic, where the power belongs to the people, where large-scale industry, transport and the banks are owned by the State and where a bloc of the labouring classes of the population headed by working class, constitute the leading force.” (A Zhdanov: “*The International Situation*”—Report at the Informative Conference of Representatives of a number of Communist Parties: from *For a Lasting Peace, For a People's Democracy!* November 10, 1947)

In his report to the Fifth Congress of the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists) on 19<sup>th</sup> December, 1948, Comrade Dimitrov, in taking into account the experience of the development of People's Democracy in Eastern Europe noted that the transition from capitalism to Socialism through the system of People's Democracy is being realised in the process of—

- (1) A struggle against all attempts and tendencies on the part of the exploiting classes aimed at re-establishing the capitalist order and bourgeois rule;
- (2) Ceaseless class struggle against the capitalist elements for their complete liquidation;
- (3) Cooperation and friendship with the USSR;
- (4) Active participation in the struggle of the united anti-imperialist camp against the attempts of the imperialist camp, headed by USA, to unleash a new world war and impede the building of Socialism and Communism.

Hence, it follows that the system of People's Democracy is not something unchanging, and given once for all. It is developing both economically and politically on the basis of a struggle between the contradictions, which already lie in it in the form of the various classes and economic systems. But owing to the fact that the system of People's Democracy fulfils the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, this development is directed towards the strengthening of Socialist elements and is taking place not at once but gradually and under conditions of a fierce class struggle. The history of the development of the countries of People's Democracy in Central and Eastern Europe provides a graphic example of this.

The experience of the People's Democracies in Europe and also the foregoing analysis of the economic and political situation in China provide a key to both an understanding of the distinctive

features of People's Democracy in China at the present stage as well as the path of its further development.

The political, economic changes carried out over the territory of the liberated regions show that the main and fundamental features of People's Democracy have already been realised over the territories of the liberated areas of China. It is above all the power of the people, the power of the toilers, with the guarantee of the leading role of the working class and its Party.

Till the convocation of a People's Political Consultative Conference and the formation of the People's Republic of China, the highest organs of power in the territories of the liberated areas were the National and Political Councils, elected by the entire population on the basis of general, direct and equal election rights and secret ballot.

The People's Political Councils possessed legislative and administrative rights within the bounds of their territory, appointed and controlled the executive organs of power in the form of the administrative committees of the liberated regions, the district heads, the village elders and the urban municipalities. The confidence of the people, the tremendous authority among the masses guaranteed to the Chinese Communist Party a leading role both in the People's Political Councils as well as the executive organs of power through which the Communist Party carried into practice its programme of People's Democracy.

In the liberated areas, a radical agrarian reform was accomplished by depriving not only the landlords but even the kulaks of land and the means of production and by transferring them into the hands of the working peasantry (its economic and political results have been described above).

In the measure of the liberation of the industrial regions by the People's Liberation Armies the transfer of big industry, banks and transport, which were in the hands of foreign imperialism and monopoly capital of the "Four Families" to the State and their conversion into public property was achieved.

In defining the main economic distinctive features of the system of People's Democracy in China, Mao Tse-tung points out:

"The economy of new China comprises of (1) State economy which is the leading element; (2) Agriculture, which is developing gradually from the individual to the collective path; (3) the economy of independent, small artisans and traders and the economy of petty and medium private capital. All these comprise national economy as a whole in the New Democratic system." (Mao Tse-tung: Speech on Dec. 25, from *Very Important Documents*.... Harbin, 1948).

Thus, as a system laying the basis for a transition to the path of Socialist development, the system of People's Democracy in China is in principle no different from the States of People's Democracy in the West.

This is manifest with special clarity from the political documents adopted by the People's Political Consultative Conference and in particular from the Common Programme of the People's Political Consultative Council, which contains the main principles underlying the People's Republic of China. There were no doubts whatsoever among those who participated in the Conference and represented the will of the peoples of the whole of China that People's Democracy represents a transitional form of development of China along the path of Socialism (Chou En-lai's speech of September 22, 1949: *Pravda*). This is reflected in all the chapters of the Common Programme without any exception.

The introduction of the Programme in defining the essence of the dictatorship of People's Democracy as a form of State power of the People's Democratic United Front, points out that People's Democracy will be the political foundation for national construction of the People's Republic of China.

Chapter I, *General Principles*, defines the People's Republic of China as a People's Democratic State. It realises the People's Democratic dictatorship headed by the working class and based on an alliance of the workers and peasants and unites all democratic classes, all China's national minorities and wages a struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capital.

The Programme sets forth as the main tasks of the People's Republic of China—the abolition of all the prerogatives of imperialism in China, the confiscation of bureaucratic capital for ownership by the People's State, the carrying out of agrarian reform, the safe-guarding of the public property of the State and the property of cooperatives, the development of national economy and transforming the country from an agricultural to an industrial country,

While guaranteeing election and other political rights to the people and declaring equal rights in all spheres for women as well as the equality of rights and duties for all the nationalities of China, the programme especially envisages the suppression of counter-revolutionary activities and depriving the reactionary elements, feudal landlords, representatives of bureaucratic capital and of the capitalists in general, of political rights.

The generally declared principles of the programme also include the solemn declaration that the People's Republic of China unites with all the peace-loving and freedom-loving countries and first of all with the Soviet Union for a struggle against imperialist aggression and for peace.

Chapter II: *Organs of State Power*, points out that State power belongs to the people and is exercised by the people through People's Congresses elected by universal suffrage and the organs of People's power elected by the latter at all levels. The All-China People's Congress is the supreme legislative organ of State power, and the executive—the Central People's Government, elected by the All-China People's Congress.

Pending the convocation of the All-China People's Congress, its functions are carried out by the People's Political Consultative Council which, after the convocation of the People's Congress will continue to remain as a consultative organ, representing the People's Democratic front.

The Programme envisages that in all the newly liberated areas, initially State power is to be exercised through the military authorities of the People's Liberation Army, through military control committees and then gradually passed on to the local conferences of the representatives of all circles. Elections in local Peoples Congresses are conducted in these areas only after the carrying out of agrarian reform and after the organisation of the population *i.e.*, after the liquidation of the economic dependence of the population in the landlords and other reactionary elements. The basis for the building of all organs of power is the principle of democratic centralism.

The Programme points out that all Kuomintang laws, oppressing the people will be abolished and laws, protecting the interests of the people will be enacted. A people's judicial system and supervisory organs will be created, where the people can approach any State institution with grievances.

In Chapters I and II, the political distinctive features, of People's Democracy, as a genuine people's power, a power of the working people operating in the interests of the people and ensuring the complete safeguarding of social interests, find full expression.

Chapter III, *Military System* envisages, the creation of unified armed forces, uniting the People's Liberation Army and the People's Public Security Forces, a system of political education of officers and fighters in revolutionary and patriotic spirit, the modernisation of the army, the creation of an Air Force and a navy, the introduction of a system of People's Militia and also preparation for the enforcement of obligatory military service. It also envisages the drawing in of the armed forces during peace time in the work of agriculture and industry.

Chapter IV, *Economic Policy*, reflects the special economic features of the system of People's Democracy and the fact that it comprises of more than one system. It enumerates five sectors of economy—State, cooperative, private peasant, private capitalist-artisan and the sector of State capitalism. In enumerating their special features, the programme points out that the leading role belongs to the sector of State economy, which bears a Socialist character and unites all the enterprises which are of important significance for the country's economy. They constitute public property and are the material basis and the leading force in the entire social economy. It is through the medium of the sector of the State-economy that the State will be able to carry out the leadership of the remaining sectors.

The programme envisages encouragement to the development of natural sciences and scientific-historic outlook to the study and interpretation of social sciences, the utilisation of literature and art in the interests of the people, the introduction of universal education, the development of technical education and the revolutionary and political education of the young and old-style intellectuals. Freedom of reporting true news is safeguarded and the utilisation of the Press to undermine the interests of the people is prohibited.

Chapter VI: *Policy Towards Nationalities* envisages the equality of all the nationalities and the establishment of regional autonomy in the regions where national minorities are congregated.

Chapter VII: *Foreign Policy*, points out that the principle of the foreign policy of the People's Republic of China is not only the safeguarding of the independence and sovereignty of the country, but also support of universal peace and the struggle against imperialist policy of aggression and war.

The foregoing principles of the programme show that in all its sections, beginning with the political and economic one and ending with the ideological one, it proceeds above all from the task of ensuring the predominance of public elements in all branches, from the task of creating a firm basis for the development of China along the path of public economy.

In this sense, the Common Programme of the PPCC undoubtedly characterises People's Democracy of China as a system laying the basis for a transition to Socialism.

In China, the People's Democratic system is being created in fierce armed struggle against the combined forces of domestic reaction and foreign imperialism, which still retain control over a part of the country. In a backward semi-colonial country, with the numerous survivals of feudalism in the economic, political and ideological superstructures, this cannot but give rise to a certain peculiarity and certain special features in the process of its development.

The most important task of People's Democracy in China in these conditions is the rapid development of productive forces and in particular industry which will liquidate economic backwardness and create the conditions for a going over from small scattered producers to large mechanised production, and prepare the economic pre-requisites for a transition to Socialism.

People's Democracy in China cannot but reckon with the necessity of allowing a certain period and within certain bounds not only the existence but even the development of capitalist elements both in

the town and in the countryside, with the compulsory condition of ensuring the regulating role of the People's Democratic State.

On the basis of this, the Communist Party also defines its tactical line in relation to the middle and petty bourgeoisie:

“The petty-bourgeoisie and the middle bourgeoisie, who suffer from oppression and persecution by the bureaucratic bourgeoisie and the landlord class and their State power, in spite of the fact that they themselves are also bourgeois classes can either take part in the new democratic revolution or otherwise observe neutrality. They are either not connected or are little connected with imperialism.” (Mao Tse-tung: Speech on December 25, 1947, c.f. *Very Important Documents*, Harbin, 1948)

With respect to this, the Communist Party forewarned against a repetition of the “ultra-left” mistaken policy in relation to the middle and petty bourgeoisie which was pursued in 1931-34. In the conditions of such a backward, semi-colonial and semi-feudal country as China.

“apart from the abolition of the special privileges of imperialism in China, the task of the new democratic revolution is the abolition of the exploitation and oppression of the class of landlords and bureaucratic bourgeoisie (big bourgeoisie), a change in the compradore, feudal productive relationships and the freeing of all the fettered productive forces.” (Mao Tse-tung, *ibid.*)

“In view of the backwardness of Chinese economy, capitalist economy represented by the broad masses of the petty and the middle bourgeoisie will still continue to exist for a long time even after the victory of the revolution over the entire country and we must tolerate it,” says Mao Tse-tung in his speech of 25th December, 1947.

Under the conditions of the predominance of State public ownership in the main branches of economy and the gradual going over of agriculture from small scattered production on to the path of cooperative development,

“the existence and development of such small and middle capitalist elements does not represent any danger. The same can be said in respect of the new kulak economy, which inevitably appears in the countryside after the agrarian revolution.” (Mao Tse-tung, *ibid.*)

The necessity of retaining for a certain period capitalist elements in the economy of People's Democratic China is also emphasised by Mao Tse-tung in a recent article—*The Dictatorship of People's Democracy* in which he points out:

“At the present stage the national bourgeoisie is very important. Imperialism is still with us and it is a cruel enemy. China will still need a great deal of time to attain real economic independence.... In order to offset the pressure of the imperialists and advance the backward economy one step forward, China must make use of every urban and rural capitalist enterprise which can benefit the national economy and is not detrimental to the people's standard of living. China must unite with the national bourgeoisie in the common struggle. Our present policy is to restrict capitalism but not to destroy it” But Mao Tse-tung further points out that the bourgeoisie “cannot occupy a leading position in the State” (Mao Tse-tung: *The Dictatorship of People's Democracy*—from *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!* July 15, 1949)

At present in the process of the creation of the People's Democratic system in China, the national bourgeoisie in the person of the representatives of the bourgeois liberal parties, groups and individual persons as one of the members of the National United Democratic Front is taking part in the People's Political Consultative Conference and in the National Committee and Central Government of the People's Republic of China, elected by it.

This also found its reflection in the Common Programme of the People's Political Consultative Council which envisages the preservation of the economic interests of the national bourgeoisie, encouragement to the activities of private enterprises, beneficial to the people and the participation of private capital in the sector of State capitalism.

The possibility of the participation of capitalist elements in the development of the economy of any country in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism when private capitalist enterprises are still one of the component parts of economy, has been proved in the example of Soviet Russia in the NEP period. The concentration of political power, commanding economic positions in the hands of the People's State and the growth of Socialist elements and their struggle against the capitalist elements is a guarantee against the restoration of the capitalist order.

Comrade Stalin in his speech *The Programme of the Comintern* on July 5, 1928, defines NEP as a policy of proletarian dictatorship directed towards

“the overcoming of capitalist elements and the building of a Socialist economy by way of the utilisation of the market, through the market and not by way of direct exchange of products, without the market and apart from the market.”

To the question whether capitalist countries and even the most developed among them can dispense with NEP in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism, Comrade Stalin replies that they cannot.

“To one or another extent, the new economic policy with its market connections and the utilisation of these market connections is absolutely necessary for every capitalist country in the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat” J. V. Stalin: *Collected Works*, Russ. Ed. Vol. XI, pp. 144-45).

It is necessary to a still greater extent for China—an economically backward semi-feudal and semi-colonial country where the system of People's Democracy is being created in the process of a continuous fierce struggle against feudal survivals and imperialist oppression and where the individual strata of the bourgeoisie (national bourgeoisie) can still march together with the people on the side of democracy.

This special feature has been conditioned by the fact that the building of People's Democracy in China is at the same time the period of the completion of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. Although this distinguishes People's Democracy in China from the People's Democratic system in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, still their basic aims and tasks coincide.

The emergence of a People's Democratic system in a number of countries that have dropped out of the capitalist system is the most important manifestation of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism. The system of Peoples Democracy creates the conditions for the gradual transition to Socialism also for the colonial and dependent countries on the condition of their support to the camp of democracy and Socialism headed by the Soviet Union. People's Democracy of China is in this respect an



inspiring example for all the colonial peoples and a tremendous stimulus for the development of their people's liberation movements.

## CHAPTER 11

### **The Revolutionising Influence of China on Other Oppressed Peoples of S.E. Asia.**

The people's liberation movement of the Chinese people through its successes in the struggle against internal reaction and imperialism, its achievements in the sphere of democratic changes, economic and cultural construction is exercising tremendous revolutionising influence on all the oppressed peoples of South East Asia. It inspires them to carry on a resolute struggle against imperialism for the achievement of freedom independence and democratic rights.

The peoples of Indo-China, Burma, Malaya and even Philippines, Indonesia and India, which are remote from China see in the success of the Chinese people a vivid example of the fact that the forces of imperialism and domestic reaction can be smashed provided there is a close unification of the broad masses of the people and a firm determination to fight to the end. Besides this the Chinese people's liberation movement, which in the conditions of a semi-colonial country, creatively applied the teachings of Lenin and Stalin on the strategy and tactics in the national and colonial revolution, the directives of Comrade Stalin on the problems of the Chinese Revolution, and which has profited from the tremendous experience of the CPSU (B) and on the basis of this achieved its present successes is itself a vast treasury of revolutionary experience, which helps all the oppressed peoples of the East in their struggle against imperialism to choose the correct path, to avoid many mistakes and to achieve their aims with less losses and in a shorter time.

The experience of the people's liberation movement in China shows the oppressed peoples of the East and in particular, the peoples of South-East Asia that—

1. The People's Liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, which is undermining the forces of the international imperialist camp, is an integral part of the general struggle of the democratic camp headed by the great Socialist power and can be crowned with victory only in close unity with it.

2. The tasks of the struggle against imperialism and for democracy are not different from one another. It is only in the struggle against imperialist rule that the masses of people can reach a solution of the most urgent needs—obtain democratic rights and land. In its turn, the defeat of imperialism is possible only on the basis of a unification of the broad masses, the creation of a broad united front, for which a satisfaction of the urgent demands of the masses is necessary. Without this, their mobilisation to wage a struggle against imperialism, and awakening them to activity in all the spheres of social life is impossible.

3. The national bourgeoisie, under present conditions, is already not in a position to fulfil the role not only of leader but even of a main partner in the national-liberation movement. Its leadership of the mass movement leads inevitably to capitulation and agreement with imperialism at the expense of the masses of people and to its suppressing the popular movement, jointly with imperialism. It is only the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party—which can ensure leadership of the anti-imperialist movement in the interest of the broad masses of people and guarantee its success.

4. The realisation of the aspirations of the people can be attained only through the path of a People's Democratic movement, through a transfer of power to the working people and land to the peasants and the main branches of economy seized by imperialism to the People's Democratic State, headed by the proletariat.

While helping to determine the internal political conditions necessary for ensuring the success of the people's liberation movement, the experience of China is also of tremendous value for an exposure of the aggressive expansionist designs and the hypocritical false tactics of American imperialism. In the example of China, they appeared sharply and in relief since American imperialism was compelled here to act openly and so to speak alone it was not able to conceal itself behind the openly predatory and crude actions of other imperialist countries (for example, the Dutch in Indonesia) and to counterpose against them its own more subtle policy of compromise with the bourgeois and landlord elements of the national liberation movement. The oppressed peoples of South-East Asia can easily discern in the example of American policy in China the falsity of every kind of "peaceful" and "democratic" manoeuvre of American imperialism, which pursues the interests of reaction. They have always been directed either towards playing for time in order to consolidate the interests of reaction or for the masking of a reactionary regime with the help of all possible kinds of pseudo-democratic forms and institutions of formal bourgeois democracy, without any change in its reactionary essence.

The close links between American imperialism and domestic reaction in any country which serves as its obedient instrument is manifested particularly clearly in the example of China. Through the example of American political and economic activity in China, the people can be convinced of the fact that American expansion is directed towards the conversion of all countries into agrarian and raw material appendages of the USA, the strengthening of their colonial position, the predatory exploitation of their resources, the destruction of the existing production apparatus and productive forces and towards such a deterioration of the living standards of the working people as they had as yet not experienced under former colonial regimes.

And what is specially important is the fact that in the example of China, the oppressed people see that American imperialism as well as the whole imperialist camp is not invincible, that even the nations that are weak in their economic development can be victorious over imperialism if they rally together, unite and fight, basing themselves on the support of the entire democratic camp.

The Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Tse-tung, pointed out the path to be taken by the peoples of the East in order to overthrow imperialist yoke.

"All the anti-imperialist forces of the East must unite against imperialism and the reactionaries in their countries, and make it the aim of their struggle to liberate the people of the oppressed East, who number more than a billion. We must take our destiny into our own hands. We must purge our ranks of all backward and vacillating elements. All viewpoints that overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate the strength of the people are wrong. Together with the democratic forces of the whole world, we must exert every effort and then we shall unquestionably be victorious over the imperialist plans of enslavement, shall prevent a third world war and thus get rid of the yoke of the reactionaries and secure the triumph of lasting peace for mankind." (Mao Tse-tung: Report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China—from *For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!*, January 15, 1948)

The growth of the anti-imperialist struggle in the countries of South-East Asia testifies to the great influence of the Chinese people's liberation movement on the oppressed peoples.

The fear of the imperialists in face of the successes of Chinese democracy is manifest not only in the enormous military aid of American imperialism to Kuomintang reaction, but also in the attempts to isolate democratic China and to obstruct the dissemination of ideas of emancipation.

The interests of American imperialism coincide in this respect with the interests of British imperialism which fears for its positions in Malaya, Burma, India; with the interests of Dutch imperialism

in Indonesia; French imperialism in Indo-China; with Kuomintang reaction which is relying on American help to retain its domination even though only in Formosa and with Japanese militarism and the reactionary elements of the South-East Asian countries.

On this basis, American imperialism is also attempting to supplement the North Atlantic Pact by forming a reactionary military alliance of Japan and the countries of South-East Asia in the form of the Pacific Pact which like the Western-European Union of its vassals, is directed against the USSR, Chinese Democracy and the people's liberation movement of the countries of South-East Asia.

Apart from this, American imperialism, by seizing in its own hands the control of Japan, South Korea and a number of islands stretching south along the coast of China and creating here its military bases is also attempting to accomplish a naval cordon against democratic China by preventing it from establishing ties with other oppressed countries and island possessions of the imperialist powers.

\* \* \*

The historic victory of the Chinese people is one of the concrete manifestations of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism and in particular, the sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system;

“World War II aggravated the crisis of the colonial system, as expressed in the rise of a powerful movement for national liberation in the colonies and dependencies. This has placed the real of the capitalist system in jeopardy.”

—A. Zhdanov—“The International Situation” Report at the Informative Conference of Representatives of a number of Communist and Workers' Parties: *From For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy!*, November 10, 1947)

China, with its population of 475 million which was subjected to the most diverse forms of semi-colonial exploitation by several of the biggest imperialist powers, represented a vast part of the imperialist rear. After the Second World War, the USA had hatched plans to exploit the Chinese market by attempting to solve at the expense of China its own sharpening internal and external contradictions and to utilise the Chinese people as cannon fodder for the realisation of the expansionist plans and plans of preparing for a third world war, cherished by the American instigators of war.

The victories of the Chinese people have destroyed these plans of American imperialism root and branch and, moreover, have demonstrated before our very eyes, the groundlessness and adventurism of the insane pretensions of the American monopolies to world domination.

Liberated China has become an indissoluble and integral part of the invincible camp of Peace, Socialism and Democracy.

## KOREA AFTER THE SECOND WORLD WAR

Korea is a country where the force of the character of the post-war crisis of the colonial system of imperialism reveals itself with a special fullness. Korea is the first colony which has been liberated from imperialist oppression as a result of the Second World War. The question of the paths of its development, of its further destinies has become the subject of a sharp and obdurate struggle between the forces of democracy and the forces of aggression.

“The Korean Question” is an illustration of two policies, of two approaches to a solution of the fate of the colonial countries, of two diametrically opposite lines. On the one hand, it demonstrates the policy of the Soviet Union, which is consistent, based upon respect for the sovereign rights of peoples and directed towards the complete liberation of colonies, and their democratic development; on the other hand, the predatory, aggressive policy of American imperialism, which has as its aim the enslavement of peoples and their conversion into colonial slaves of the Dollar.

The territory of Korea has not merely become the meeting-point of mutually opposing political tendencies in the solution of the colonial problem. Here they have found their practical verification and testing in life. Two parts of the Korean People’s Democratic Republic—the North, where thanks to the support of the Soviet State and its army, the Korean people headed by the working class, have carried out great historical changes and laid the firm foundation of People’s Democracy and the South which is groaning under the yoke of the American colonizers—are a graphic expression of these two policies. They demonstrate before the eyes of the peoples of the colonies, what mighty support is rendered them by the peace-loving policy of the Soviet State and what the imperialist line pursued by the U.S.A. brings to them.

Korea is a graphic example of the bankruptcy of imperialist colonial policy, and index of the fact that

“under present conditions, imperialist countries like the U.S.A., Great Britain and the states closely associated with them become dangerous enemies of national independence and the self-determination of nations, while the Soviet Union and the new democracies are reliable bulwark gist encroachments on the equality and self-determination of nations.” (A. A. Zhdanov, *The International Situation*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1947, p. 31)

Korea is a clear example illustrating the crisis of the colonial system. The formation of the Korean people’s Democratic Republic, the successful development of People’s Democracy in the North of the country as well as the powerful rise of the national-liberation democratic movement in the South point to the formation of a new breach in the colonial system of imperialism.

### I THE FIRST PERIOD AFTER THE LIBERATIO OF KOREA (August-December, 1945)

Soviet troops having defeated the best forces of the Japanese—the Kwantung Army—in August 1945, liberated the Korean people from colonial oppression that had lasted for many years.

According to an agreement between the USSR and the U.S.A., Korea was temporarily divided into two zones—to the North of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel, the Zone under the supervision of the Soviet Army and

to the South, the Zone under the supervision of American troops.<sup>3</sup> This division was to be a temporary one. The question of the future destinies of the liberated colonies was under special consideration.

Immediately after liberation there began a mighty upsurge of social activity in North and South of Korea. The perspective of the creation of an independent democratic state evoked an unprecedented growth in the political activity and creative energy of the Korean people. Different parties and public organisations began to be formed spontaneously. Everywhere there were demonstrations and meetings of many thousands in which was clearly expressed the love and gratitude of the mass of people of Korea to their true friend and mighty liberator, the Soviet Union.

Under the pressure of the people, the Japanese authorities, who remained in the country till the entry of the Soviet and American troops were compelled to release the political prisoners. Emerging from deep underground and the Japanese torture chambers, the Korea Communists under the leadership of the tried professional revolutionary, Pak Hen En<sup>4</sup> set about reorganising the Communist Party.<sup>5</sup>

On 20<sup>th</sup> August, 1945, a preparatory committee was organised for this purpose and a programme of action was worked out. The Communist Party became the fighting centre of all the democratic progressive forces inside the country.

In the very first days after the capitulation of Japan, a Preparatory Committee was created in Seoul for the organization of state power in Korea. Simultaneously, People's Committees began to be

---

<sup>3</sup> North Korea covers nearly 57% of the entire area and two-fifths of the population of Korea. It constitutes the industrial area of the country, and is rich in useful minerals. According to the figures of 1939, there was concentrated in North Korea: 99.9 per cent of the iron ore mines, 99.5 per cent of anthracite, 97.7 per cent of brown coal, 78.5 per cent of wolfram and molybdenum, 71 per cent of graphite, 72.5 per cent of gold and silver and the entire production of cast iron.

The Japanese created a wide network of hydro-electric stations in North Korea. According to the 1937 figures, North Korea provided 92.7 per cent of the entire production of metallurgical industry and 85.7 per cent of the entire chemical production of the country. During the Second World War, upto 40,000 workers worked in the largest chemical combine in Hinnam. Besides this, two big metallurgical factories were situated in North Korea, a factory of special steel and factories of ferrous metal, etc.

South Korea constitutes in the main an agricultural region. The agricultural production of South Korea according to the average figures for 1936-37 comprise in percentage relations: 69.2 per cent of the whole production of rice, 85.7 per cent of barley, 77.3 per cent of cotton.

Industry in South Korea is predominantly textile mills, which in 1937 gave 76.8 per cent of the entire textile production of the country, foodstuff enterprises, which produced 60.7 per cent of the production and metal refining plants which gave 92.7 per cent of the metal refining production of the country. "CHOSAN KENDJE NENPO" (Yearbook of Korean Economy) Seoul, 1948, p. 322.

<sup>4</sup> PAK HEN EN was born in 1900 in a family of a peasant tenant in the Province of Chunch on Namdo. From 1919 he commenced active revolutionary activities. In 1925, Pak Hen En organized a Union of Korean Communist Youth. He was arrested in that very same year and sentenced to 2 years of hard labour. Although he has been in prison for 10 years. After the liberation of Korea, he took the lead in the reorganization of the Communist Party and was elected its General Secretary. After the unification of the Communist Party and the People's and New People's parties into the Labour Party of South Korea, Pak Hen En was elected Vice-President of the Cabinet of Ministers and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Korean People's Democratic Republic.

<sup>5</sup> The Communist Party of Korea was formed in 1925 out of the scattered Communist groups. In 1928, the decision of disbanding it was adopted. It was proposed to the Korean Communists that they conduct work for rallying the masses and primarily for organising the workers, so that later on, a communist Party could be created whose basis would be the workers. Right up to the moment of the liberation of Korea, the Communists carried on work amongst the masses from deep underground. In Seoul, Taegu, Khamken, Communist groups were organised. In 1934, a group of Communists, with initiative, published the Programme of Action of the Communist Party of Korea, which served as a basis for rallying the Communist forces in the country. However, the re-formation of the Communist Party was possible only after the liberation of the country from the Japanese.

formed in the North and in the South, in the towns and villages at the initiative of the people. In some places, they were called preparatory committees for the organization of state power, in other places, political people's committees, but their essence remained the same—they were organs of the Korean people's power.

On 6<sup>th</sup> September, the First Congress of People's Representatives took place in Seoul. It was attended by more than 1,000 delegates. The Congress elected a Central People's Committee of the Korean Republic, where the representatives of different parties and views participated.

The declaration adopted by the Central People's Committee reads:

“We are fully determined to:

- (1) Build a self-sufficient State, independent both in political as well as economic respects;
- (2) Liquidate the remnants of Japanese imperialism and the feudal survivals in our country and to devote ourselves to the principle and ideas of real democratism on the basis of which the political, economic and social needs of our nation must be satisfied;
- (3) Ensure the most rapid improvement of the living standard of workers, peasants and all toilers;
- (4) Being one of the democratic countries of the world, strengthen the cause of peace, jointly with other democratic countries.”

The Central People's Committee noted as its practical tasks:

- (a) To revoke immediately all laws and decrees issued by the Japanese colonisers.
- (b) Nationalisation of the land belonging to the Japanese and the traitors to the Korean people and its transfer, free of charge to the peasants.
- (c) Nationalisation of all mills, factories, mines, railways, sea transport, banks and all forms of communications, belonging to the Japanese.
- (d) To bring all industrial and commercial enterprises under State control.
- (e) To establish the eight-hour day; and for those below eighteen, 6 hours; employment of children upto 14 years to be prohibited.
- (f) To grant political freedom: the freedom of expression, of press, of assembly, of union, of demonstration and of religion to the Korean people.
- (g) To grant voting rights to all citizens who have reached the age of 18, irrespective of sex and other restrictions, with the exception of national traitors; to grant women equal rights with men.
- (h) To introduce compulsory primary education.<sup>6</sup>

Besides this, measures were envisaged for the regulation of prices, the restoration of industry, the abolition of forcible rice supplies and the abolition of unemployment. This democratic programme of action of the Central People's Committee was popularised by the local committees among the broad masses and accepted by them with great satisfaction. However, its realisation was only possible in the North of the country. The Soviet Army, which entered Korea as an army of liberation, supported the initiative of the mass of people in its Zone, recognized the People's Committees as the lawful organs of power, and created favourable conditions for their activities.

The people's power of North Korea, with the support and help of the Soviet troops, immediately set about the determined eradication of the remnants of Japanese domination inside the country and a demolition to the roots of the Japanese colonial apparatus. The Japanese colonizers and their Korean

---

<sup>6</sup> “CHOSON HEBAN ILNENSA” (A Year After Korea's Liberation, Year Book for 1946, published by DNF Seoul, 1946, p. 87-89)

accomplices were from the very start deprived of the possibility of influencing the internal life of the country.

All the large-scale industry, mine pits, railroads, means of communication, banks were first taken under the control of the Soviet administration, which preserved the national wealth of the country and later transferred it to the Korean People's authority. Workers' Committees were created in the enterprises, mines and pits. The Japanese were removed from work not only in the administrative apparatus but also in industry or they were utilized under the control of the Worker's Committees. Schools, hospitals, houses, property and the landed estates of the Japanese were handed over to be managed by the People's Committees.

The very fact of the presence of Soviet troops, the support rendered to them by the patriotic progressive forces of the country, contributed towards a rapid consolidation of the democratic camp of North Korea and to the weakening of the forces of reaction.

In October, 1945, the Org. Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of North Korea, headed by the famous national hero and greatest political leader of Korea, Kim Ir Sen was created. Till then the role of a Party Centre of the Northern Zone was fulfilled by the Phen Yan Regional Committee of the Party. The Communist Party headed the struggle of the people for the carrying out of democratic transformations and the formation of a United Independent Democratic Korean State.

Under the leadership of the Communists in North Korea, there were formed trade unions, unions of Communist Youth, Women's Democratic Organizations; Peasants' Unions began to emerge in villages and were later amalgamated into a United Peasants' Union. A Democratic National Front was created in the country, Communists also fulfilled leading role in the People's Committees.

It is completely evident that under the conditions that were created from the very first day in the Northern Zone, Korean reaction was not able to operate openly. The reactionary feudal-landlord elements with all types of Japanese accomplices, sensing that the ground was slipping from under their feet and powerless to oppose, chose round-about paths of struggle. They tried to penetrate inside the organs of people's power, to occupy leading position in them and to disorganise them from within.

There used to be cases when the big landlords, acting under the guise of democrats transferred their land plots to the People's Committees and took upon themselves the maintenance of the apparatus of the Committees and wormed their way into leading positions. Besides, they tried increasingly to implant their agents in all links of the administration.

The resistance of the class enemy was reflected also in the sabotage of the decisions of the People's Power on the lowering of rent on land to 37 per cent of the harvest and other measures of the People's Committees. The Communist Party of North Korea, backed by the mass democratic organizations, carried on a determined struggle for the consolidation of the People's Committees as a result of which they were purged of reactionary pro-Japanese elements and became a powerful support of the new democratic power.

A completely different situation was created in the American Zone of supervision—South Korea. Already before the entry of American troops into Korea, on 7<sup>th</sup> September, 1945, General MacArthur issued an order, the so-called "Proclamation No. 2", which said that everyone who committed an action "with the aim of destroying public peace and order, and deliberately performs action hostile to the allied troops will, according to the decision of a Military Occupation Court be sentenced to death or any other punishment which the Court determines."

How soon it had become clear that it was primarily the national-liberation movement, the struggle of the popular masses for independence and democracy which was considered a blow to the American order! The edge of the police regime created in South Korea was also directed towards the suppression of this movement, towards the defeat of the democratic forces.

The American occupation forces refused to recognise the democratic organs of power—the Central People’s Government and the People’s Committees in the localities. On 17<sup>th</sup> October, 1945, General Hodge, who was commanding American troops in South Korea declared that the sole government and the sole authority in South Korea is the America Military Administration.

The occupation authorities of the USA completely retained the Japanese colonial administrative system, the Japanese laws, orders and rules, the entire colonial apparatus hated by the people. In the beginning, they even attempted to keep also the Japanese administration in the Government organs and to retain the Japanese police and gendarmerie and it was only under the public pressure that they were forced to give this up. But while removing the Japanese officials, they placed instead “Koreans with experience,” i.e., the active collaborationists. Besides, they preached increasingly the “theory” which is a favourite one with the colonisers that the Koreans were “unfit” to rule their country, a theory that was wholly refuted by the practice of North Korea.

While pursuing colonizing aims, the American military authorities, from the very first day of their arrival in South Korea, directed their efforts towards forming for themselves a social support inside the country and with its assistance, to put a new burden of slavery on the Korean people.

Out of which class elements was this support created? Above all, from the representatives of the most reactionary class of Korea—the big landlords and the semi-feudalists who were the stronghold to Japanese colonial administration and had for many years actively helped the Japanese to enslave the country, and themselves plundered and ravaged the mass of people with the protection of the Japanese.

A similar support were the representatives of the big bourgeoisie, who had actively collaborated with the Japanese and had created a position for themselves under them. Such blatant Japanese accomplices as the “textile kings” and the big landlords of Korea—Kim Si Su, and Kim Ion Su or the owner of the aviation company, Pak Hin Sik and similar others, were naturally the most reliable and an already “tested” support for the foreign plunderers. To them were added also the representatives of the reactionary officialdom, who had worked in the Japanese organs of Government, the most mercenary and depraved elements, who purchased the right to serve in the colonial apparatus at the price of national treachery.

But the American could not limit themselves to this type of a support. Its authority amongst the people was far too undermined, the hatred and score evinced by the mass of people towards it was for too strong. The ranks of the open traitors had to be supplemented with the Quislings and traitors, playing the role of “fighters for independence”. With this aim, reactionary elements from amongst the Korea emigrants all over the world were gathered. The so-called Provisional Government which had for a quarter of a century lived at the expense of foreign imperialists, was sent for from China. The hour had come even for those Korean reactionaries, who were in emigration in the U.S.A. and had long ago betrayed the interests of their people and become American agents. In October 1946, Syngman Lee<sup>7</sup> was hurriedly brought to South Korea in a military planes.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Syngman Lee is generally known to Indian readers as Syngman Rhee.

<sup>8</sup> SYNGMAN LEE was born in 1874 in a nobleman’s family. Spurred on by ambitious hopes, he began to participate in political life and was soon appointed a member of the Taineh Council under the Korean Emperor. His character began already to manifest itself here. Syngman Lee supported as actively as possible the openly



It is interesting to note that General Hodge represented Syngman Lee as a great patriot, as the State leader of Korea, as “the father of the Korean people” and he in turn recommended Hodge as a great liberator and friend of the Korean people.

The political centre of the camp of reaction became the Democratic Party, Hang Uk Minchjudan, which was created in the days of the entry of the American troops into Korea. It united the active Japanese accomplices, the big capitalists and the landlords and various types of national traitors in whom there was born a fear before the people and a desire to retain the colonial position of the country. Hang Uk Minchjudan became a nest of national betrayal and the most active force of Korean reaction.

Around the Democratic Party, there grouped other Right parties and organisations, which also represented a bloc of landlords, big capitalists and corrupt officials. It became a centre of terrorist bands and fascist youth organizations.

Depending on these reactionary fascist forces, the Americans began to create a police terror regime in South Korea. And although Korea is not enemy territory but territory liberated from the enemy, they established military occupation rule in their Zone.

By organizing and supporting Korean reaction, the occupation authorities opposed in every way the creation and the activity of genuinely democratic organization. But they were incapable of halting the swift growth of the democratic movement.

Towards the end of 1945, under the leadership of the Communist Party, mass political organizations were created in South Korea—the Workers’ Confederation of Labour, the Women’s Union, the Union of Communist Youth, the Peasants’ Union. At that very time, a People’s Party was organized, which was nearly close to the Communist Party in its programme and principles, and closely cooperated with it.

---

treacherous pro-Japanese elements, who were compelled to resign from the membership of Taineh Council. In 1898, he was arrested along with other members of the “Independence Club” and sentenced to indefinite penal servitude.

But he found a highly-placed protector. The Japanese Minister plenipotentiary in Korea turned to the Korean Government with a petition for the release of Syngman Lee. As a result the indefinite penal servitude was commuted to 7 years’ imprisonment.

In 1904, Syngman Lee was released from prison and went to America. Immediately after the annexation of Korea in 1910, Syngman Lee returned to his native land. He hoped to make a career for himself by joining the Japanese imperialist masters. It is not accidental that the accomplice of Syngman Lee, Sin Hin U pointed out: “Had Syngman Lee received recognition from the big politicians of Japan, then he would have found a common language with them.” (“Ideological Questions” from the Japanese Supreme Court of Korea, Seoul 1938). But the “big politicians” of Japan did not value the qualities of Syngman Lee. He returned to Korea in 1912 working as the founder of the Social Department of the Youth Christian Society. He lived in Korea from 1910 to 1912; seeing that the attempts “to make a contract” with the Japanese did not lead to anything, Syngman Lee returned to America.

When in 1919, the Korean emigrants created a Provisional Government in Shanghai, Syngman Lee was proclaimed its Prime Minister and later—its President. Having received no recognition from Japan, he became an active accomplice of the Americans. In 1920-21, Syngman Lee succeeded in transferring Korea under the mandatory rule of the U.S.A. This was such an open betrayal of the ideas of independence that even the leaders of the self-styled emigre Government began to express their dissatisfaction. Syngman Lee had to shift in his attempts to retain his reputation as “fighter for Independence” and at the same time to win recognition and help from the American imperialists. He persistently sought for establishment of ties with the reactionary circles of the U.S.A. in every way before him and poured out torrents of dirty anti-Soviet slander in the columns of the Hearst Press in order to please the. Simultaneously, he conducted trade with American businessmen, by selling them the national riches of the country.

The democratic camp in South Korea grew and consolidated.

Thus, the first period after the liberation of Korea from Japanese colonial rule was characterise by a tremendous rise in the political activity of the people by the creation of a People's Democratic Power as represented by the People's Committees, the functioning and growth of democratic parties and organizations. However, the different tasks and aims, pursued by the Soviet and the America armies, which had entered the Northern and Southern Zones of the country determined, from the very beginning, the different paths of development of these Zones.

In North Korea, the democratic authority which was created by the people away, recognized and supported by the Soviet Military Command, was able in this period to demolish the Japanese colonial apparatus and to prepare the conditions for fundamental democratic changes.

In contradistinction to this, in the Southern Zone, the American occupation authorities, having kept the mass of people away from the administration of the country recognized the Japanese colonial administration in accordance with the interests of American imperialism. They organized and united the forces of Korean reaction in order, by depending on these forces, to defeat the growing democratic front and the national liberation democratic movement of the people.

## II

### THE DECEMBER MEETING ON KOREA OF THE MINISTERS FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS: TWO PATHS OF DEVELOPMENTS OF THE SOUTHERN AND NORTHERN ZONES OF THE COUNTRY (Dec. 1945 – April, 1947)

In December, 1945, there took place a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, U.S.A. and Britain, in which the programme and concrete conditions of the establishment of Korea as an independent democratic State were discussed. Already at this meeting two different approaches to the solution of the Korean problem were noted.

The plan proposed by the American delegation and later withdrawn by it, in fact, meant the conversion of Korea into a mandated territory under the power and authority of a "High Commissioner". It kept away the Koran people from participating in the administration of the country and did not envisage the creation of a National Government. It advanced, as its most immediate task the formation of an American-Soviet Military Administration, which was to rule the country till the establishment of trusteeship. They further had in view the creation of an administrative organ of Four Powers (U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Great Britain and China) for the establishment of trusteeship which according to the plan could continue for ten years.

The Soviet delegation, could not naturally agree to the American proposals, which ran counter to the legitimate rights of the Korean people. It brought forward its own plan which was based on the Moscow Agreement. According to this Agreement, the Allied Powers had to ensure the restoration of Korea as an independent State and the creation of conditions for the development of the country on democratic foundations. The Moscow Agreement recognized the urgency of the formation of a Provisional Korean Democratic Government. The Agreement says:

"With a view to the re-establishment of Korea as an independent state, the creation of conditions for developing the country on democratic principles and the earliest possible liquidation of the disastrous results of the protracted Japanese domination in Korea, there shall be set up a Provisional Korean democratic government which shall take all the necessary steps for

developing the industry transport and agriculture of Korea and the national culture of the Korean people.” (*The Soviet Union and the Korean Question, Documents*, Moscow 1948, p. 5)

It was decided to form a Joint Soviet-American Commission for assistance in the creation of a Provisional Korean Government.

The most important condition for the implementation of the Moscow Agreement was the obligation taken upon itself by the Soviet Union and by America to consult the democratic parties and organizations of Korea, since it would, of course, be impossible to decide the question of the future of the Korean people without listening to their opinion.

The Joint Soviet-American Commission was entrusted, “with the participation of the Provisional Korean democratic government and of the Korean democratic organisations, to work out measures also for helping and assisting (trusteeship) the political, economic and social progress of the Korean people, the development of democratic self-government and the establishment of the national independence of Korea.” (Ibid., p. 6)

The period of the Trusteeship was fixed at five years and its prolongation was ruled out.

Thus, the decision of the Moscow Agreement which was adopted in conformity with the Soviet plan, corresponded to the fundamental national demands and interests of the Korean people and opened the path for the restoration of Korea as an independent, democratic State. The people of Korea met it with a warm approval All over the North and the South, demonstrations of many thousands were held to greet it. All the democratic parties said organizations of North and South Korea declared their unconditional support to the Moscow decision. It was only the numerically weak reactionary parties and groups which came out against it, since this decision struck a blow at their anti-popular plans.

It turned out that the December meeting of 1945 brought complete clarity on the Korean question and determined the further paths of development of Korea. However, it was only the beginning of the acute, irreconcilable struggle between the U.S.A, which from the very first days, took the course of disrupting the agreement that was adopted by the Soviet Union which consistently and persistently pressed for its realization in life.

In March 1946, the Joint Soviet-American Commission began its work in Seoul. Contrary to the Agreement, the America delegation in the Joint Commission refused to consult the democratic parties and organizations of Korea, representing the majority of the Korean people and expressing their will. It insisted on consulting the anti-popular Right reactionary organizations and groups. It included in the list of consultations 17 parties and groups of South Korea which had actively fought against the Moscow Agreement.

Being convinced that the position of the Soviet representatives who were pressing for the fulfilment of the Moscow Agreement was unbending, the U.S delegation, after a month and a half’s session, proposed to cease the work of the Commission.

The aggravation of the struggle around the Korean question facilitated the process of the demarcation of political forces inside Korea. Two sharply hostile camps were formed. On the one hand, the Right-wing camp, isolated from the people and uniting all the reactionary forces in the country, all the anti-popular treacherous elements for whom the democratic power, based on the broad masses, was more dreadful and dangerous than the foreign colonizers. On the other hand, the Democratic National Front, fighting for the reunification, independence and democratic development of the country and resting on the support, and sympathy of the broad strata of the people—the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, artisans,

handicraftsmen and a considerable part of the middle and petty owners and traders. At the head of this camp stood the working class, headed by the Communist Party. The influence of the Communist Party in the masses grew incessantly and this gave an irretrievable blow to the American policy of disuniting and colonizing the country.

In spite of the disruption of the work of the Joint Commission, the people's power of North Korea with the direct help and support of the Soviet Army, began to implement an extensive plan of democratic changes. These changes were dictated by the vital interests of the people, by the tasks of the economic and cultural development of the country. They were the only sure guarantee of its independence and sovereignty and were called to transform North Korea into a base of independence and the democratisation of the whole country.

In February, 1946, at the initiative of local people's committees, a Provisional People's Committee as the central organs of power was formed. Kim Il Sun was elected its president.

Kim Il Sun was born in 1912, in the family of a teacher revolutionary. As a boy of 13, Kim Il Sun went to Manchuria. On completing middle-school, he joined a partisan detachment and soon became the generally acknowledged leader of the Korean partisan movement. In 1930, Kim Il Sun joined the Communist Party. Till partisan detachments that were operating against the Japanese in Manchuria and the North regions of Korea. A talented commander and organiser, he with his fearless and courageous struggle against the Japanese, with his brave exploits for the sake of the liberation of his native land, with his supreme service to the people, who renown as national hero.

The Provisional People's Committee of North Korea took the lead in implementing democratic changes. The most grandiose of these was the Land Reform.

It is completely evident that for such a backward agrarian country as Korea, where approximately three-quarters of the population was employed in agriculture, where landlord ownership and the enslaving rent system dominated in agriculture, where the overwhelming majority of the peasantry did not possess any land of its own and languished for many years under the dual yoke of the Japanese colonizers and the Korean landlords and moneylenders, where agriculture was fettered by feudal survivals and was actually in a state of deterioration, the Land Reform was an acute political and economic necessity.

It was only after having solved the question of land, and liberating the peasantry from feudal bondage and predatory exploitation and after having undermined the economic base of the class of landlords, that it was possible to go over to other democratic changes. The Law on Land Reform adopted by the Provisional People's Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> March, 1945 envisaged a radical solution of this question.

“The task of Land Reform”, the Law points out, “is the abolition of Japanese landownership—the landownership of the Korean landlords and the abolition of the rent system. Only he who tills the land will have the right to own it. The agrarian structure in North Korea will rest on independent peasant households which are free from the landlords, and are the private property of their possessors.” (*Land Reform in North Korea.*)

In conformity with this Law, land belonging to the following categories was confiscated and distributed freely to the peasants: land belonging to the Japanese State, to those individuals who are Japanese by birth and jurisdiction, to traitors to the Korean people who had actively collaborated with the Japanese organs of power and to those who had fled from the country at the time of Korea's liberation from the Japanese yoke; the Korean landlords who owned farms of more than 5 *chon*<sup>9</sup> of land; the

---

<sup>9</sup> Korean measure of land equal to 0.991 hectare.

landlords who did not carry on their farming and had given all their land on lease; owners of plots of land, who had, irrespective of its size, given it systematically on lease; churches which had more than 5 *chons* of land.

The entire confiscated land was released from all debts and burdens and handed over free of charge to the perpetual ownership of the Korean peasantry.

Tractors, agricultural implements, outhouses, estates of the landlords were placed at the disposal of People's Committees for distribution amongst the farm labourers and peasants with very little land. Forests attached to landed properties, irrigation and other technical equipment were also confiscated and transferred within the province of the Provisional People's Committee.

As a result of the Land Reform, more than one million *chon* of land was confiscated. Seven-hundred and twenty-five thousand landless peasants and peasants with little land received it; more than 60 percent of this land was received by 400,000 landless tenants and farm labourers. The Land Reform was implemented with the direct and active support of the broad peasant masses. In some places it was carried out by the People's Committees and Peasant Committees, specially created for this purpose, and elected at meetings of the landless peasants and peasants with little land.

It is difficult to overestimate the significance of the Land Reform for the population of North Korea. It liquidated the Japanese landownership and the landownership of the Korean landlords; eliminated the lease system, and freed the peasantry from the oppression of the landlords and the moneylenders and made them independent agricultural producers. It liquidated the economic foundations of the most reactionary class—the landlords, which was the support of collaboration and treachery both in the period of the Japanese rule and after the liberation of the country. Moreover, it undermined the forces of reaction inside the country.

The Land Reform unleashed the political activity of the peasantry, and joined it to broad State activity. Having undermined the forces of reaction and consolidated the forces of democracy, it facilitated the conditions for carrying out other democratic changes into practice.

Along with this, the Provisional People's Committee of North Korea adopted a decision about a single agricultural natural tax, which provides for supplies to the State; from fields under water 27 per cent of the harvest, fields under cereals and technical crops 23 per cent and 10 per cent from land cultivated by *Hvadzenmins*,<sup>10</sup> the so-called "burning fields". After the payment of agricultural tax, the peasants obtained the right to dispose of their harvest freely.

Land Reform and the introduction of an agricultural tax helped in solving the food provisions problem, which was the most difficult for North Korea.

The people's power of North Korea implemented the nationalization of the industry, transport, communication and banks, belonging to the Japanese and to the traitors to the Korean people.

The Law of the Provisional People's Committee of North Korea, adopted on August 10, 1946 says:

---

<sup>10</sup> *Hvadzenmins*—Peasants cultivating the land in mountain regions that are not scorched. They burn forests and bushes and sow grain crops and potatoes on scorched plots.

“All the industrial enterprises electric stations, railway and water transport communication, commercial and cultural institutions, banks, belonging earlier to the Japanese and to individuals who are Japanese by birth and by jurisdiction as well as to the traitor to the Korean people are to be confiscated without any compensation and declared the property of the Korean people, i.e., they are to be nationalized.” (Law on the Nationalization of Industry, Means of Transport, Communication and Banks in North Korea.)

It is quite obvious that the nationalization of Japanese industry has become possible only owing to the fact that the Soviet Army only preserved national property and gave it to a People’s State.

In the Law on the Nationalization of Industry, it is stated that:

“the Soviet Army entering on the territory of Korea with the purpose of defeating the Japanese Army, liberated North Korea from Japanese slavery and guaranteed democratic liberties to the Korean people, safeguarded the private and public property of the Koreans, preserved national wealth and created the possibility for the most rapid economic and cultural rebirth of the Korean State.”

Thus, the commanding heights in the most important branches of economy (largescale industry, banks, transport) passed over into the hands of the State and along with the agrarian reform, was the biggest step in the path of building the economy of the People’s Democratic State and unfolded broad possibilities for the further development of the country.

While setting about the restoration of industry in North Korea, the people’s power was simultaneously confronted with the necessity of a fundamental reorganization of this industry. The colonial policy of Japanese imperialism determined the one-sided distorted development of the industry of Korea. It was wholly subservient to the interests of Japanese monopoly capital. The construction of factories, mines, pits, electric stations and railroads in Korea by the Japanese had the aim not only of extracting super-profits and exploiting the cheap labour but also of converting Korea into a military strategic springboard for Japan. The industry of the colony served exclusively the aims of predatory Japanese imperialism and was an integral part of the war industrial base of the metropolitan country.

Before the people’s power of North Korea stood the task of the complete subordination of the development of industry to the interests of the nation, the creation and consolidation of a People’s Democratic State and a rise in the well-being of the people. While the agrarian reform liquidated the class of landlords, the nationalization of industry, belonging to the Japanese and to the traitors to the Korean people, liquidated the economic base of the Korean big bourgeoisie, closely connected with Japanese capital. And although in North Korea it was not numerous, since the main enterprises belonged to the Japanese monopolists, its liquidation signified a serious blow to the forces of reaction.

Along with this, there are small and medium enterprises in North Korea which are in the hands of the Koreans. The enactment of the Provisional People’s Government, which was adopted in October, 1946, provided for the protection of the rights of private property and encouragement to private initiative in industry and in commerce. “In the interests of drawing in private capital of Korean citizens for increasing the output of production and goods of wide consumption for the needs of the population”, the sale and lease of mills, factories, mines, forests and fisheries (with not more than 50 workers) and also commercial investments, belonging to the Japanese and now at the disposal of the People’s Committees to industrialists and merchants was permitted in certain cases.

However, while permitting and encouraging private initiative, the people’s power took it under its own control and directed it towards ensuring the interests of national economy.

The conditions of work of the workers and employees were altered in a radical manner. The Law on Labour adopted in June 1946, was the greatest gain of the working class of North Korea; the eight-hour day was established in enterprises and institutions, and in heavy work and in industries below the ground, the seven-hour day. Child labour which was widely employed before was forbidden. Labour protection and social insurance were introduced. This contributed to a rapid growth of the productivity of the labour of workers, the birth and the development of labour emulation and shock work.

In the process of the struggle for the democratic rebuilding of the country and the restoration of national economy, their own national cadres of specialists, who had successfully familiarized themselves with the science of directing production were created and grew. As a result of the reforms passed, the conditions were created for the emancipation of the Korean women, who had no rights and were subjected both to unheard of degradation and savage exploitation. They were granted equal rights with men in all the spheres of State, economic, cultural and social and political life. The Korean woman became an equal partner in the building of a new life.

The implementation of democratic changes in North Korea took place under conditions of an acute class struggle. The remnants of the defeated class of landlords and collaborationist bourgeoisie, the reactionary bureaucratic elements, the section linked with the Catholic Church and in the main with the Protestant Church, which was since long connected with the American Missionaries—the agents of U.S. imperialism—such were the internal forces of reaction. But besides this, bands of terrorists and wreckers were constantly sent by the American and Korean reactionaries from the South. These hostile elements tried to disrupt the democratic changes in every way. They, as before, tried to penetrate inside the People's committees and political parties in order to disrupt them from within. The reactionaries succeeded in temporarily worming their way in to the leading organs of the democratic Party of North Korea. But the lower organizations exposed the anti-popular policy of the treacherous leadership of this Party and the first session of the Party in February, 1946, the Central Committee headed by Cho Man Sik was dismissed. During the carrying out of the land reform, the reactionaries assured the peasants that the reform would lead to starvation and the collapse of agriculture. They frightened the peasants that the land would be returned to the landlords.

Possessing no influence among the people and deeply scorned by them, the enemies of the people's Democratic power, directed by South Korean reaction and its American leaders, in their impotent and violent fury, resorted to the most diverse forms of struggle, from wrecking acts to sabotage and terror.

The unification in August, 1946, of the Communist Party and the New People's Party which was close to it in its aims and tasks, into a Labour Party of North Korea (Puk Choson Notondan) was of tremendous importance for the democratisation of the country. This contributed to the further growth and consolidation of the democratic camp in the country. The Labour Party became the soul and the leading force of the United Democratic National Front of North Korea (Puk Choson Minchjyuchjyui Minchjok Chonchjen) which was formed in the middle of 1946 and united under its banner more than 5 million people.

In the process of the democratic construction, the People's Committees—the basis of the New Democratic regime of North Korea, were consolidated. The People's Committees in the Northern Zone became the genuinely democratic organs of power.

“The defeat and the liquidation of the main centres of Fascism and world aggression”, Comrade Stalin points out “have led to profound changes in the political life of the peoples of the world, to a broad growth of the democratic movement amongst peoples. Learning from the

experience of the war, the mass of people have understood that the fate of States can never be entrusted to reactionary Governments, pursuing narrow, caste and selfish anti-popular aims. It is, precisely therefore, that the people, not wishing to live any longer in the old way, are taking the fate of their States in their own hands, establishing democratic order and waging an active struggle against the forces of reaction and against the instigators of a new war.” (J.V. Stalin: *Pravda*, 1.5. 1946)

The main feature of the People’s Committees of North Korea is precisely that they represent the power of the toilers, the vast majority of the people, under the leadership of the working class.

On 5<sup>th</sup> September, 1946, the Provisional People’s Committee of North Korea adopted the law on the people’s Committees of the provinces, districts, towns and volosts as organs of local people’s power, elected by the people on the basis of general, equal, direct voting rights with secret ballot. The law laid down the responsibility of the members of the people’s Committees to the electors. “If a member of the People’s Committee fulfils badly the responsibility with which he is charged, the electors have the right in the established legal order to recall him and elect a new one. All members of People’s Committees must understand that they are the chosen and trusted persons of the people. Therefore, the fulfilment of the popular will is their highest duty.” (Law on People’s Committees.)

In November, 1946, in North Korea elections to the provincial, district, and town People’s Committees took place and in the beginning of 1947, to the village and volosts committees. These elections demonstrated the great solidarity and unity of the people of North Korea. 99.6 per cent of votes were cast for the candidates of the United National Democratic Front.

The representatives of all strata of the population joined the People’s Committees. All the democratic parties and social organizations of North Korea were represented in them.

The First Congress of the People’s Committees held in February, 1946, elected the highest legislative organ of North Korea—the People’s Assembly. It was composed of 89 members of the Labour Party, 29 members of the Democratic Party, 29 members of the Chonudan Party and 90 non-Party members. (The Chonudan Party is pre-eminently peasant in composition. Its programme, along with religious principles puts forward the demand for democratic reforms. The Chonudan Party is inside the United National Democratic front of North Korea).

The People’s Assembly and the People’s Committee elected in February, 1947, exercised legislative and executive authority in North Korea till the formation of all-Korean organs of power.

While the population of North Korea, with the support of the soviet Army, effected a very great transformation laying the economic basis of People’s Democracy, in South Korea the American military authorities, relying on Korean reaction, continued their policy of enslaving the country consistently and in a planned manner. This was expressed in the preparation of a corresponding political and economic regime, which would guarantee the implementation of the colonizing plans of U.S.A. as well as in the military measures, directed towards converting South Korea into a military and strategic base of the U.S.A.

Having disrupted the work of the Joint Soviet-American Commission, the Americans commenced terroristic operations in their zone against Left organizations and leaders, against all those who supported the decisions of the Moscow meeting on Korea, against the democratic progressive forces of the country, and primarily against the Communists.



The Communist Party was forced to go over to a semi-illegal position. The American authorities issued laws, demanding not only the registration of political parties and organizations but also the submission of a complete list of all members and all financial documents to the police. There is no need to say that the edge of these laws was directed, above all, against the Communist Party.

The American Military Command prohibited Left organizations from holding demonstrations and meetings, and encouraged in every way the pogroms of the reactionaries.

The American occupation authorities of South Korea paid great attention to the formation of a police corps. The police recruitment took place by recruiting "those who had experience", i.e., those who had worked earlier in the Japanese police. The police was vested with extensive powers. The police was empowered to keep under arrest arbitrarily thousands of innocent people for any period of time. All its activities were carried out under the guidance of the American military police.

In South Korea, a broad branching out network of terroristic organizations, uniting the fascist youth, the sons of the big landlords and the capitalists, all kinds of de-classed rabble and criminal elements began to be formed for helping the police. The most significant amongst these was the fascist organization, the Korean National Youth which was taken into the keeping of the American military administration.

After having taken the Japanese mills and factories under their control and having seized the commanding positions belonging to the Japanese, the Americans utilised this to penetrate more deeply into all the pores of the economy.

Having set the aim of converting South Korea into its colony, the American military administration undertook nothing to restore Korean industry. In 1946, 40 per cent of the enterprises in South Korea were in operation, in 1947 only 25 per cent while even those enterprises which were functioning worked far below the full capacity.

The American monopolies were not interested in the rebirth of Korean industry which would have created the prerequisites for the economic independence of the country. They were not interested in the restoration of mills and factories, whose production would constitute a competition to the goods exported from U.S.A. In South Korea there were nearly 300 enterprises (including also small ones) of the machine-building and instrument industry. However, the American authorities included only 16 enterprises in the plan of output for 1947. The ship-building industry was exclusively occupied with the repairs of small ships. In spite of the fact that here, there are two shipping wharves equipped for the construction of steamers and 55 shipping wharves for building country-boats, in two years only one boat was built in all the wharves. The locomotive and wagon-building factories existing in South Korea have the right to occupy themselves only with repair work, and the Americans have begun importing locomotives into the country.

The production of the textile industry (which in the main was concentrated precisely in South Korea) comprised in 1946 altogether of only 17.6 percent of the production of 1941. For the future, textile production was still more curtailed.

While holding back the restoration of Korean enterprises, the Americans began to import goods in the country which could be provided with success locally for the needs of the Korean population. In the first place, it was subordinated to the task of converting South Korea into a springboard of American reaction against the forces of democracy in Eastern Asia, and against the Soviet Union. In passing, the American monopolies disposed of in South Korea any rubbish, left over from the war production; cement,

preserved food, old clothing, telephone and telegraph apparatus, motor lorries, etc. were transported in increasing quantities.

South Korea is in the main an agricultural region and the land question is a central question for it. Besides, after the liberation of the country, no changes took place in this sphere—everything remained as under the Japanese colonial rule. The landlords' ownership of the land and the enslaving lease system were fully retained. As before, the landlords and the usurer remained the all-powerful masters in the countryside. Eighty percent of the peasants had no land and were forced to rent it.

The biggest Japanese monopoly—the Eastern Colonial Society—was converted into an American company, “New Korea”. Having concentrated in its hands the former Japanese land, irrigation and other constructions, and the industrial enterprises, this company remained as before the main colonial plunderer.

The American imperialists were not interested in effecting agrarian changes in South Korea. From the very first day, they opposed their implementation as well as the carrying out of other democratic reforms into practice. The Americans were not interested in the liquidation of feudal relationships and the backwardness of the Korean countryside. This backwardness was suitable and necessary for them, since it was by utilising it that they hoped to realise their aggressive plans. Besides, the agrarian transformation would have undermined their economic positions and the positions of their allies in South Korea—the Korean landlords and the capitalists, closely linked with landownership.

Thus, owing to the colonising policy of the American imperialists, agriculture of South Korea continues to remain fettered by feudal survivals, and the peasant masses doomed to bondage and misery.

South Korea is indispensable for the U.S.A., primarily as a war base, as a strategic springboard for the fight against the U.S.S.R. and democratic China.

As soon as American troops entered into South Korea, they began to implement their plan of military measures. It was expressed in the creation of military and aviation bases, in the extension and re-equipment of sea ports, in the formation and training of police and military formations from amongst the Koreans. The Americans began the extension of the Port of Fuzan (Pusan) and the construction of a new port to the North-East of Fuzan. The construction of a new pier was begun in the Port of Inchon. Aerodromes were reconstructed and extended. The aerodrome of Kimpo, 40 kilometres away from Seoul, was extended several times. Barrack construction was developed on a broad scale.

The American military authorities paid special attention to the formation and to the suitable training of the so-called “Korean army.” It was with this purpose that the Department of National Defence was created. The command of the army formations was selected from among those Koreans who had served in the Japanese army. The training was conducted by American instructors with American weapons. The preparation of armed forces was also going on under the guise of the creation of a police corps. The Americans took into their own hands the military training of the terrorist youth organizations of a fascist type to which their officers were attached in the capacity of advisers.

Consequently, the expansionist policy of American imperialism in South Korea proceeded from the very beginning on the lines of a complete political and economic enslavement of the country and its conversion into a military and strategic springboard of the U.S.A. in the Far East.

However, insuperable barriers stood in the way of the realisation of the designs of the USA, in the form of the national-liberation movement, which drew into its powerful stream the broad masses of the people.

The first significant mass action against US imperialism and its puppets in South Korea was the general strike of October, 1946, which passed over into an all-people's liberation struggle. Begun in September, 1946, on the initiative of the railwaymen of Pusan, it was caught up by all the workers of the country and soon became general. The peasants supported the workers. Everywhere in the villages, there began revolts and demonstrations. The peasants attacked the landlords' estates and the police posts, wreaking vengeance on the traitors to the people.

In the beginning of October, the strike and demonstration in many places grew over into armed uprisings. In the struggle were included the employees, the students, the traders—representatives of all strata of the population. According to the incomplete figures, more than one million took part in the movement. The main slogans of those in revolt were: immediate cessation of the terror and the transfer of all power to the People's Committees; the guarantee of political liberties, the carrying out of Land Reform; the implementation of nationalization of industry, transport, communications; the immediate passing of a democratic law on labour as in the North.

At the head of the October people's struggle emerged the working class and the Communist Party of South Korea, which in November merged with the People's and New People's Parties, which were close to it and formed the Labour Party of South Korea (Nam Choson Notondan).

The people's struggle was suppressed with great savagery, which took a toll of innumerable victims but the bloody defeat of the movement, brought about with the active help of the American troops, did not crush the will of the people for independence and for liberty.

The strike movement assumed a broad sweep. The strikes bore a clearly expressed political character. The main demands of the strikers, the demonstrators and the partisans were: (1) Transfer of power to the People's Committees; (2) The carrying out of similar democratic transformations as in North Korea. It was generally supported by the peasantry and by other strata of the people, which in its turn testifies to the qualitative growth of the movement. Thus, the general strike in March 1947, called forth by the intensified repression on the part of the American authorities, their order for the arrest of the Central Committee of the Labour Party, was immediately caught up by the peasants, the employees and the students. In the villages "rice riots" flared up now and then. In some regions, partisan actions developed. The period from the Moscow meeting in December, 1945 to the summer of 1947, disclosed still more clearly the profound difference in the two paths along which the development of the two zones of Korea proceeded.

### III

#### CONSOLIDATION OF THE FOUNDATION OF PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY IN NORTH KOREA: THE MILITARY OCCUPATION REGIME IN SOUTHERN ZONE OF THE COUNTRY (April 1947 to September 1948)

In April, 1947, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., V.M. Molotov and the Secretary of State of the U.S.A., Marshall, exchanged letters on the question of Korea. V.M. Molotov proposed the renewal of the work of the Joint Commission on the basis of the exact fulfilment of the Moscow Agreement, having defined as its main tasks:

"1. Formation of a Provisional Korean Democratic Government with the broad participation of Korean democratic parties and social organizations, in order to accelerate the political and economic unification of Korea as an independent State, exempt from foreign interference which would put an end to the division of the country into two zones.

“2. Formation throughout Korea of democratic organs of Government by means of free elections based upon universal and equal suffrage.

“3. Assistance to the Korean people in reviving Korea as an independent democratic State and in developing the national economy and national culture.”

(The Soviet Union and the Korean Question, Moscow, 1948, p. 17)

On May 21, 1947, the Joint Soviet-American Commission restarted its work, but in spite of the agreement, the position of the American representatives remained unchanged. They proceeded from the following: either to ensure a majority of Right reactionary elements in the Provisional Government or if this were not to succeed, to disrupt the work of the Commission and carry on separate operations. This was confirmed by the whole course of the work of the Commission and the conduct of the American delegates. They presented the Commission a list of 425 parties and organizations, whom it was necessary to consult. All kinds of local, religious and even purely family groups and trade institutions were included here. A considerable part of these were fictitious. Here there were also active opponents of the Moscow Agreement, the participants in the “Committee of Anti-Trusteeship Struggle.” All these organizations represented, according to the American figures, 70 million people, which exceeds by five times the number of the inhabitants of South Korea.

The striving of the American delegation to ensure, in any way possible, the predominance of reactionary elements and not to permit the creation of a democratic Government, was expressed quite openly by the American representatives themselves.

However, the situation which existed was not in favour of the Americans. The firm stand of the Soviet delegation, supported by the broad masses of the Korean people, the influence and the organization of the parties of the Democratic National Front headed by the Labour Party, the unpopularity of the Right organizations and leaders amongst the peoples served as a serious impediment in the realization of the American plans of dividing and colonizing the country. Convinced of this, the American delegation took the course of disrupting the work of the Joint Commission and of carrying out separate actions. In his letter to V.M. Molotov, dated the 26<sup>th</sup> of August, 1947, Lovett, the U.S. Vice-Secretary of State, while affirming that the Joint Commission was incapable of fulfilling its mission, presented the proposals of the U.S.A. regarding the creation of provisional zonal legislative assemblies in South and in North Korea, which was basically contrary to the decisions of the Moscow Agreement and which secured the division of Korea into two zones.

The Soviet Government rejected these proposals. In his reply, V.M. Molotov pointed out that the Joint Commission had far from exhausted its possibilities and that the failure of the work of the Commission was the result of the position taken by the U.S.A., the result of its unilateral activities.

In the summer of 1947, when the Joint Commission was still conducting its work, the occupation authorities in South Korea began to carry out a smashing up on a broad scale of the democratic parties and organizations. In all places, there began mass arrests of Left leaders, the smashing up of all democratic papers. All the progressive organizations were driven underground. Terror assumed unheard of dimensions inside the country.

In reply to the declaration of the head of the Soviet delegation in the Joint Commission, General Commander Shtykov, that the mass terror and repression were disrupting the work of the Commission and to the demand to adopt measures for restoring the normal conditions, the American representatives answered cynically that the repression in South Korea was a normal police measure against “violators of order”. They even attempted to blame the Soviet delegation, that being a “guest”, it was interfering in the domestic affairs of south Korea, although it was absolutely clear that the Soviet delegation in the

International Commission created by a decision of the Moscow Agreement, could not remain indifferent to the activities which disrupted this decision.

Seeing that the U.S. Government did not wish to fulfil the obligations taken upon itself and that it was disrupting the work of the Joint Commission, the Soviet Government, through its representatives in the Commission brought forth the proposal for a simultaneous withdrawal of the Soviet and the American troops from Korea and for granting the Korean people the opportunity to decide their own State affairs. This proposal was a radical solution of the question. It corresponded with the fundamental interests of the Korean people and was met by them with warm approval. But it did not suit the plans of the American imperialists.

The ruling circles of the U.S.A., which till now had affirmed hypocritically that they were striving for the quickest withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea, refused to accept the Soviet proposal.

Having grossly violated its obligations, taken at the Moscow Conference and having twice disrupted the work of the Joint Commission, the U.S.A. illegally brought the Korean question for discussion in the General Assembly and tried to screen its colonizing policy in Korea with the authority of the UNO.

The United States managed to press the discussion of the Korean question at the second session of the General Assembly of the UNO. Against the protests of the representatives of the USSR, this discussion took place without the participation of and behind the back of the Korean people. Under the pressure of the USA, which mobilised the majority machine, the session adopted a decision to send a Provisional Commission of the UNO to Korea, which had ostensibly “to supervise” the carrying out of the elections and the creation of a Korean government. This decision violated also the principles of national self-determination of the Korean people and the international agreements on Korea. The Soviet Union and the countries of People’s Democracy refused to participate in this illegal Commission.

The population of Korea replied to the formation of the UNO Commission with general mass protest. The Commission turned for consultation to another illegally formed organ, to the so-called Inter-Session Committee which gave a directive to conduct separate elections in South Korea. Thus, the American Government completely revealed its plans. They consisted in the fact that in order to tighten the occupation of South Korea, to consolidate the position of its support in the country—the collaborationists and the reactionaries—to form out of them, under the cover of the UNO, an obedient puppet government and with its support, to realise the conversion of South Korea into a colony and a military-strategic springboard of the USA.

The terror intensified. Tens of thousands of patriots were murdered, tortured and cast into prison. Even before the far from objective materials of the UNO Commission on Korea pointed out that 30,000 democratic leaders were imprisoned in South Korean prisons, which exceeded the number of those imprisoned under the Japanese. These materials cite that “the majority of people with democratic views are now either under arrest, or in prisons or their freedom of movement is restricted.” (*Pravda*, 11-12-1948)

The American militarists in South Korea created chaos and violence. Along with the Korean police and the fascist terrorists, they tortured the population not only for participating in the national-liberation movement, but also for the slightest sympathy with this movement. The American occupationists and their agents destroyed the homes of peaceful inhabitants merely because their owners supported the decision of the Moscow meeting on Korea. They arrested thousands of Koreans, who had participated in the meetings of support to the work of the Joint Soviet-American Commission. They

declared the unemployed as “seditious” because they demanded work. The strikes of workers were crushed with the force of arms. Peaceful demonstrations were fired upon.

In 1920, Vladimir Ilych Lenin, pointing to the predatory character of Japanese colonial rule in Korea wrote:

“Here there is a combination of all the methods of Tsarism, all the latest perfected technique, with a purely Asiatic system of torture and unheard of cruelty. But now the Americans want to snatch this dainty Korean piece away.” (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXV, Russ, ed., Moscow, p. 502)

The American imperialists, who had for many years longed for the “dainty Korean piece”, in attempting to seize it, created in their zone, an occupation regime which combined unheard of brutality and purely Asiatic torture and the latest technique of plunder and exploitation of the mass of people.<sup>11</sup>

It is no accident that the American military authorities learnt the experience of conducting “plebiscites” from the German fascists before conducting separate elections in South Korea.

The entire conduct, the practices of the American military authorities in South Korea, confirms that they used extensively the fascist methods of suppressing and destroying the national-liberation and democratic movement of the mass of people.

The entire Korean people in the North and in the South met the decision on separate elections with profound discontent. Even the Centrist and a section of the Right-wing political parties of South Korea came forward with a call to boycott the elections.

Towards the end of April, 1948, there was a meeting held in Pyongyang of, representatives of 56 political parties and social organizations of North and South Korea, uniting more than 10 million people. The meeting decided unanimously to boycott the elections. It turned to the Governments of the USA and the USSR with a request for the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops from Korea.

After this a meeting of 33 political parties and social organizations of North and South Korea was convened at which a declaration was worked out, which envisaged the immediate withdrawal of foreign troops, the convocation of an all-Korean Congress for the formation of a Provisional Democratic Government and the carrying out of universal elections to the legislative organs.

However, contrary to the will of the Korean people, irrespective of the mass general protest, the American authorities conducted the so-called elections in South Korea. They were held under conditions of barbaric police terror and force. The American troops, the Korean police, the terrorist organizations were brought out in fighting readiness. American warships were brought to the shores of Korea. American planes flew over the country; American soldiers, armed with automatic revolvers patrolled the

---

<sup>11</sup> The United States has played more than once an ignoble role in the destination of the Korean people. In the years when the menace of Japanese servitude hung over Korea, the ruling circle of Korea placed great hopes on help from the USA. However, the USA treacherously violated the Korean-American treaty of 1882, one of the points of which says: “If other powers behave unjustly or bring pressure to bear on one of these (contracting) Governments, then the other Government, on being informed about it, offers its good services in order to reach an amicable solution of the question.” For the benefit of the imperialist plans, the USA sacrificed the independence of the Korean people to Japan without any hesitation. A similar improper role was also played by the USA during the annexation of Korea by Japan and also in 1919 and in the subsequent years.

streets. Police patrols were quartered by the election booths and in many places the police were inside the election booths. The electors were searched and beaten up.

In Seoul, on the day of voting, 10<sup>th</sup> May 1948, a state of war was declared. At all places in South Korea, mass arrest took place. For three days from the 7<sup>th</sup> to 10<sup>th</sup> May, 1948, 5,424 people were arrested, 350 were murdered and wounded for participating in the movement against separate elections. From 11<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> of May, 137 people were wounded and 128 were killed from among those who had refused to participate in the elections.

Eighty-four landlords, 34 big owners of enterprises, 23 officials who had earlier actively collaborated with the Japanese entered the “National Assembly” of South Korea which was created by means of the pressure of military and police forces, through terror and falsification.

On August 15, it was declared that a Korean ‘Government’ had been appointed. It was headed by Li Bom Sok, who had been an emigre for more than 30 years in China and had arrived in South Korea on the recommendation of the American Intelligence Service. It is characteristic that the Prime Minister is at the same time the leader of a fascist organization, “The Korean National Youth” and four “Ministers” in his Government are members of the presidium of this organization.

The head of the Seoul Police, the landlord Chan Tek San who had won notoriety for himself as a leader of pogroms and a terrorist, was appointed Minister for Foreign Affairs. Chon Dzin Han, who was renowned for his bloody vengeance against the strikers, who was the protector of strike-breakers and the leader of reactionary trade unions, received the portfolio of Minister for Social Work. An official of the Japanese Court, Li Ni became Minister for Justice. The landlord Yun Chi Iyon, who had in the past been an active leader of the pro-Japanese organizations in Korea was appointed Minister for Internal Affairs.

An offspring of the former Emperor’s family had been included in the ‘government’ but there was not a single representative of the labouring people—the workers, the peasants, the intelligentsia.

Out of the eighteen Ministers, eight are members and leading workers of the democratic party Hang Uk Minchujdan—the citadel of Korean reaction.

Syngman Rhee was proclaimed President of the ‘Republic’. Such a South Korean ‘Government’ was created by the Americans in order to secure and consolidate a political system in the country, suited to their colonizing designs so that with the assistance of this ‘government’ screening them they could suppress the national-liberation movement of the Korean people. From the very first days of its work, the puppet Government directed all its efforts for the fulfilment of the plans of the American masters.

The agreement, signed in the middle of September 1948, by the American Command and the South Korean ‘Government’ is extremely significant. According to this agreement, the American Command retained complete political, economic and military control over South Korea as well as the right to dispose of the national wealth of the country without any restriction. The one-sided character of this treaty was so evident that even many members of the National Assembly refused to accept it.

In December, 1948, the USA signed an agreement with its puppet Government on the rendering of ‘American aid’ to South Korea, for the next three years, in accordance with the Marshall Plan. According to this agreement, the ‘Government’ of South Korea undertakes to establish control over foreign trade, through the introduction of a system of licenses on export and import, and to develop the industry, working for export. It undertakes to create conditions favourable to foreign capital investment. Besides, American citizens will be granted the most favourable conditions for commercial, industrial or

any other kind of activity. The Syngman Rhee 'Government' undertakes to transfer to America the material it needs and primarily military and strategic raw material, and to come to an agreement on "individual sections" of its economic plan, in other words, on all its economic measures. This treaty is a new act of the economic and political subjection of South Korea to American imperialists.

By utilizing the Syngman Rhee regime, the Americans have begun to extract its natural resources out of South Korea. They are exporting strategic raw materials—wolfram, molybdenum and other rare metals out of it. The entire ferro-wolfram ore is exported to America. From May to August, 1947 alone 87,070,000 *wongs* (4 wongs = 1 rouble) worth of lead, 39,200,000 worth of wolfram and 50,000,000 wong worth of ferro wolfram were exported to America. (*Korean Year Book*, Chosen Nenkvan, 1949, Pyongyang, p. 185)

While holding back Korean economy artificially in a state of decline, the American imperialists affirm that without the investment of American capital, South Korea is not in a position to solve the task of the restoration of economy. Under the cover of this colonizing theory, they have begun increasingly to import their capital inside the country; American companies have invested more than 750,000 dollars in the electrical industry of South Korea. All the coal mines of South Korea have already passed under their control. In the four Provinces of the South alone, three million dollars were invested by them in the extraction of non-ferrous metals.

An inevitable result of the colonizing policy of the USA is the deterioration in the life of the mass of people of South Korea. According to the official figures, the total number of unemployed in South Korea is 700,000 and according to an admission of the Seoul press, it has reached 2,790,000.

Inflation is rising. The gap between the excessively high prices of goods and the low wages is increasing more and more. Thus as compared with 1936, the prices in 1948 had gone up by 710 times while wages by 200 times (Ibid, p. 191). Speculation has assumed catastrophic dimensions and disorganized completely the economic life of the country.

The position of the peasantry is deteriorating. According to the figures of 1947, 63 per cent of the area under cultivation in South Korea belongs to the landlords, who comprise 3.4 per cent of the total number of farmers engaged in agriculture.

Rent, taxes, rice supplies to the Syngman Rhee Government and all manner of extortions take away a lion's share from the peasants' harvest and sometimes even exceed it. The collection of rice supplies is accompanied by force and by arrests. Their dimensions are growing continuously. Thus, in three years, they were increased twice over. The sowing area diminished by 31 per cent in comparison with 1944. The annual yield of rice also fell approximately to the same extent (Ibid, p. 190). South Korea which is the granary of the country is experiencing an acute and chronic shortage of food supply; its population is starving. At the same time, the profits of the colonizing companies and the incomes of the landlords are growing. According to official figures, the net income of the "New Korea Company", for a little more than two years, was 2,280 million *wongs*, (Ibid, p. 188) (4 wongs = 1 rouble).

In March, 1948, the American military administration issued an order for the dissolution of the "New Korea" Joint-Stock Company. According to this order, the land of the company had to be sold off to the peasants, having upto 2 *chon* of their own land. The peasants were bound to pay compensation for 15 years to the "Central Land Administration" that was created in the place of the Company. The American military authorities placed certain hopes on this measure. They timed it with the elections to the "National Assembly", calculating on deceiving the votes in the countryside with this "gift", but the peasantry of South Korea gauged unerringly the significance of this "reform". It was not in a position to pay for the purchase of the land. The peasant of South Korea, in an overwhelming majority of cases, is a



poor insolvent debtor. He is not able, nor does he want to pay for land which by right belongs to him, which in the North of the country has been distributed free of charge for perpetual use to the peasants. As one should expect, the land sold off fell into the hands of landlords and speculators.

The predatory colonizing actions of the U.S.A. are made more and more difficult by the resistance of the mass of people of South Korea. The anti-imperialist liberation struggle, headed by the working class and the Labour party is extending and growing inside the country. The movement against the American policy of dividing and colonizing the country, against the separate elections, against treacherous actions of the puppet Government has assumed the character of an all-people's liberation struggle for national sovereignty, for the unity of the country, for People's Democracy. The victories of People's Democracy in North Korea, ensuring the rise and development of people's economy, an improvement in the well-being of the mass of people, a resurgence of the national culture of the Korean people are a powerful stimulus to this struggle.

Already towards the end of 1947 almost all the 1,034 nationalised industries in North Korea were restored and put in operation. The production of more than 100 new types of products was mastered. The National Economic Plan of 1948 was fulfilled by 105.5 per cent. Industrial production rose by 45.9 per cent in comparison with 1947, and 3.3 times over as compared with 1946.

Released from the shackles of feudalism and serfdom, agriculture entered the path of progress. The sowing area increased in 1948 in comparison with 1945 by 15.6 per cent and the productivity of the main agricultural cultivation considerably exceeded the pre-war level. Improved irrigation installations were brought into service, which in their turn made it possible to extend the sowing area of the irrigated fields. In the beginning of 1948, 58 such installations were built and set into operation.

While in South Korea, just as under the Japanese rule, the main figure in the countryside is the landless peasant-tenant, in the North, as a result of the agrarian reform, the independent agricultural producer, free from the fetters of feudal and usurer exploitation, has become the main figure.

The existence of a democratic State power, representing the interests of the broad labouring masses of town and countryside, the nationalisation and steady development of the most important branches of economy, the broad support rendered by the People's Committees to the peasant farms, create extremely favourable conditions for the further progressive development of agriculture.

The Two-Year National Economic Plan of 1949-50 places before itself the aim of finally liquidating the remnants of the colonial past of the national economy and of overcoming completely its feudal backwardness. According to the plan, the volume of gross output of State industry in 1949, will exceed the 1946 level by 4.7 times and in 1950 by 6.6 times. In 1950, the output of the most backward branch of industry—machine building—will rise 33 times as compared to 1946. (The newspaper, *Teren Tyu Djiho*, 27-11-1948, Tokyo). In the sphere of agriculture, the plan has in view a further extension of the sowing region, the construction of irrigation installations, the raising of the yield-capacity and an increase in livestock cattle. The successful fulfilment of the Two-Year Plan is laying the firm foundations of the economic development of United Korea.

As a result of the profound changes brought about by the People's Democratic power in the economy of North Korea, the following main sectors have been formed: Socialized sector, which consists of State industry, transport, means of communication, banks and other credit institutions, State commerce and cooperatives; small commodity sector, including peasant farms, handicraft and a section of the small trade enterprises; private capitalist, embracing the private industrial and commercial enterprises. The Socialised sector occupies a leading role in the national economy. The output of State industry for 1947

comprised 83.2% of the total industrial output of North Korea (The journal *Atarasi Sekayi*—New World—Tokyo, March 1949, p. 20).

On the basis of the successful development of national Economy, the well-being of the people has improved. In June 1948, by a decision of the People's Committee, prices of nutrition products and of goods of wide consumption were lowered in the State and co-operative trade. The real wages of workers and employees rose considerably.

A national culture, expressing in content the deep popular and democratic changes which have taken place in the Northern part of the country after its liberation, is being reborn.

In North Korea, where there was not a single high school, there now function eleven high schools for higher education and 720 middle schools.

While for South Korea, the period between the summer of 1947 and September 1948, was characterised by the creation of a reactionary puppet "Government" set up by the occupationists and existing by grace of the American imperialists, for North Korea this was a period of consolidation of political and economic foundation of People's Democracy.

The daily friendly assistance of the Soviet Union, having created conditions for the consolidation and development of People's Democratic power in North Korea, ensured a rapid rise of its national economy, an increase in the level of the well-being and culture of the working people and opened the path for a further flourishing of economy and culture.

As a result North Korea became not only the centre of unification and democratisation of the entire country; it became a new base of People's Democracy in the Far East, which by itself was a blow to the aggressive plans of the U.S.A. and one of the clear indications of the sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system.

\* \* \*

The tremendous successes achieved by the people of North Korea were secured by the assistance of the Soviet Union and by the vanguard role of the working class in the democratic national liberation struggle of the Korean people. The combination of these two main conditions has led both to the victories of People's Democracy in North Korea and to the formation of a Korean People's Democratic Republic.

The Soviet Union which liberated the people of Korea from Japanese bondage, is a powerful factor in its free democratic development. In exactly the same way as the liberation of Korea from Japanese colonial oppression was a result of the great liberation mission of the Soviet Union, the successes of people's Democracy in North Korea became possible thanks to the assistance and support of the soviet people.

"Our people will never forget," wrote Kim Ir Sen, in his address to Com. Stalin, "that it was at the hands of the Soviet Army, led by you, that they attained not only liberation but also the opportunity of building their life on democratic principles. The freedom-loving people of Korea are overcoming all difficulties and obstacles in the path of the complete restoration of their sovereign State.

In many thousands of letters and speeches, the workers, peasants, teachers, doctors, artisans—the entire people of Korea declare:

“The dearest and most cherished thing that we possess, which we will guard and strengthen is the friendship with the great Soviet Union.”

Another conditions, ensuring the victory of People’s Democracy in North Korea and leading to the formation of the People’s Democratic Republic, is the leading role of the working class in the liberation movement of the Korean people and the unbreakable alliance of the working class with the peasantry.

The Korean people, who have languished for four decades under the Japanese yoke had even earlier conducted a struggle for national liberation. The clearest expression of this was the popular uprising of 1919 which was one of the links of the international revolutionary process, arising under the influence of the Great October Socialist revolution. But then, the people of Korea did not possess a militant, revolutionary leader. The working class was young and weak, and it did not yet represent an independent political force, capable of leading peasantry and other strata of the population behind itself. There was no revolutionary Party. The bourgeoisie and the semi-feudal elements, took upon themselves the role of leader not in order to lead the movement of the people but in order to decapitate and betray the movement by a deal with Japanese imperialism.

As distinct from this, after the Second World War, the leadership of the democratic liberation movement of the Korean people is in the hands of the working class and its party. It has passed over to a class, which is capable of fighting with utmost determination, consistently and to the end for national independence and against the attempts at a new colonisation, for the elimination of the ruinous results of Japanese rule, the elimination of feudal survivals and for People’s Democratic transformations.

The passing over of the leadership to the working class contributed to the further drawing in of the broad masses of people in the struggle since it is precisely the vanguard role of the proletariat which guarantees the realisation of the fundamental interests of the broadest sections of the people.

The Communist Party, which emerged from underground immediately after the liberation of the country from the Japanese, headed and united all the advanced democratic forces of the country, organized and rallied the democratic front and became the universally acknowledged leader of the mass of people.

In the conditions of Korea, what was it which caused the passing over of the leadership of the national liberation movement to the hands of the working class? It was, above all, the growth in the specific weight and influence of the proletariat inside the country, particularly in the period of the Second World War. However much the Japanese imperialists arrested the development of industry in their colony, the conversion of Korea into a military springboard against the Soviet Union and the pursuit of superprofits forced the Japanese ruling circles into extending the industry to a certain extent. And although this was a distorted colonial, industrial development, it was all the same inevitably accompanied by a growth in the working class.

The preparation for a war compelled the Japanese to implant new branches of industry in Korea, which were of interest to the Japanese war machine. Enterprises of military importance, linked with the concerns Mitsubishi, Noquti, Sumitomo, Mitsui and other Japanese concerns were created on the basis of the local raw materials.

The number of mill and factory enterprises, of manufacturing industry in Korea, comprising of five or more workers rose from 4,025 in 1929 to 6,298 in 1937 and the number of workers from 86,400 in 1931 to 167,100 in 1937. (Ghazdantsev, *Korea*, p. 417.)

The total number of all workers, including the mining industry, transport, etc., comprised of approximately 1,100,000 workers in 1938. (Ibid, p. 301)

War in the Pacific contributed in a still greater degree to the industrial development of Korea. Big metallurgical enterprises, automobile and even aeroplane plants made their appearance in the country. The shortage of military and strategic materials in Japan proper and the impossibility of its supplies from the South Sea countries forced Japanese imperialists to increase the extraction of the strategic raw materials in Korea and to develop war industrial construction there. The extraction of coal was nearly 8 million tons in 1944, the extraction of iron ore 3.3 million tons. Smelted cast iron, which amounts to 161,000 tons in 1933 reached 800,000 tons in 1943. In 1945, there were more than 30 ferrous metallurgical enterprises in Korea and more than 100 electric steel smelting furnaces and more than 20 factories of non-ferrous and light metals (Zaichikov, *Korea*, p. 98)

Their main part was situated in North Korea. According to the figures of the Japanese Governor-General in January 1945, the total number of workers in Korea amounted to 2,122,374.

With the aim of dispersing industry and relieving transport as well as to utilise cheap labour power and raw materials in the locality, the Japanese transferred, in the war years, a part of their big enterprises from Japan to Korea. All this stimulated not only a numerical increase in the working class of Korea but also its concentration in big industrial enterprises, and consequently, a growth of its organisation and its role and influence among the people.

Another reason conditioning the advance of the working class to the position of a vanguard of the national-liberation struggle, was the fact that the compromising national bourgeoisie of Korea had, by its many years of collaboration with Japanese imperialism, compromised itself in the eyes of the people and had finally been isolated from the people's liberation struggle.

The path of the Korean big bourgeoisie, which was closely linked with feudal landownership and with Japanese capital, was the path of the systematic betrayal of the national interests.

In his speech at a meeting of the students of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East on May 18, 1925, Comrade Stalin pointed out that with the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and dependent countries,

“the national bourgeoisie in such countries splits into two sections, a revolutionary section (the petty bourgeoisie) and a compromising section (the big bourgeoisie), the former of which continues the revolutionary struggle, while the latter enters in to a bloc with imperialism.” (J.V. Stalin, *Marxism and the national and Colonial Question*, L. & W., London, 1942, p. 215)

This also applies as a whole to Korea.

The big bourgeoisie and the landlords of Korea were specially drawn close to Japanese imperialism in the period of the Second World War. They called upon the people of Korea to support Japan in the war and strenuously mobilised the forces of the nation for the victory of imperial Japan.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> The figure of the leader of the Democratic Party of South Korea, Kim Son Su is extremely significant in this respect. A big capitalist and a landlord under the Japanese he was one of the leader of the political organisations created by them in the country, which had at their aim the rearing of religious sentiments for the Emperor and disuniting the mass of people, of exposing and isolating the most advanced revolutionary elements.

It is perfectly natural that this could not but undermine the influence of the Korean bourgeoisie among the people, could not but push it aside from the leadership of the national liberation struggle. The reactionary Korean emigres who had compromised themselves and broken away from the national-liberation struggle, attempted to play upon the contradictions between the imperialist powers in order to realise their own narrow mercenary ends.

On the other hand, the mass of people in Korea had the opportunity to be convinced through the experience of the preceding anti-imperialist struggle about the self-sacrifice and revolutionary consistency of the working class and its Party, which fought irreconcilably and determinedly for the general national interest of the people and the independence of the country.

The passing over of the leadership of the national-liberation movement to the hands of the working class, caused substantial changes in the character of the movement.

The experience of Korea confirms that where the working class stands at the head of the national liberation struggle, it inevitably grows over into a struggle for People's Democracy. For only the working class, as the most consistently revolutionary class, is interested in carrying the democratic transformation to completion, and in creating the necessary pre-requisites for advance to Socialism.

The bourgeoisie of Korea, which has been closely connected with landownership, has always feared the land reform. This is vividly confirmed by the position in South Korea.

It is precisely the working class which is interested in radical land reforms, liquidating the landownership of the landlords, emancipating the millions of peasants from landlord's and moneylender's bondage and contributing to the advance of the entire national economy of the country.

The Korean big bourgeoisie, owing to its class nature, its links with imperialism and with the feudal elements, cannot have any interest in the liquidation of the economic and political backwardness of the country, which it needs for the unhindered exploitation of the mass of people, which fact is also confirmed by its grievous activities in South Korea.

It is precisely the working class which is vitally interested in completely eliminating the backwardness of the country and the ruinous results of Japanese colonial rule. It is vitally interested in the realisation of those reforms and changes which ensure the genuine and not the formal independence of the country and ensure not formal but real democracy.

Headed by the working class, the anti-imperialist liberation struggle of the mass of people of South Korea against the American aggressors and their colonising policy, a struggle which did not subside for four years, is a struggle for People's Democracy, for the realisation of the same democratic changes that have been introduced in North Korea and which serve as a guarantee for the independence and unity of the country.

#### FORMATION OF A KOREAN PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The mighty liberation movement of the mass of people of Korea, headed by the working class was crowned by the creation of a Korean People's Democratic Republic. According to a decision of a

---

During the war in the Pacific, Kim Son Su persuaded the Korean Youth to enter the ranks of the Japanese Army voluntarily and "to die for the Japanese Emperor". He called upon the people of Korea to support all the war measures of Japan.

joint meeting of the leaders of the political parties and the public organisations of North and South Korea, elections to a single legislative organ of the country—the Supreme People’s Assembly, were held on 25<sup>th</sup> August, 1948. 99.7 per cent of the electorate of North Korea and—in spite of savage police terror—77.5 per cent of the voters of South Korea took part in the elections.

All sections of the Korean people—the workers, peasants, employees, handicraftsmen, artisans, traders are represented in the Supreme People’s Assembly. Thirty-two parties and public organisations of North and South Korea are represented in it.

The first session of the Supreme People’s Assembly adopted the Constitution of the Korean People’s Democratic Republic. In this Constitution were embodied the cherished aspirations of the Korean people. It gave legislative embodiment to the historic gains of the mass of people of North Korea and opened the path for a further development of the country.

On 10<sup>th</sup> September, 1948, the Supreme People’s Assembly of Korea turned to the Government of USSR and the USA with a request for the simultaneous withdrawal of Soviet and American troops. True to its international obligations, and desiring to speed up the restoration of Korea as an independent State, the Soviet Government thought it fit to meet this request. In December, 1948, the evacuation of Soviet troops who had fulfilled with honour the noble task of assisting the people of North Korea in the rebirth and democratisation of the country, was completed.

The reply from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, J.V. Stalin, to the appeal of the Chairman of the Ministerial Cabinet of the Korean People’s Democratic Republic, Kim Ir Sen, on the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the Korean People’s Democratic Republic says:

“The Soviet Government which unswervingly upholds the right of the Korean people to create their united independent state, welcomes the formation of the Korean Government and wishes it success in its activities on behalf of the national resurgence and democratic development of Korea.” (*The Soviet Union and the Korean Question*, Moscow, 1948, p. 84)

The Soviet Union and the People’s Democratic recognised the Korean People’s Democratic Republic and established diplomatic relations with it. This was of tremendous and decisive significance for the future destiny of the young Republic since in the strengthening of the friendly relations and ties with the Soviet State lay the guarantee of its independence, democratic development, and the progress of its economic and cultural life.

In their letter to Comrade J.V. Stalin, the Korean people write:

“The Korean people will in future strengthen the friendship with the Soviet people, a friendship which is the guarantee that the Korean people will be free and happy. The strengthening of the friendship among our peoples, cemented by the bright blood of the Soviet fighters, shed on the battlefields for the liberation of our country, is our sacred duty.”

The mass of people of Korea see in the mighty Soviet power a reliable bulwark of their freedom and independence. The agreement on Economic and Cultural Cooperation between the USSR and the Korean People’s Democratic Republic which was concluded in Moscow in March, 1949 signalises a further consolidation of Soviet-Korean friendship. It is the first equal treaty in the history of the Korean people. It not only corresponds to the vital interests of both the countries but also serves the cause of international cooperation, of peace and security in the Far East and in the whole world.

As is well-known, the United States did not respond to the request of the Korean people for the withdrawal of troops and for granting them the right to resolve their State affairs themselves. On the contrary, the USA attempted in every way to entrench itself inside the country. It once again thrust the Korean question at the session of the General Assembly. The notorious Provisional Commission of the UNO was once again sent to South Korea.

By raising a hue and cry about the withdrawal of their troops, the American expansionists are carrying on a reorganisation and strengthening of the occupation system in South Korea. The formation of an American Military Mission is nothing but a new organ of military occupation.

The penetration and domination of American monopolies in South Korean economy is intensifying. The treacherous activities of the Syngman Rhee clique, the intervention of American imperialists in the internal affairs of Korea, in whatever form it might be expressed—in the form of sending military missions, granting credits for arms or one-sided “aid”—all this only incites the hatred of the mass of people towards the enemies of Korean independence, towards the foreign plunderers and their proteges.

The struggle of the Korean people for the unification and independence of their country is broadening and growing. In May 1949, the democratic parties and organisations of South Korea turned to the Central Committee of the United Democratic National Front of North Korea with the proposal to form an All-Korea National Front, uniting all the democratic forces of the country.

The constituent session of the United Democratic Fatherland Front which was held in June 1949 ratified the programme of the United Democratic Fatherland Front and adopted an appeal to the Korean people with the concrete parties and organisations of the Northern and Southern part of the Republic, the entire Korean people, met the declaration of the UDFP with warm approval.

Mortally afraid of the plan of the peaceful unification of the country, the American puppets intensified the terror and repression. They attempted to foment the conflagration of a civil war. With the support of the American patrols, they adopted special measures for the strengthening of the South Korean Army, the police and the terrorist organisations.

But the Korean people’s will for the unification of their Motherland is unswerving. All the provinces of South Korea are enveloped in a partisan movement. The partisans are undermining the military measures of the Syngman Rhee clique, capturing ordnance stores with arms, destroying railway lines and dislocating communications. In the regions they have captured, they are creating People’s Committees, carrying out Land Reform and other democratic changes. The strike movement in South Korea is growing, the unrest among the peasantry is increasing.

None of the efforts, none of the roundabout manoeuvres of the imperialists and their agents is in a position to halt this movement, or to arrest the process of the progressive development of the infant Korean State, which was born as a result of the defeat of Japanese militarism in the Second World War, the unselfish assistance of the Soviet Union and the unprecedented rise of the national liberation struggle of the Korean people for independence and for People’s Democracy.

## THE PEOPLE OF VIETNAM IN THE STRUGGLE FOR INDEPENDENCE AND DEMOCRACY

By V.Y. Vasilieva  
Candidate of Historical Sciences

Inspired by the heroic struggle and the successes of construction in Democratic China, the people of S.E Asia are rising, arms in hand, in defence of their rights, for freedom and for an independent existence. The Republic of Viet Nam is marching in the front ranks of the fighting peoples of S.E. Asia. The three years of existence of the Republic were years of severe ordeals and difficulties for the Vietnamese people, but at the same time, they were years of overcoming these difficulties and of great victories in the path to liberation. It is in the conditions of a protracted colonial war that the Vietnamese people are waging a struggle for the final assertion of their independence and the creation of a people's Democratic Republic. It is in a difficult and complex situation, under conditions of almost incessant military operations, that the Republic of Viet Nam is realising its first steps on the path of democratic construction.

As a result of the defeat of imperialist Japan by the Soviet Army on August 17, 1945, the creation of an independent Democratic Republic of Viet Nam was triumphantly proclaimed by the League of Struggle for the Independence of Indo-China and a Provisional Government headed by the President of the Republic. Ho Chi-Minh, was formed. The Republic comprised of the territory of Tonkin, Annam/ and Cochinchina, inhabited by the Annamites. The territory of the Republic at the moment of its creation consisted of 328,000 sq. Kilometres out of a total area of 750,000 sq kilometres of French Indo-China, i.e., a little less than half the territory of the whole French Indo-China. The remaining areas of Laos and Cambodia, with a numerically small population did not join the Republic.

Twenty-two million people out of the total number of the 26 million population of Indo-China dwell on the territory of the Republic of Viet Nam.

Viet Nam's independence was not recognised by the French imperialists who opened military operations against Viet Nam. However as a result of the three years' war, the military position of the Republic was strengthened, Viet Nam stood the onslaught of the Anglo-French interventionists, who relied upon first-class American military technique. It put up a dogged resistance to the aggressors and is continuing to conduct successful offensive battles.

By the third anniversary of the proclamation of independence, almost the entire countryside, without exception, was in the hands of the Republic. The French succeeded in capturing only the big towns, the railway centres and certain mining districts. However, although considerable French armed forces are also concentrated here, the imperialists do not feel safe.

In his appeal to the people and troops on the third anniversary of the Republic, Ho Chi-Minh defined the territory controlled by the Republican Government as equal to 95 per cent of the entire territory, with a population of 20 million. Thus only 5 per cent of the territory of Viet Nam was in the hands of the imperialists. The troops of the interventionists are sustaining great losses in men. The Republic was able to organise an army of resistance which began to be formed already in the struggle against the Japanese occupiers, and now during the course of almost incessant battles, has been transformed into a big military force, both in respect of quality and quantity.

Viet Nam's regular army comprises of no less than 150,000 soldiers and officers. When the Republic had just begun its resistance to the Anglo-French interventionists, its arms were most primitive, consisting for the most part of knives and bamboo-sticks. At the present time, the Viet-Nameese Army is



supplied with modern firearms. It uses the weapons captured in the battles against the foe; the Government of the Republic has organised the production of arms and military supplies. In the factories and in the numerous workshops that have been switched over to war production automatic rifles, mines, mine-throwers and anti-tank grenades are being manufactured. The entire territory of the Republic is divided into ten military zones. The army representatives and representatives of the partisan ranks confer at regular meetings for an exchange of experience of struggle and for working out further plans of resistance.

The Republic was able not only to form a strong disciplined army, with fighting capacity and to furnish it with supplies but also to elaborate the tactics of a new war, which consists in the combination of military operations of a regular army with the operations of numerous and constantly fighting partisan detachments, which can also be rapidly organised once again at the approach of the enemy. These tactics are based on the exceptional mobility and manoeuvring capacity of the Republican Army, on its adaptability to the climatic conditions and knowledge of the locality.

The military forces of the Republic are not limited only to the regular troops. The partisan detachments, which have accumulated great fighting experience, also represent a big resistance force; they comprise of more than 300,000 fighters.

Both the army as well as the partisan ranks rely upon every kind of support from the majority of the population. Even the French invaders have been compelled to recognise the exceptional heroism and valour of the fighting Vietnamese people, which is manifested daily in big and small tasks. The French troops carry out savage terror on the population of those territories of Viet Nam temporarily captured by them. They burn those villages whose inhabitants are suspected of entertaining sympathy towards the partisans. They torture and execute the captured partisans. The French troops are employing more and more base methods to undermine the economy of Viet Nam. For example, in the province of Nam Din, north of Hanoi, the French "Amphibion" armoured cars trampled for several weeks upon thousands of acres of rice fields; in the provinces of a Hai Duong and Tai Ngyuen, the French troops burnt down thousands of barns of rice and destroyed hundreds of heads of cattle. In the provinces of Fun-En and Vin-En French aeroplanes shot down Viet-Nameese peasants who were fortifying river dams.

Beginning with the spring of 1947, the military operations in Viet Nam are increasing. The head of the French General Staff was specially dispatched to Indo-China with the aim of reorganisation and rebuilding the military forces of the imperialists, who were fighting against the Viet-Nameese people.

The development of military operations is undoubtedly bound up with the successes of the offensive of the Chinese people's Liberation Army. The northern part of Viet Nam, Tonkin, borders upon the province of Yunan, Kwangsi and Kwantung. The victorious advance of the Chinese People's Liberation forces in the South evokes fear amongst the imperialists. The French imperialists and their American masters think that there is no time to be lost and they are intensifying their efforts in the struggle against the Republic and are still reckoning on succeeding in smashing it.

It is necessary to take into account the fact that Viet Nam and Indo-China as a whole are included in the sphere of American expansion. In the first place, as an extremely suitable position for American expansion in S. E. Asia and in China, Indo-China interests the U.S.A. At the same time, the U.S.A. looks upon French aggression in Viet Nam as an integral part of the struggle of the imperialist camp against the national-liberation movement in the countries of Asia and the Far East.

American imperialists are not merely following intently the events in Viet Nam but are also actively intervening in their course.

The French reactionary newspapers write openly of American interference. For example, the French newspaper *Combat* wrote: "The representative of the State Department of the USA has affirmed that the American Government has many times conducted negotiations with the French Government apropos the Indo-Chinese problems." *Combat* also reported on the active participation of the USA in the formation of a puppet Government of General Ngyuen-Ksyu-An in Cochin-China and also in the "restoration" of the Annam Empire headed by Bao Dai, which the French imperialists are now attempting to establish in Indo-China.

The Republic of Viet Nam is existing and developing under the conditions of severe imperialist intervention, under the conditions of incessant war. And it is just because of this that the economic position of the Republic remains difficult as before and the results of Japanese occupation cannot be removed. The French administration and the years of occupation by the Japanese imperialists, have plundered and destroyed the economy of Indo-China. Indo-China has sustained dual oppression—that of French and Japanese imperialism. The economy of Indo-China was brought to a state of collapse. Direct military operations in Indo-China caused further damage to transport, to the ports and aerodromes. A great deal of transport equipment and oil installations were destroyed, mines were smashed and towns and plantations suffered. When the fight of the interventionists against the Republic of Viet Nam began, the military operations of the French interventionists placed the economy of Indo-China on the verge of a heavy economic catastrophe.

The Second World War led to a considerable weakening of the economic and political positions of French imperialism in Indo-China. In the pre-war period, Indo-China was a supplier of raw materials and food products to France and to the world market. The export of raw materials and foodstuffs out of Indo-China was a source of super-profits for all possible kinds of French colonial import and export firms which retained the entire trade of Indo-China in their own hands. During the Second World War and after it, the trade and production of many products fell considerably in Indo-China. Formerly, Indo-China produced nearly seven million tons of rice yearly, out of which it exported an average of 1,800,000 tons annually. Now the production of rice, even according to the official figures, has declined by a half. Indo-China produced nearly 70,000 tons of rubber yearly and the entire production for 1947 consisted of only 15-20 thousand tons.

The dropping out of a considerable part of the territory of Indo-China from the power of French imperialism and its passing over to Viet Nam and into the hands of the people, the attempt of the Republican Government from the very first days of its existence to reconstruct the economy of Viet Nam on the basis of an independent economic development—all this constitutes the biggest blow to the imperialist order, a new step of the formerly enslaved peoples on the path of their final liberation. All this testifies to a further sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system.

The Government of Viet Nam was forced to carry out democratic construction and democratic changes in the conditions of colonial war imposed by the imperialists. This has left its impress on the whole life of the young Republic of Viet Nam, and compels all the efforts of the people and the Government to be directed, above all, for repulsing the enemy who is the cause of the extreme difficulties of the Republic in the work of construction. It is only in the measure of the fulfilment of the most primary military tasks in the struggle for driving out the imperialist invader that the Government could go over to the solution of the urgent, national economic tasks, e.g. to the restoration of destroyed transport—the most important condition for the defence of the Republic and restoration of its economy. The Government set about the consolidation of the extremely disorganised finances, the introduction of currency reform, the reorganisation of the tax system, and in the first place, the poll-tax which always places heavy burdens on the toiling section among the population, was removed.

The democratic Government of Viet Nam paid special attention to improving agriculture—the basis of the economy of Viet Nam. As a result of Government measures, agricultural technique and, in particular, the rice cultivation improved. In the Ministry for Agriculture a special department of assistance to the peasants has been created, which gives money loans to the peasants. The State also renders assistance to the peasants by giving them working livestock.

The Republican Government has begun introducing land reform. The situation with respect to the land in the three regions, which form the Republic of Viet Nam is not uniform. Tonkin is a region with extremely dispersed small-scale landholding. The number of proprietors, possessing parcelled-out land upto one *mou*<sup>13</sup> and from one to five *mou* comprise 91.5 per cent. Till the Second World War, there went on an uninterrupted process of the peasants being deprived of land, and under the pressure of worsening economic conditions, they lost their last bits of land.

The main figure in the countryside in Tonkin and North Annam was the peasant-proprietor of a tiny piece of land, which could neither feed its owner nor his family. Much of the land was concentrated in the hands of the French imperialists, the local landlords, in the hands of the usurer and kulak sections in the countryside. The situation with respect to the land in South Annam was similar to the situation in Cochin-China. It was here that there developed notably the process of the expropriation of peasant landownership, and the big French and native estates were formed. In Cochin-China an enormous amount of land was concentrated in the hands of the French, who seized not less than 25 per cent of the entire cultivable land of Indo-China.

The central figure in the countryside of Cochin-China was the landless peasant sharecropper. The petty and middle proprietors in Cochin-China comprised an insignificant minority and were provided with small amount of land. Alongside this, 2.5 per cent out of the total number of proprietors in the Central and Western provinces of Cochin-China owned 45 per cent of the entire area of rice fields.

As yet there are no exact figures which would characterise the change in land proprietorship which took place during the years of Japanese occupation. The change proceeded on the lines of a still greater concentration of land in the hands of the landlords, the usurers and the village kulaks and the peasant masses losing land on a still greater scale.

The Government of the Republic in taking into account the importance and the acuteness of the agrarian question and attempting to lighten immediately the position of the peasant, introduced in the first place a reduction in the rent by 50 per cent. In many districts of the country, the rent, which was extortionate and far too heavy for the peasant, exceeded two-thirds of the harvest. This gave rise to a further impoverishment of the peasants and intensified their enslavement by the landlords and usurers. The Government of Viet Nam has also prohibited usury. The common land was re-alloted among the peasants. The common lands had once belonged to the village communes. When French imperialism began to rule in Indo-China, the common lands virtually passed over into the hands of the village top stratum; the village authorities and the well-off sections of the countryside seized them. In Tonkin in the pre-war period, 231,000 hectares of common land was conserved, i.e., 21 per cent of the land under rice, in Annam 25 per cent and in Cochin-China only 3 per cent of the whole.

The distribution of the common lands among the peasants deals, above all, a blow to all well-to-do semi-feudal strata, who virtually controlled these lands. In the conditions prevailing in Tonkin, it is essentially this measure of the Republican Government which alleviates the difficult position of the Tonkin peasantry since the new land area is assigned to a tiny peasant allotment. In Cochin-China with

---

<sup>13</sup> Mou is equal to 0.36 hectare.

the existence of an enormous mass of completely landless peasants and with a very small stock of common land, this measure cannot, of course, lead to any marked results.

The measures of the Government of the Republic, directed towards easing the conditions of the peasantry and improving the conditions of the peasantry and improving the conditions of agricultural production, open for the peasantry of Viet Nam the path to a new and better life. As a result of these measures, which have already begun to be carried out in practice, the position of the peasantry has begun to improve.

Even in the conditions of war, the Democratic Government of Viet Nam is paying great attention to the organisation of labour and the position of the workers.

The Government is helping in the development of trade unions. A General Confederation of Labour, uniting 250,000 organised workers has been formed. The trade unions control the execution of laws on labour through the formation of committees of workers in every enterprise and committees of employees in every institution. In actual practice, the workers of the Republic of Viet Nam work in a new way in the enterprises and plantations which are in the hands of the Republican Government. Quite often the workers have worked voluntarily and without remuneration over-time in order to increase war production. The workers are the soul of the military resistance. They not only themselves participate with enthusiasm in the reconstruction of the country, but also draw the broadest strata of the toilers in the struggle and in construction.

In the Republic there is developing the movement of patriotic emulation, which mobilises the efforts of the workers for resistance to the enemy and for a rise in production. The workers of Viet Nam are putting in all their energy in their work and are inspired by the task of the complete emancipation of their country from French, American and British imperialists, of the consolidation of the republican structure and its victory over the entire territory of Viet Nam.

The People's Committees are the basis of the new State system in Viet Nam. The People's Committee is the organ of power in every administrative unit—in a province, canton, district and village. The People's Committee are elected through universal elections with secret ballot. The members of the Committee carry out their work as social work, without receiving any remuneration for it.

The People's Committees render tremendous aid to the Government in carrying out all social and economic measures, and also in the sphere of the development of culture, notably in the fight against illiteracy. It is necessary to emphasise the fact that the Republic of Viet Nam has achieved great successes in the fight against illiteracy. Formerly, the percentage of illiterate people comprised approximately 85-90 per cent but after three years of the Republic existence, it has fallen to 40 per cent.

The achievement of the people of Viet Nam testify to the fact that the Republic of Viet Nam is laying the foundation of the People's Democratic State.

The fight for independence and democratic construction is being carried out by the people of Viet Nam under the leadership of the working class. The struggle of the Indo-Chinese people has passed through several stages in the years of the Second World War and in the post-war years. The progressive forces fighting consistently for the achievement of complete independence rallied together, and the exploiting classes and strata left the movement and took up anti-popular and treacherous position.

The rallying together of the national forces in the struggle against the Japanese occupationists found its expression in the formation, already in 1941, of the League of Struggle for the Independence of Indo-China, the Viet Minh, under the leadership of Communist Party. The Viet Minh was headed by the

leader of the Indo-Chinese Communist Party, Ho Chi-Minh. The Viet Minh united a number of progressive political parties, including also the Communist Party and a number of mass democratic organisations. The Viet Minh embraced the various classes of Indo-China, who aspired for national emancipation.

The slogan of nationalistic propaganda, proclaimed by the Japanese, found response chiefly amongst the feudal and semi-feudal elements, among the bourgeois top stratum, which had till the war been linked with the French colonisers and during war-time along with them served the Japanese invaders. All kinds of French and native businessmen and speculators grouped round the Bank of Indo-China, amassed enormous profits even during the war years and profited from the want and hunger of the toiling masses.

The activities of the Japanese occupiers, their rapacious plunder evoked the hatred of the majority of the Indo-Chinese population.

The creation, in August 1945, by the masses of the people of an independent Viet Nam, headed by the Viet Minh, was a further step in the consolidation of the unity of the people of Viet Nam on a democratic basis. The spirit and the leading force of the Viet Minh are the Communists. They are the directing force in the trade unions and other mass organisations. They are at the head of the struggle against imperialism and are carrying out democratic changes in the Republic.

At the head of the Government of the Republic is the oldest, most popular and beloved leader of the Indo-Chinese people, the founder of the Communist Party of Indo-China, Ho Chi-Minh. There are a number of Communists in the Government of the Republic.

The general elections in January 1946 to the National Assembly brought complete victory to the Viet Minh which won 230 out of the 300 seats. The remaining seats were secured by the parties which had not joined the Viet Minh (the split-away section of the Party Dong Min Hoi, Kuok Zan-Dang and other smaller groups that had not joined the Viet Minh).

In spite of all the efforts of the French colonisers to disrupt the elections, even in occupied Cochinchina under the conditions of the most brutal terror, 90 per cent of all the voters voted. The people, received for the first time in their history, the right of free participation in political life, and displayed an exceedingly high consciousness and political activity.

The overwhelming majority of the voters cast their votes for the Viet Minh which expressed the interests of the broad masses of people and is now the Government Party of the Republic. However, other parties and non-party are also represented in Ho Chi-Minh's Government.

At the moment of its formation, the Ho Chi-Minh Government elaborated a programme of immediate actions and measures. Its main points are: a determined struggle for complete independence and territorial integrity of Viet Nam, the consolidation of national unity, the extension and strengthening of democratic liberties, the reorganisation of area administrative government, a radical improvement in the workers' conditions of work the raising of their material well-being, improvement in the conditions of the peasants.

The National Front of Viet Nam unites the main masses of the Viet-Nameese people. The working class, the peasantry, the urban poor, the artisans, the intelligentsia, the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie have joined it.

The leading force of the united National Front of Viet Nam is the working class headed by the Communist. The working class of Viet Nam has rich revolutionary traditions. It is not accidental that the centre of the political life of Viet Nam is concentrated in Tonkin and Annam. Tonkin is the centre of the industrial life of Indo-China, the citadel of the working class.

Already the first world war laid the foundation for the development of the industry of Indo-China. With a relatively weak national bourgeoisie, there was formed here a national proletariat which was mainly concentrated in transport, in the light and mining industry, in the big towns and in the plantations belonging to the imperialists. The brutal colonial exploitation for a long time has been impelling the working class to struggle. The Great October Socialist Revolution was a powerful impetus for the advance of the national-liberation movement in Indo-China. The struggle of the Chinese people for independence and for a democratic development also contributed to revolutionising the toiling masses of Indo-China by serving as an example for them. With the twenties, a strike movement began developing in Indo-China. In 1930, there emerged the Communist Party of Indo-China, unifying the first Communist groups and organizations that had arisen since the twenties.

The emergence of the working class and its struggle laid the foundation for the mighty advance of the national-liberation movement in 1930-31. By the Second World War, the Indo-Chinese working class had acquired the experience of a struggle for the leadership of the national-liberation movement; at the head of the working class, as its guide and leader marched the Communist Party of Indo-China. The working class has fought and is fighting most consistently for the independence of the entire Viet-Nameese people. The proletariat marched in the front ranks of the popular movement of resistance to the Japanese occupiers, it headed the national democratic revolution and created a democratic Republic. It is leading the struggle against the French invaders and is the pioneer of democratic construction.

The working class is leading the vast masses of peasantry, interested in a radical change in the regime of colonial oppression and a solution of the land question—the most acute and fundamental question of the colonial revolution. The peasantry of Indo-China has always led a miserable semi-starved existence, since the tiny parcelled land, belonging to the peasant or the tiny parcelled land rented by him cannot feed his family. The position of the peasantry worsened extremely during the years of Japanese occupation and the intervention of the French imperialists which then followed.

In close alliance with the working class and the peasantry, which constitute the basis of the national front, march the numerous urban poor. The petty and the middle bourgeoisie and a considerable section of the intelligentsia also is drawn inside the National Front. Under the leadership of the proletariat, all these strata are waging a struggle against imperialist aggression and for the complete emancipation of the people of Viet Nam.

Though the struggle of the people of Indo-China is, in the first place, directed against imperialism and against its attempts to restore the colonial regime, nevertheless, the big bourgeoisie, frightened by the democratic character of the popular movement headed by the proletariat, has openly taken to the path of betrayal of its people.

At the time of the proclamation of independence, not only the big bourgeoisie but even a section of the feudalists were prepared to join the Republic, thinking that they would manage to retain their class domination in an independent Viet Nam and obstruct the development and the deepening of the revolution. But as soon as the People's Democratic character of the liberation struggle, led by the Communists, was defined, there began a rapid departure of the bourgeois-landlord "fellow-travellers" of the democratic Republic.

The compradore bourgeoisie, which has always been closely linked with the French imperialists and, at the same time, with the feudalists and the landlords, collaborated with imperialism and was its support in the same manner as the big industrial bourgeoisie which is numerically weak and has, at the present time, joined hands with the French occupationists.

All these exploiting anti-popular classes and strata are now also collaborating with the French invaders. They are utilising the difficult economic position of the Republic, by continuing all kinds of business deals and speculation in order to increase their fortune. They are helping the French imperialists in the struggle against the Republic of Viet Nam. It is from just these treacherous elements that the imperialists are forming the “puppet governments” in the territory of Viet Nam.

By utilising the top stratum of the bourgeois-landlord parties and groupings and through their Right leaders, the French imperialists are attempting to disrupt the national front. A section of the Party of Kuok-Zan-Dang, which had not joined the Viet Nam and in particular its Right leadership, as well as the pro-Kuomintang leadership of the Party of Dong-Min-Khoi, formed on the territory of South China in 1942 from among the Annamite emigres, are helping the French colonisers to realise their aggressive plans.

The entire policy of French imperialism in relation of Viet Nam is determined by a constant endeavour to stifle by all means the young and still not consolidated Republic, and to restore the regime of colonial oppression. However, the designs of suppressing the struggle of the Viet-Nameese people with armed force have failed completely; the war has become protracted, and victory and advantage passing more and more to the republic. The successes of the struggle of the people of Viet Nam and the difficulties of military suppressing the Republic have forced the French colonisers to pass over to a policy of intricate, treacherous manoeuvres, by means of which they hope, by round-about ways, to achieve the very same aim—the stifling of the republic. The Agreement of 6<sup>th</sup> March, 1946 was the first manoeuvre of the imperialists. In accordance with this, the French recognised the Republic of Viet Nam as a part of Annam and Tonkin, as an independent State with its Government, its Parliament, army and finances, forming alongside with other parts of Indo-China, the Indo-Chinese Federation, which was to join the French Union.

The question of the entry of Cochin-China, which was occupied by the French, as well as that of Annam and Tonkin, inhabited by the Annamites, joining the Republic was to be decided by a referendum of the population. As the sympathy of the population of Cochin-China was certainly on the side of the Republic of Viet Nam, and as the outcome of the referendum was clear to the imperialists, the French colonisers hastened to declare Cochin-China an autonomous Republic and set up a government, from among the landlords and the representatives of the national big bourgeoisie and obedient to their will, and intensified the military operations against the Republic of Viet Nam.

The reply of the people was a broad partisan war, embracing the whole of Cochin-China. The resistance of the people in revolt forced the colonisers to resort to new manoeuvres. The so-called *modus vivendi* was followed—the new provisional Agreement of September 14, 1946, in which the independence of Viet Nam was once again confirmed. This agreement provided for the cessation of military operations in Viet Nam and the resumption of negotiations for concluding an agreement on economic, political and other questions.

However, even in December 1946, immediately after the conclusion of this Agreement, the French imperialists did not for a minute cease to despatch more and more troops into Indo-China. They recommenced the war and are carrying it on to this day.

After the Government of Viet Nam declined the unsuitable and shameful “conditions of Peace” proposed by France in April, 1947, the French colonisers resorted to new manoeuvres and provocations. They decided to put back into Viet Nam, the former Emperor Bao Dai who dreamt of restoring the puppet Annamite Empire which had been abolished at the time of the creation of the Republic in August, 1945.

The imperialists began prolonged preparations to restore this French protege, on whom they placed great hopes as an instrument for disrupting the people’s liberation movement. The French colonisers attempted in every way to foment separatist sentiments in different parts of Indo-China, which was directed against the Republic of Viet Nam. The nationalistic groups, specially create by the imperialists for this purpose, put forward the demands for restoring Bao Dai.

Although the leaders of the seceded sections of the Kuok-Zau-Dang and the pro-Kuomintang Dong-Min-Hoi, formally came out against French imperialism, they, in actual practice, created in January, 1947, along with former Emperor Bao Dai and under the wing of the Kuomintang in Nanking, the so-called “United National Front of Viet Nam” around which all the treacherous anti-popular elements grouped themselves. It was here that the hostile actions, directed towards undermining the Republic and the unity of the people of Viet Nam were organised. The American imperialists sent their agents to this centre in order to operate, through it, against the republic of Viet Nam. The United National Front of Viet Nam, i.e., the front of the traitors and betrayers along with the newly-created police and nationalistic groups, was to become the prop of Bao Dai and his French masters.

At first it was decided to create a temporary “transitional government” of General Ngyuen-Ksu-An, the obedient executor of the wishes of the French imperialists. By creating, alongside the legitimate Ho Chin-Minh Government of Viet Nam elected by the people, the puppet “Government” of Ngyuen-Ksu-An, the colonisers wanted to deceive the world democratic public opinion, dupe the people of Viet Nam, split the national front of Viet-Nameese people, and undermine its power of resistance.

In the beginning of June, 1948, the so-called French-Vietnamese Agreement was signed between the former Supreme Commissioner of France In Indo-China, Bolaer, and Bao Dai, who spoke shamelessly in the name of Viet Nam” France, in accordance with the agreement with its stooge, recognised the “independence of Viet Nam” which joined the French Union. The puppet Government was obliged to conclude various agreements with France on economic, military, financial, cultural and other questions.

Apart from the officially published agreement, a secret agreement was concluded which was exposed by the Republican press of Viet Nam. Its main points were the following; Viet Nam was not to have any independent financial system. It could not pursue an independent foreign policy, it could not possess its own army. The Viet Nam police forces were to be under French control.

The “Government” of General Ngyuen-Ksu-An helped the French colonisers and their masters across the Oceans, with all their powers, to restore and strengthen their positions in Indo-China that had been weakened in the war years. But this so-called “Government” did not have any support among the people, among whom it evoked only hatred and contempt.

The French imperialists decided to replace this Government by Bao Dai, thinking that this trick would cause a bigger effect than the assiduous activities of the traitor Ksu-An.

Next, on March 8, 1949, the so-called “French-Viet Nam Agreement” was signed in Paris by the President of French Republic on the one hand, and the “Emperor” Bao Dai, on the other. Both the Agreements, that of 1948 and of 1949, are in essence not different from each other. According to the new agreement, Viet Nam will also be granted the so-called “independence”, within the framework of the



French Union. Viet Nam can have, with the consent of the President of the French Union, its representatives in certain States (they have in mind the countries of S.E. Asia). In Viet Nam a national army is to be created with French officers and French engineering and technical personnel. The General Staff of Viet Nam must be led by French guidance. Viet-Nam is obliged to purchase all war material for her army from France. Viet Nam must concede to France a number of strategic points. France retains all the advantages in the economic and financial spheres.

Is there any need to point out that with such an agreement, the colonisers want once again to tie Viet Nam to the chariot of French imperialism and to resurrect the regime of old colonial oppression there?

Finally, there followed the act which, in the opinion of the imperialists was “conclusive”.

Bao Dai, the roving “Emperor”, reared by the French Governor-General, returned to the part of the territory of Indo-China occupied by the imperialists in May 1949.

The French reactionary Press made all efforts to represent the Agreement with Bao Dai as a forced ‘concession’ and “compromise”. In actual practice, it is a document “formalising’ the restoration of the rule of the imperialists over Viet Nam.

The new Agreement evoked indignation among the people of Viet Nam. The military court of the Viet-Nameese Republic issued an order for the arrest of traitor Bao-Dai who was visiting Indo-China. Not long before this, the democratic Government of Ho Chi-Minh published a list of criminals and traitors of the Viet-Nameese people. Among them is also mentioned the head of the puppet “Government” Ngyuen-Ksu-An, who was subject to arrest and trial for betraying his people.

The democratic public of France also appraises these so-called agreements as a direct refusal by the French Government to settle French-Vietnamese relations in a peaceful way, with the lawfully elected popular Government of Ho Chi-Minh and approach them as a policy of further conducting the war in Viet Nam.

The events which took place in the Republic of Viet Nam show the growth in the political consciousness of the working masses. The Government of General Ngyuen-Ksu-An was still-born; even more still-born is the regime of Bao Dai, which is hated by the people. The people of Viet Nam are behind their lawful, genuinely popular Government of Ho Chi-Minh and are not ceasing the struggle even for a single day.

In spite of the compromise of the landlords and the big bourgeoisie with the imperialists, in spite of the treachery of the nationalistic groups and sections, the existence of a broad and stable unity of the people of Viet Nam, in the struggle against the French imperialists, is an undoubted fact, which is characteristic of the situation in Indo-China. This unity ensures the stability of the Government of Ho Chi-Minh which has constantly been leading the struggle of the people and the construction of the Republic from the moment of its formation.

The French imperialists also widely utilised the multi-national character of Indo-China and the tried methods of fanning national hatred and antagonism of one people against another. They exerted all efforts in order to contrapose Laos and Cambodia to the Republic, and retain them as “kingdoms” completely subservient to French imperialism. This was facilitated by the fact that the monarchist and semi-feudal elements, which represent a considerable force in Laos and Cambodia, have always been the prop of French imperialism, have always been closely linked with the French administration and have

always executed its will. However, the partisan struggle is also beginning to embrace Laos and Cambodia, where till now the French imperialists had considered their position to be firm and reliable.

The struggle of the people of Viet Nam shows that the basis of the French colonial system which has existed for more than 100 years is crumbling and that the crisis of the colonial system of French imperialism is deepening.

French Imperialism, at whose back stands Wall Street is unable to restore its position in Viet Nam. It is the American imperialists who are more and more openly taking to stifling the freedom of the people of Viet Nam and this is proved by the fact of the trip to Indo-China by Bullitt who had prepared the deal with Bao Dai. There is no doubt that the imperialists will also try in future by various ways and insidious methods to impede the movement of the people of Viet Nam towards victory.

The Republic of Viet Nam and its heroic people are and will be confronted with great difficulties and dangers. But the successes of the struggle of the Chinese people, the development of the struggle of the people of S.E. Asia, the support for the Republic of Viet Nam of all the progressive forces of the whole world, led by the Soviet Union are factors which facilitate the path towards victory.

## NATIONAL LIBERATION STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES OF MALAYA

By G.L. Bondarevsky  
Candidate of Historical sciences

The tremendous interest of British finance Capital in Malaya in the course of the recent decades is generally well-known. British capital investments in the Malayan rubber industry alone amount to 200 million pounds sterling. Of no less significance for the British financiers is also the tin industry of Malaya where, at the present time, as well as before the war two huge firms—the British Tin Investment Corporation and the London tin Corporation—dominate exclusively. The British financiers were also guaranteed their monopoly position in the world rubber and tin market before the Second World War by their influence in Siam, and by their big investments in the Indo-Chinese and Indonesian rubber industry. The whole of the tin extracted and the rubber produced in Siam was exported to outer markets through Malayan ports—Penang and, in the main, Singapore. Thus, in the field of these two most important forms of strategic raw materials, until the Second World War the British imperialists emerged as monopolists on the world market, while the U.S.A. is the main consumer of tin and rubber. The attempts of the American financiers and industrial circles to break the British monopoly through the construction of tin-smelting factories in the U.S.A. (the entire tin ore of Malaya and Siam was smelted in the British factories in Malaya), and to create a rubber base in Brazil and Liberia, were not crowned with success.

During the period of the Second World War, the position changed considerably; the Americans who were cut off from the main sources of tin and rubber as a result of Japanese occupation, invested nearly 800 million dollars in the construction of factories for the production of synthetic rubber in the U.S.A. In 1946, nearly 75 per cent of the rubber needed by American industry was obtained through synthetic methods, while till the war, 90 per cent of American requirements of rubber were provided for by Britain by way of supplies from Malaya. In the war years, the American Government financed the construction of a big tin-smelting plant in the town of Longhorn. In 1947, this plant manufactured 30,000 tons of tin ore of which a considerable part breaking the former British monopoly, came directly from Siam, where in the post-war period the Americans had strengthened considerably their economic positions and political influence.

British monopoly in the sphere of rubber and tin was considerably undermined. True, not completely because the synthetic rubber produced by the U.S. plants was more expensive than natural rubber and the tin mines of Siam were not able to fully provide for the requirements of American industry. Therefore, already in 1946 as a result of prolonged Anglo-American negotiations, the Americans once again began to purchase Malayan rubber and tin. In 1947 alone, the U.S.A. imported 457,000 tons of rubber and more than 20,000 tons of tin from Malaya. The cost of Malayan exports to U.S.A. amounted to 346 million dollars, which exceeded by 166 million dollars the cost of the entire British export to U.S.A. in 1947. Therefore the British Press with full justification called Malaya the “dollar arsenal” of Britain. One can understand the tremendous economic significance of Malaya in the strained balance of payment of “Marshallised” Britain.

Taking into account the general rise in the prices of raw materials, the British monopolists looked forward to considerably greater profits in 1948 than they had received in 1947. However, the British financiers had reckoned without the master. Wall Street did not in the least intend to increase the dollar cash of the British bank and lessen Britain's dependence on the U.S.A. Therefore, the American monopolists by threatening their British competitors to take to artificial rubber, to increase the purchase of rubber Indonesia (the great activity which Americans are displaying there is not without reason) and also to extend the extraction of tin in Siam, not only did not allow a rise in prices of tin and rubber but also as was pointed out by the Diplomatic Correspondent of the *Daily Worker* of July 26, 1948, it even secured a considerable lowering of prices of the two most important types of raw materials.

The British monopolists, who were compelled to subordinate themselves to American pressure as a consequence of the causes that have been pointed out as well as, as a result of the general intensification of Britain's dependence upon the U.S.A., attempted to transfer the costs of the unsuccessful struggle against their competitors across the ocean on the shoulders of the toiling masses of Malaya by lowering their wages, which were already very low.

But serious changes had taken place in Malaya during these past years. The organisation of the toiling people of the country had grown considerably. Nearly half a million members of the trade union had united in the all-Malaya federation of Trade Unions. Under the leadership of a militant Communist Party and the All-Malaya federation of Trade Unions, the working people of Malaya in alliance with the intelligentsia and the petty-bourgeoisie commenced an active struggle for their rights and their national independence. That is why the British rubber and tin monopolies decided to decapitate, with the help of the police and the armed forces, the national-liberation movement of Malaya before raising the question of lowering wages. Relying upon the agreement that had been secured in 1946 with the feudal top stratum of Malaya (expressed in the replacement of the so-called Malayan Union by the Malayan Federation and in the restoration of the rights of the Sultans of nine feudal princedoms) in London, they relied upon drowning the liberation movement in Malaya in blood, and on guaranteeing millions of super-profits for the rubber and tin monopolies.

The plans of the British imperialists found complete support and approval in Washington. In the measure of the growth of the national-liberation movement in the countries of S. E. Asia, the consolidation of the front of democracy and freedom in China and the weakening of the positions of Kuomintang reaction, the anxiety of the American politicians increased. It was particularly intensified in May 1948 when there appeared in Washington the alarming reports of American military experts on the catastrophic situation of Chiang Kai-shek's army and on the possibility of an onrush of Chinese democratic forces to the South.

The situation in S. E. Asia was discussed in detail in June 1948 at a regular gathering of the joint Council of the Chiefs of Staff in Washington. The American representatives declared for the quickest organisation of a *cordon sanitaire* in S. E. Asia, which would have to prevent the growth of the influence of democratic forces in this part of the world in the case of the final defeat of the Kuomintang regime and the victory of democracy in China. According to the reports of the *Telepress Agency* dated 22<sup>nd</sup> June, 1948, at this gathering the American representatives demanded from the British the defeat of the democratic forces of Malaya, the bringing about of "order" there and the re-occupation of the country by a considerable number of British forces. The American generals and diplomats considered that these measures would not only finally resolve the question of providing American industry with strategic raw materials of S. E. Asia, but would also prevent in case of "extraordinary events", the isolation of American military bases in the Far East and in the Pacific Ocean by ensuring at any time an approach of them from the side of S. E. Asia and would also guarantee control over Singapore.

Thus, on the Malayan question the interests of British and American monopolist coincided.

In realising the decisions of the Washington meeting of the Joint Council of the Chief of Staff the British Government in its turn adopted the decision of moving the main base of British Far East squadron from Hongkong to Singapore. There began simultaneously the accumulation of military units and armaments for the re-occupation of Malaya and for the destruction of the democratic forces in the country. The British bourgeois press of all shades and trends raised heart-rending wall about the "Communist" menace in Malaya and about the foreign intervention in the affairs of the country.

After so much of careful preparation, the British Colonial Power thought that in June, 1948, a most appropriate moment had been reached for dealing a blow to the communist party of Malaya and to the progressive trade unions which had joined the All-Malaya Federation of Trade Unions. At a signal from London and Singapore, all over the country there began raids upon communists, the smash-up of trade union organizations, the arrests and murders of democratic leaders.

It is clear that the bloody events in Malaya which began in June, 1948, and are continuing to this day, are not the result of the “Communist plot” as the British military and political leaders and the corrupt British Press are attempting to prove but are the consequence of pre-planned provocation, carried out at the dictates from London and Washington.

Even such a trumpet of imperialist propaganda as the Far Eastern correspondent of the London Times, Morrison, in his article published in the *Far Eastern Survey* (No. 24, December 22, 1948), is forced to state:

“An incontestable conviction is being developed that the Malayan communists were compelled to launch military operations earlier than they were prepared for them, i.e. it turns out (seems) as though they were drawn in the revolution.”

In preparing the attack against the toiling masses of Malaya, the British colonisers reckoned that they would be able within a few days to smash the Communist Party and the trade unions and finally to subjugate and enslave Malaya. However, the British imperialists had miscalculated seriously. They did not realise the serious changes that had taken place in S.E. Asia and in particular, in Malaya during the years that had elapsed. The years of struggle against the Japanese occupation had contributed to a considerable growth in the political consciousness of the peoples of Malaya and had assisted in the solidarity of her popular masses and given the first experience of partisan struggle. As a result, after the Japanese occupationists had been driven out of Malaya, the national-liberation movement already had a firm base among the masses of the people of Malaya, and was based on the political consciousness of the masses and possessed the experience of an armed struggle. If we bear in mind also the great influence of the communist Party, and influence which rose in the years of the anti-Japanese struggle, then the baselessness of the calculations of the British colonisers about dealing with the democratic movement in a short time becomes evident.

In reply to the attack of the British imperialists, the toiling people of Malaya under the leadership of the communist Party and the All-Malaya Federation of Trade Unions rose in defence of their independence. The liberation movement developed into an armed struggle of the peoples of the country against the British colonisers. In June, 1948, as a reply to the provocative actions of the planters of Perak, who had formed bands of cut-throats for smashing up the trade unions in the central parts of Perak, the first partisan units in Malaya were created from among the former members of the “Anti-Japanese Army of the Malayan People.”

The bands of ruffians were defeated by the people’s detachments. In the clashes of 16<sup>th</sup> June, there Englishmen—managers of the rubber plantations were killed. The British Colonial Power in Malaya finally secured the long-awaited excuse for intervention. The British press of Malaya and Great Britain began to screech about Communist uprising while the Governor of the Malayan Federation, Ghent, had already on 17<sup>th</sup> June granted to the police of Perak and other States of the Federation the right to arrest without trial and even to shoot at sight all those who “resisted the actions of the police authorities.”

Thus, the most violent colonial terror against the Malayan people received “judicial” sanction. The fact that the murder of the three Englishmen, which served as an excuse for the terror of the

colonisers was in actual fact a provocation is also recognised by Morrison, whom we have already cited and who in the same article in the *Far Eastern Economist* writes:

“The murder of the three British planters did not enter into the plans of the Communist leadership and was an accident.”

In the middle of June, partisan detachments also began to be formed in the principedom of Kelantan and in a number of regions, where the local police had been particularly rowdy.

The planters and the colonial army units were frightened. They demanded of the British Government the employment of most resolute measures and the dispatch of military regiments. Already on 22<sup>nd</sup> June the British minister for Colonies, Creech Jones, speaking in Parliament reported that the government had decided to liquidate the disorder at any price. It granted extraordinary plenary powers to the British colonial authorities in Malaya and sent military units there.

On the very day, it was announced in the Federal capital of Kuala Lumpur that there was to be a state of siege in the four main rubber-producing regions of Malaya. After two days, the State of siege was also extended to Singapore although it was perfectly calm there. The British colonizers calculated on thus dealing a powerful blow to this centre of the National Liberation movement of Malaya.

As a result, from 20<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> June, according to the official figures alone more than 800 members of the Communist party of Malaya were arrested in the big centres of Malaya. In the end of June, the state of siege was extended to the whole of Malaya. The police and troops were granted the right of shooting at sight any one who was found in possession of weapons. The Malayan police widely employed the draconian rights granted to them and hundreds of democratically-minded Malayan, Chinese and Indian workers were tortured and shot down in the police regions.

However, already the first days of June saw a noticeably significant extension of the partisan movement, which embraced the regions directly bordering on Kuala Lumpur. On 3<sup>rd</sup> July, 1948, the group of representatives of the rubber planters and tin monopolies visited Ghent, the Governor of the Malayan federation. These real masters of the colonial administration categorically demanded from Ghent the employment of the most fierce measures against the rebels and also the immediate bringing into action of the big military units.

Literally on the very day, the big Conservative papers in Britain published editorials containing sharp accusations regarding the inefficiency and uselessness of the British colonial administration in Malaya. The Governor of Malayan Federation, Ghent, well-known for his opposition to the policy of the Minister for Colonies with respect to Malaya, was urgently summoned to London for the next instructions. However, he did not succeed in flying to Britain. He was killed in Switzerland in an air catastrophe, resulting from circumstances that have not been explained.

Frightened by the revival of the movement of the people in revolt and apprehending the beginning of a general uprising, the British colonizers began demanding immediate military reinforcements. Gurkha regiments, mine-fusiliers, Yorkshire, Inniskilling and Irish fusiliers regiments were sent to Malaya in the course of July 1948 from Britain, the Near East, Malta, Ceylon and Hongkong.

Already in the middle of July these newly-arrived troops were directly from their ships, sent into action against the partisan detachments whose numbers had begun to grow and extend over the entire country. For reconnaissance and for dealing blows to the partisans from the air, the air force was widely utilised. For this purpose several squadrons of destroyers and bombers were transferred from Ceylon to Singapore and Kuala Lumpur.

In the second half of July, over almost the whole of Malaya there took place many engagements between the partisan detachments and the British military units. The most serious engagement took place in central Kedah, in the region of Balito, where the battle between the partisans and army units went on for 16 hours on 15<sup>th</sup> July. Serious engagements took place in all the provinces of Selangor, Perak, Negri Sembilan. A particularly tense situation was created in Johore, nearby Singapore. In this principedom there began simultaneously with the struggle of the partisans a strike of the workers of almost all the rubber plantations.

The alarmed and frightened shareholders of Great Britain could now no longer be satisfied with fables about the conspiracy of a small number of Communist in Malaya. In spite of the obstacles placed by the British censor, it has become clear even to the ordinary readers that unrest embraces the whole of Malaya.

In order to somehow explain away the situation that was developing and to save the British authorities from reproaches the *Reuter* agency and a number of British papers began, as has been pointed out above, to publish reports about “Cominform activities” in Malaya, about the co-ordination of the Communist movement in Malaya and Burma, about the help which the Malayan Communists were supposed to be receiving from outside. The Bangkok fables about the activities of the mythical League of South East Asia were again let loose.

All this anti-Communist propaganda reached its climax on 23<sup>rd</sup> July, when at a session of the House of Commons, Creech Jones declared with shouts of approval both from the Conservative as well as from the Labourite members that the British Government had sanctioned the decision of the Malayan colonial authorities for the immediate banning of the Malayan Communist Party.

The Minister for Colonies pointed out that he wholly supported the assertion of the British authorities in Malaya that the Communist Party bore the main responsibility for the present happenings inside the country and that it had carried out all the preparatory work for an uprising.

The Communist member of Parliament, Gallacher, spoke in reply to the Government, to the businessmen and officials of the colonies, who had gone to extreme lengths and to the conservative and Labour members who had let themselves go. He exposed “all this slander and attack against the working class of Malaya” and refuted the assertion that the Communist Party of Malaya was to blame for the disorders in Malaya. Gallacher pointed out that the disorders in Malaya are an expression of the frank and legitimate demand of the peoples of the country for the granting of independence to them. The events in Malaya, emphasised Gallacher, are a protest against the injustice done to toiling classes, who are demanding that the tin and rubber should be taken away from imperialists who control them and who exploit the people of Malaya.

As usual, the bourgeois Press attempted to blackout Gallacher’s speech. However, it reached Malaya and produced a very powerful impression there, as a symbol of the fraternal support of the British proletariat to the peoples of Malaya, fighting for their freedom.

Simultaneously with the banning of the Communist Party, the British authorities took the decision to ban other progressive democratic organisations also—the league of democratic youth, the Ex-Comrades Association of the Anti-Japanese army of the People of Malaya, and the League of Youth for the Struggle for the National Independence of Malaya. During the month preceding this, the British colonial authorities had taken the decision to disband the All-Malaya Federation of Trade Unions which was so popular among the working people and so hated by the planters.

Having organised numerous provocations and having drowned Malaya in blood, the British colonial authorities executed the orders of the British tin and rubber monopolies and the task set up by the bosses of Wall Street; they disbanded and banned the progressive organisations of Malaya.

However, the plans of the British monopolists were realised only partially; the banning of the Malayan Communist Party and the anti-Japanese Army of the Malayan People did not in the least signify their liquidation. On the contrary, going underground the Malayan Communist Party raised aloft the banner of the anti-imperialist struggle by uniting around itself the toiling masses of Malaya and the members of the former Anti-Japanese army of the People of Malaya, and came forward in an active struggle against the British colonisers.

It was no accident that in the many proclamations and leaflets issued by this fighting organisation, it called itself not the anti-Japanese but the Anti-British Army of the People of Malaya. In the second half of July, 1948, the military operations continued to spread. The partisan detachments attacked a big centre of the coal industry—Baty Arang and a large number of coal pits were put out of commission. Serious battles took place in the area of the tin mines and rubber plantations to the South of Kuala Lumpur, where the British commander was forced to concentrate two columns of British troops with artillery, tanks and aeroplanes.

In the last days of July when the unrest spread to the main centre of tin industry—Ipoh, the British command, on the demand of the tin concerns brought aerial descent units into action and mass attacks of “spitfires” were organised on the peaceful Malayan villages in the area of Ipoh, and big artillery reinforcements were ordered from the Near East.

The panic amongst the British planters and colonial authorities reached unheard of dimensions in the beginning of August. An all-Malaya meeting of the planters in Kuala Lumpur demanded the immediate despatch to Malaya of not less than two fresh divisions of regular troops, threatening otherwise to cease immediately the extraction of rubber with all the consequences for British export ensuing from it. And this being not enough, frightened by the unexpected result of their own provocation and machinations, the British colonial authorities demanded that the British Government should raise before the Australian Government the question of transfer of Australian troops from Japan to Malaya.

With the aim of working out concrete measures to crush the national-liberation movement, a big meeting was called in Singapore on 6<sup>th</sup> August of British military and civil authorities in S.E. Asia. The Commander-in-Chief of the British armed forces in Malaya—General Boucher and other top representatives of the British armed forces in S.E. Asia and also the Governors and representatives of the colonial authorities of all the British possessions in the region, took part in it.

On August 7<sup>th</sup>, the *Times* published an editorial devoted to the results of this meeting. In it, this organ of the City pointed out that the aim of the coming invasion of Malaya is “the suppression of the forces of the Communists in Malaya, which will mean a heavy blow to Communism throughout Asia. If a defeat can be inflicted on the Malayan communists, then all the forces which give rise to the unrest and disruption that is taking place at the present time in Burma, Siam and in the Dutch East Indies will receive a blow. This will clear the path for the economic and political rehabilitation of these countries, which is being carried on in collaboration with the Western Powers who expect aid and a balancing of their budgets from this part of the world.”

It is difficult to express more clearly the aims of the British monopolists. It turns out that the question is not of the mythical menace of Communism but of the desire to once again subjugate the peoples of S.E. Asia to their power, to convert this area into a vast reserve of raw materials and dollars for the Marshallised countries of Western Europe.



However, the bellicose declarations of the British generals and the still more bellicose articles of the British papers did not frighten the peoples of Malaya. In September, 1948, the partisan movement embraced two-thirds of the country.

The British Government adopted an extraordinary decision. Two-Guard brigades were sent to Malaya. Never before in the history of Britain have the Guards been sent to the colonies in times of peace. At that very time, two squadrons of the latest reactive-destroyers with rocket equipment were sent. The Attlee-Bevin "Socialist" Government decided to employ also other methods of fighting the people of Malaya. According to the report of the special correspondent of the *Daily Worker*, the British authorities acquired wolf-hounds, specially trained for hunting men in the Hitlerite concentration camps. These dogs were transported to Singapore to hunt down the partisans. But even this turned out to be inadequate for the Labourite colonisers who were running riot. The progressive public of the whole world was literally stunned by the report that, at a special directive of the British Government, the savage inhabitants of Borneo, the Dyaks, were conveyed in aeroplanes from Sarawak to Singapore. According to a report of the Reuter agency, the Dyaks were intended for the organization of special detachments which were to track down the partisans in the Malayan jungles. The main weapon of the Dyaks were the special blow-pipes, from which they released poisoned darts. This weapon was conveyed from Sarawak to Singapore by a special plane. From rocket destroyers and the latest tanks to wolf-hounds and poisoned darts—such were the methods of fighting employed by the British "Socialists" against the peoples of Malaya.

In order to frighten the population of the country, towards the end of September the British colonial authorities began to conduct mass public executions of the partisans who had been taken captive, employing the method of "psychological attack", namely, one with British aeroplanes scattering tens of thousands of leaflets depicting the mutilated head of the murdered leader of the Malayan partisans, Liew-yau, who had proved himself to be a courageous fighter and a splendid organiser of the masses of people.

However, nothing helped. The movement against the colonisers continued to grow. The British colonisers attempted to mobilise Malayan feudal reaction against the peoples of the country. There appeared at the courts of all the nine Malayan Sultans, special representatives of the ministry for Colonial Affairs. They promised the Sultans a number of additional concessions, granting some of their demands in exchange for support for the struggle of the colonisers against the national-liberation movement. The reactionary Muslim clergy mobilized and it began to set the Malayan Muslims against the Chinese. It was with this very same aim that the experienced provocateur, the former Commissioner of the Palestine police, Gray, was sent to Malaya. He began immediately to operate in the Palestine style by organizing clashes between the Malayan and Chinese groups of the population. In accordance with the agreements with the feudal rulers, Gray and his henchmen set about organizing a band of provocateurs, who distributed themselves amongst the partisan detachments. These traitor cut-throats were set the task of establishing contact with the partisans and thus betraying the location of the partisan detachments to the British command.

In October, 1948, with the arrival of the Guards, the total number of British troops in Malaya exceeded 50,000 and thus the British were compelled to employ against the peoples of Malaya considerably more forces than they had employed in their time against the Japanese in this very theatre of military operations. The number of partisan ranks towards the end of 1948 did not exceed twenty thousand members even according to the figures of the British bourgeois press. But all the same, the British colonisers were not able to achieve any decisive successes.

In February, 1949, it became evident that in spite of the extensive military operations of troops supplied with modern arms, the British colonisers were not able to defeat the partisan detachments of the Malayans and the Chinese and at the price of considerable sacrifices, could only squeeze the fighting

units of the Malayan patriots out of the southern part of Malaya and in particular out of Johore into the central and north-western part of the peninsula. A debate in the House of Lords was held in February, 1949, on the situation in Malaya. The Labourite Lord Elibank was forced to admit that the situation in Malaya had deteriorated. He emphasised that “our prestige and our positions in the Far East are at stake.” The Conservative Lord Shankfort declared: “It is difficult to understand what is happening in Malaya today. One thing is clear—we are not winning.”

In concluding his speech, he emphasised that the military operations in Malaya cost the British exchequer 35,000 pounds daily. Lord Hurley (Independent) was also forced to admit that “there were almost no successes in Malaya.”

A still more concrete declaration on the state of affairs in Malaya was made in the House of Commons on 8<sup>th</sup> February, 1949 by the Labourite Longden, who pointed out that “the Malayan population was more favourably inclined towards the rebels than towards the Government.”

A no less pessimistic appraisal of the situation of the British colonisers in Malaya was given by the newspaper *Yorkshire Post*, which is closely connected with the leadership of the Conservative Party. In its leading article, devoted to the situation in Malaya (19<sup>th</sup> February) it noted that although the total number of British troops and police in Malaya had risen to 70,000 they had not succeeded in winning victory over the partisans. The article pointed out that the partisan detachments had the opportunity of making up for their losses by considerable reinforcements from the local population.

The Singapore correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* and *Morning Post*, Buckley, also testifies to the fact that the losses of the partisans in the military operations against the British armed forces were not great. In an article published on 16<sup>th</sup> May, 1949 he estimates the possible losses of the partisans to be 20 per cent of their total number. He emphasises that the only result, achieved by the British Command at the end of a year's struggle against the partisans and at the cost of heavy human and material sacrifice is that the main forces of the partisans were forced to retreat to the central part of the peninsula, mainly in the direction of the Siamese border. Thus, the first five months of 1949 did not bring any victory to the British imperialists in their struggle for the enslavement of the peoples of Malaya. Being unable to achieve victory in the struggle against the partisans the British colonisers began employing ruthless repression against the defenceless, peaceful inhabitants of the peninsula. According to the figures of Lim—the Editor of the bulletin, *The Malayan Monitor*—during the one year of war operations in Malayan, the British imperialists hanged 75 and shot down more than 500 fighters for freedom. Two thousands three hundred Malaysians and Chinese were exiled from Malaya only for being suspected of sympathising with the partisans. On that very same charge, eleven big villages were burnt down by the British colonisers; nearly 7,000 Malaysians are languishing in concentration camps. The British colonizers in their hatred towards the democratic forces of Malaya went to this extent that from 1949 they began to exile and to hand over the families of the Chinese settlers who were fighting in the ranks of the partisans to the Kuomintang authorities.

However, neither the gallows nor torture can break the will of the Malayan people. The manifesto published recently by three organizations participating in the struggle for national liberation—the Organisation of the Fighting Youth, the Peasants' Union and the Women's Federation—points out:

“British imperialism has completely exposed its fascist character by shooting down the village population by the bombardment of the countryside and the driving away of people from their homes.”

In conclusion, the Manifesto says that although the struggle against imperialism will be a prolonged one “victory is with us because British imperialism is getting weaker and becoming more and

more isolated, while we are becoming stronger, since our struggle is a revolutionary war for the liberation of our country and our people.”

Being unable to achieve the defeat of the democratic forces through military methods, through terror and intimidation, the British imperialists made an attempt to disrupt the national-liberation movement by compromising with certain circles of the Malayan and in particular, the Chinese petty and middle bourgeoisie. Already on November 10, 1948, during a debate in the House of Lords on the Malayan question, Lord Listowel acting for Creech Jones reported on a number of reforms which the British Government intended to introduce in Malaya. As one of these, he pointed to the possibility of a unification of Singapore and the Malayan Federation. The separation of Singapore from Malaya was one of the most important aims of the British colonisers at the time when they had put forward the plan of forming a Malayan union and later the Malayan Federation. Now the British Minister for Colonies was forced to raise the question of a possible unification of Singapore and the Malayan Federation. It is perfectly evident that it was only the growth of the national-liberation movement in the country which compelled the British imperialists to change their stand on this question. A characteristic proof of the people’s successes in Malaya is the speech (20<sup>th</sup> April, 1949) made at a meeting of the London branch of the League of Young Conservatives by Mancroft, a prominent leader of the Conservative party who had recently returned from Malaya. Mancroft declared: “We will be glad to see Malaya within the Commonwealth of Nations as an independent dominion.” Surely this is an indication of the anxiety of British imperialism for its position in Malaya. Such a declaration testifies to the fact that the British ruling top stratum, having sustained defeat in its policy of employing the knout in respect of Malaya is now attempting to pursue the policy of honeyed words.

The British colonisers made the usual attempt to split the trade union movement in Malaya and through this make the struggle of the Malayan proletariat more difficult. At the end of February, 1949, at the dictates of the British authorities a conference of the representatives of yellow trade unions was called in Kuala Lumpur. The leader of the Malayan feudal reaction, Dato Onn Bin Jaffar, who had secured from the British the post of Prime Minister of Johore spoke at this conference. Jaffar pointed to the necessity of uniting within a new Federation of trade unions all the “moderate” elements in the working class and trade union movement. Jaffar’s speech was the beginning of a big campaign of provocation by the British colonisers. In order to further this campaign “trade union advisers” were sent from Britain who had actively joined in all measures directed towards splitting the trade union movement.

However, no quislings were found among the Malayan working people. The yellow unions were boycotted and the All-Malayan Federation of Trade Unions which was disbanded by the British and had gone underground enjoyed tremendous authority and popularity as before. The British made attempts to physically wreak vengeance on the leaders of the All-Malaya Federation of Trade-Unions. In March, 1949, the President of the All-Malaya Federation, Ganapathy, an Indian was captured, put under arrest and tortured. Ganapathy’s arrest and the sentence of death passed on him for alleged possession of a revolver, evoked tremendous indignation of the public in the countries of the East and in particular in India. This compelled the Indian Government, after fruitless efforts at securing from the British authorities in Malaya commutation of the sentence, to turn with a corresponding request to the Minister for Colonies in London. In spite of the promise of the Minister for Colonies to consider this question, Ganapathy was executed on 3<sup>rd</sup> May. Ganapathy’s execution evoked a still greater outburst of indignation. In India there began mass protests and it is characteristic that the Indian public connected the disdainful attitude of the British authorities to the request of the India Government in respect of Ganapathy with the lowering of India’s prestige, brought about by Nehru’s acceding to allow the country to remain within the British “Commonwealth of Nations.” The Acting-General Secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress, Manek Gandhi, declared on 5<sup>th</sup> May, at a crowded meeting in Bombay that Ganapathy’s execution is “the first result of the fact that the Nehru Government was subservient to British imperialism and had agreed to retain India within the “Commonwealth of Nations.” A prominent member of the

Socialist party of India, Ashok Mehta declared: “The tragedy of Ganapathy hangs like a load in the Commonwealth chain recently forged in London.”

However, the British colonisers were not content with the vengeance wrought against Ganapathy. In the beginning of May, the Indian, Veersenan, who succeeded Ganapathy to the post of President of the All-Malaya Federation of Trade Unions was shot down.

Neither the repression of the British imperialists, nor the provocation of British agents, nor the military operations of the British armed forces could break the resistance of the working people of Malaya. The armed struggle against British imperialism is continuing. In the beginning of November, 1949, more than 40 per cent of the territory of Malaya was an arena of fierce battles between the partisan detachments and the British armed forces. In the princedoms of Pahang, Perak and particularly in Kelantan and Keddah, vast territory is under the direct control of the Malayan partisans.

It is true that the partisans have not succeeded in forming a contiguous territory of liberated regions. Nevertheless, the British armed forces, numbering more than 75,000 and equipped with the most up-to-date fighting technique were not able to defeat the partisans of Malaya in a year.

It is difficult to describe the brutality let loose by the British colonisers. The correspondent of the reactionary American paper, *Christian Science Monitor*, writes in an article published on 1<sup>st</sup> April 1949: “The troops bombard, machine-gun and raid villages, inhabited by the peaceful natives, if there is suspicion that Communists are hiding in the village. The troops shoot down men carrying prohibited weapons, they throw into prison the inhabitants suspected of radical leanings (for this no proof is demanded) and banish the population of entire Chinese villages by directing the inhabitants into Kuomintang China.

The struggle continues. The heroic Malayan partisans—Malays, Chinese, Indians—enjoy the widest support of the entire population of the country. This explains the surprising fact that for more than one year 20,000 partisans have been resisting the British armed forces, which exceed their number by many times and are defeating all the provocations of the British colonisers and local Malayan reaction.

In Malaya, the people’s liberation war is taking place against British imperialism. The leader of the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples is undoubtedly the heroic proletariat of Malaya, whose numerical strength as distinct from the other countries of S. E. Asia, is quite big and amounts to (along with the workers of the rubber plantations) 10-12 per cent of the country’s population.

The most important reasons determining the success of the struggle of the peoples of Malaya against the British colonisers are the solidarity and organisation of the proletariat of Malaya and in particular of the workers of the mining industry, the tremendous authority and popularity enjoyed inside the country by the Communist Party of Malaya, which has been able to rally not only the industrial proletariat but also tens of thousands of farm labourers, and permanent and seasonal workers of the plantations. The correct policy of the Communist Party of Malaya on the agrarian question and the national question contributes in no small degree to the successes of the democratic movement and to drawing in the broad masses of the peasantry in it, and uniting for the first time in the history of Malaya, the Chinese, Malayan and Indian population inside the country.

Of course, one must not think that the British ruling circles have given up the idea of enslaving the peoples of Malaya. On the contrary, at present with the tremendous growth of the national-liberation movement over the whole of S.E. Asia and in particular with the remarkable victories of the democratic forces in China, the British and the American imperialists who are standing at their back (on the Malayan question, they act in conjunction) will exert all their forces in order to suppress the national-liberation

movement of the peoples of Malaya. In acting jointly with the American imperialists against the national-liberation movement in Malaya and creating a *cordon sanitaire* on the borders of China, the British colonisers are pursuing their own aims in Malaya. Behind the clamour of a struggle against Communism on the north-west borders of Malaya, the British by establishing contact with the reactionary regime of Pibul Songgram in Siam, are attempting to strengthen their positions in that country, positions which have been shaken as a result of the growth of American influence. This tendency became particularly noticeable very recently when British military experts visited Bangkok and numerous British "Liaison Officers" appeared in the regions of Siam bordering on Malaya.

It is necessary to point out also to the economic background of the events in Malaya. One of the reasons of the Malayan conflict was the attempt of the British ruling circles to secure a considerable reduction of wages and of the living standards of the toiling masses and, at the same time, to increase the profits of the British rubber and tin monopolies after defeating the democratic forces in Malaya.

Such is the situation in Malaya. In spite of all the measures of a military and political character, British imperialism has not succeeded and will not succeed in breaking the will for victory of the peoples of Malaya. The struggle of the peoples of Malaya for the freedom and independence of their country which they are waging under the leadership of their Communist Party and with the support of progressive people all over the world, is continuing and has all chances of complete success.

MANOEUVRES OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM IN CEYLON  
[ON THE QUESTION OF GRANTING CEYLON THE STATUS OF A BRITISH DOMINION]

S. V. Pokrovsky  
Candidate of Historical sciences

Situated close to the peninsula of Hindustan on the sea routes linking Europe to the countries of S.E. Asia and the Far East, Ceylon occupies an important strategic position in the Indian Ocean. During the Second World War Ceylon played a big role as a strategic spring-board for the Anglo-Americans in S.E. Asia.

The area of Ceylon is 70,000 sq. kilometres; the number of its population, according to the figures for 1946, is 6,658,899 people.<sup>14</sup> The population of the island is not uniform in national composition and in religious affiliations. It is particularly important to note this, since the disunity of the different national and religious groups in Ceylon serves as a favourable basis for the implementation of the basic principle of British colonial policy: “divide and rule.” The British colonisers are artificially setting the different national groupings one against another and are diverting their attention from the struggle against British imperialism.

The population of Ceylon consists in the main of Singalese (nearly 4 million), Tamilians (nearly 1.5 million), Maoris (nearly 400,000), and the so-called burgers (nearly 40,000), the descendants of the assimilated Dutch colonisers who ruled over Ceylon from 1658 till 1795. The oldest among the dwellers of the islands, Vedda, only consist altogether of a few thousands. Europeans in Ceylon (in the main British) number 11,000.

The division of the population into religious groups almost coincides with its ethnical division. The religion of the Singalese is Buddhism, of the Tamils—Hinduism (Shivism), of the Maoris and Malays—Islam. Christianity, in the main in the form of Catholicism, began to be forcibly implanted already in the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century by the Portuguese who were the first European invaders of Ceylon. The present-day class structure of the population of Ceylon is characterised by a preponderance of the small peasantry, of which a great part rents land on the basis of share-cropping from local semi-feudal landlords and Buddhist monasteries. But the main and the best part of the land was seized by the British for their plantations. Alongside the British bourgeoisie from the beginning of the twentieth century, there gradually grew a national bourgeoisie. In this period little by little a national proletariat was formed and consolidated. Thanks to its class consciousness and organisation after the Second World War the working class became a serious force, playing a conspicuous role in the political life of Ceylon and in the leadership of the national-liberation struggle of the people of Ceylon.

Ceylon's economy is a typically colonial economy. Commanding positions are in the hands of the British. In 1933 there were 193 European (predominantly British) companies with a capital of 702 million rupees, out of which 488 million rupees were invested in plantations. There were also large investments of other foreign and, in particular, of American capital.

British imperialism converted Ceylon into an agrarian and raw-material appendage of the metropolitan country whose monopolies subordinated the economic development of the island to their own interests. But, developing for the most part the production of industrial crops, the British colonisers showed entirely no care for the urgent needs of the population. The production of tea, rubber and coconut for export did away with other agricultural crops. Food-stuffs were imported from other countries, mainly from India. The surplus of cheap labour-power—in particular of Indian coolies—and the regime of the most savage exploitation of the native workers is enabling the planters to extract

---

<sup>14</sup> Statesman Yearbook, 1947, p. 181.

colossal profits. To this day, forced labour is employed in the plantations. The native workers and peasants live in perpetual misery.

Till the Second World War the product of the plantations in Ceylon was imported into Britain and the countries of the British Empire. As a consequence of the general weakening of the position of British imperialism during the war and after it the role of the USA in the external trade of Ceylon increased sharply. And in spite of the fact that trade with the countries of the British Empire still retains first place in the external trade balance of Ceylon, still its share is decreasing while the share of the USA is gradually increasing. While the share of Britain in the import of Ceylon in 1938 consisted of 21 per cent and in 1946 of 19 per cent, the share of the USA in import in 1938 was equal to 2 per cent and in 1945 already 13 per cent. Britain's share in the export of Ceylon reached 54 per cent, occupying the second place after Britain.

The lop-sided nature of economic development of Ceylon is also demonstrated in the fact that British capital has not developed industry to any considerable extent, even the reworking of local raw material. In spite of the diversity of minerals in the soil of Ceylon, mining industry was practically absent.

It was only during the Second World War, when the industry of the metropolitan country was reorganised on a war basis and Britain had to reduce her export sharply, industry began developing partially in Ceylon and in the main light industry—textile, footwear and food-stuffs. In this industry the capital of the national bourgeoisie of Ceylon is beginning to play a big role side by side with British capital. American capital has also struck root here and is not without success.

The development of industry as a result of the war situation led to an immeasurable growth in the incomes of the capitalists and feudal landowners of Ceylon. At the same time the position of the toiling masses deteriorated sharply as a result of the intensified exploitation, the rise in prices and fall in the standard of real wages. Thus the index of the cost of living, even according to the official minimised figures, rose from 110 in 1939 to 129 in 1941, to 183 in 1942 and to 204 in 1944.

In the first place the one-sided development of Ceylon's economy tells upon the toiling population of the island. This manifested itself particularly during the Second World War (1939-1945) when less number of products of nourishment and articles of wide consumption were imported and the partial development of local light industry did not cover the requirements. The growth of impoverishment along with the intensification of the exploitation of the industrial and plantation workers, the dockers and the poor peasantry evoked a wave of economic and political strikes.

The fall in the "boom" caused by the war situation led to a still greater intensification of the exploitation of the toilers, to a still greater growth of prices, to an increase in the index of the cost of living, to the growth of unemployment, to the further impoverishment of the toiling masses and to a deterioration in their living standards. Thus, according to a *Reuter* report dated 2<sup>nd</sup> Feb. 1949, as a result of the strikes in the rubber industry of Ceylon, 200,000 workers of this branch of industry are constantly menaced by unemployment. The trade balance of Ceylon is deteriorating. For example in 1946, the value of exports consisted of 265 per cent (1938 = 100) and the value of imports 423 per cent.

The economic changes, taking place in Ceylon during the years of the Second World War, had a serious influence on the general political situation in the island.

The most important happenings in the course of the war were the change in the correlation of class forces in Ceylon and the advance of the national-liberation movement. The intensification of the class struggle and the growth of the national-liberation movement are the basic factors characterising the present-day political life of Ceylon. The numerical growth of the working class and its organisational and

political consolidation are converting it at the present time into a great political force, heading the struggle against the foreign domination, the local landlords and the big bourgeoisie. While the working class is more and more winning a leading role in the national-liberation movement, the Ceylonese bourgeoisie, not to speak of the landlord and clerical circles, is deserting the struggle for national independence by selling the country and entering into an agreement with British and American imperialists against its own people.

There are several political parties in Ceylon. The communist Party was formed as an organisation in July 1942 out of the United Socialist Party of Ceylon formed in 1940. Coming forward under the slogans of the nationalisation of the property of the British capitalists (mills, plantations, banks, etc.), The immediate withdrawal of British troops and the transfer of all British military bases from Ceylon, and by demanding the implementation of genuinely democratic transformation it rapidly gained authority amongst the broad masses of the toiling population and, in particular, amongst the industrial and plantation workers and the poor peasantry. The Communist Party has a powerful influence in the Federation of Trade Unions. The leaders of the Party are its General Secretary, Peter Kueneman, and Vaidialingam, The General Secretary of the Federation of Trade Unions.<sup>15</sup> The Communist Party has its representatives in the parliament of Ceylon. The leader of the Communist fraction in the parliament is the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Ceylon, Peter Kueneman. The Communist Party of Ceylon, in its struggle for leadership of the toiling masses, is systematically exposing the Trotskyites, who are carrying out undermining work directed towards the splitting of the working-class movement of Ceylon. The Trotskyites have at present entrenched themselves in the Lanka Sama Samaj Party. This party, which was formed in 1935, in the beginning united the various political trends in the working-class movement. In 1939, there was a split and the revolutionary elements went out of it. The leaders of the Lanka Samaj, who demagogically play upon the nationalistic and anti-British slogans, are in essence the servitors and agents of imperialism and are attempting to rely upon the backward sections of plantation workers, a section of the unemployed intelligentsia and different declassed elements. They are bringing about a split in the ranks of the working class, disorganising the democratic movement and disrupting the anti-imperialist struggle of the toilers of Ceylon.

To the category of bourgeois-nationalist parties belong the ultra Right party of the Sinhala Maha Sabha, which is linked with the feudal, clerical and bourgeois circles and which is attempting to subject the masses to its leadership on the basis of the common allegiance to Buddhist religion; The Ceylon National Congress which is a moderate reformist party of the Singalese bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia; the Muslim League of Ceylon, and the Malaya League.

These parties were formed in 1946 in "United National Party (UNP) under the presidentship of the leader of the Ceylon National Congress, the British agent Stephen Senanayake. The UNP is the compromising bourgeois reformist party, which is hiding behind the slogans of "unification of all national groups of the island" and "the development of the well-being and progress of the masses." By utilising the support of the British imperialists and being a party of the parliamentary and government majority, the UNP is carrying out a pro-British internal and external policy.

The British authorities, which come down with all the means at their disposal on the toiling masses and in particular upon the working class and its Communist Party, are attempting to support Ceylon's reactionary bourgeoisie and the feudal landowners, where such support does not damage the interests of the British imperialists. By giving formal concessions to the bourgeois-nationalist parties of Ceylon, the British imperialists are attempting at the same time to raise their authority in the eyes of the masses and to depict them as fighters against British imperialism.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Ceylon Federation of Trade Unions joined the World Federation of Trade Unions and is continuing to remain in it, in spite of the disruptive activities of the Anglo-American agents in the World Federation of Trade Unions.



The parliamentary elections in September 1947, which were carried out under the “supervision” of the British authorities, gave a comparative predominance in the parliament to the United National Party (UNP), from among whose representatives in the main the present government of Ceylon has been formed. It is clear that by resorting to “indirect rule” and keeping themselves in the background, the British can feel themselves secure behind the back of a government which is composed of the representatives of the reactionary bourgeoisie of Ceylon.

In the course of the entire history of the domination of British imperialism in Ceylon one can follow the line of artificially fomenting national and religious enmity and of compromising with the reactionary strata of Ceylon in order that imperialism should maintain its rule. On their part, the landlords and the big bourgeoisie have readily entered and are entering into a compromise with the bourgeoisie of Britain, of the oppressor country, for the sake of retaining their “rights” in the share of the exploitation of the toiling masses.

The growth of national consciousness and the advance of the national movements registered during the First World War in a number of colonial and dependent countries, also took place in Ceylon.

The Great October Socialist Revolution had great influence upon the development of the national-liberation movement in Ceylon. The rising proletariat activated the struggle against the British invaders and the local bourgeoisie. The formation of political organisations here takes place precisely at this time. A number of liberal, bourgeois-reformist organisations were formed during this period—the Ceylon League of Reform, the National Association of Ceylon, and the Ceylon National Congress. These organisations, whose leadership was seized by the propertied classes of Ceylon, demanded from the British the carrying out of administrative reforms, which, while not affecting the basis of British domination, would extend the rights of the national bourgeoisie of Ceylon. The struggle and the demands of the working class strengthened the positions of these organisations, which attempted to draw over the toiling masses to their side in order to later betray them. The growth of national consciousness and the intensification of the anti-British sentiments forced the British to come to an agreement with the bourgeois-landlord top stratum. The result was the reforms in colonial administration of 1920 and 1923. These reforms did not broach upon the national and military principles of domination of British imperialism. They hampered the national-liberation movement for the time being but were not able to stop it. The sharpening of national and class contradictions in the period of the world economic crisis at the beginning of the thirties of the twentieth century compelled British imperialism to seek for a more stable alliance with the national bourgeoisie in order to dupe the broad masses of the people. The Donmor Commission, which was widely advertised by the British and which worked out the Constitution of 1931 (known as the “Donmor Constitution”) had to achieve this aim.

But even the Donmor Constitution led to only partial changes in the form of the British rule in Ceylon and it too did not broach upon the economic, political and military basis of British domination.

The predominance of the Singalese in the State Council evoked discontent on the part of the backward national groups and, in particular, the Tamils. Dissatisfaction in the regime of British rule appeared in the State Council itself which was composed of persons carefully selected by the British from the native top stratum of Ceylon. The reform of 1931 did not stop the growth of the national-liberation struggle against the British power. The British Government was forced to admit that the Donmor Constitution machinations did not pay.

The Second World War and the great liberation struggle of the USSR against German and Japanese imperialism inspired the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. The struggle of these peoples against Hitler fascism and Japanese imperialism which assumed a broad anti-imperialist

character, compelled the British imperialists to resort to new manoeuvres in Ceylon also. The sharp weakening of the positions of Britain in the Far East and S.E. Asia, which manifested itself in the beginning of the war, compelled the British imperialists to promise reforms to their colonies in Asia. Side by side with the promises made to India already in September 1941, the Churchill government was forced to declare that the question of self-rule of Ceylon would be considered at the end of the war. On May 26, 1943 the British Minister for Colonies, Commander Oliver Stanley, declared that the British Government was considering the question of future reforms, with the aim of creating “a fully responsible government” in Ceylon.

In July 1944 a commission was formed, under the presidentship of Salisbury, which concluded its work only towards the end of 1945.<sup>16</sup> The new constitution of Ceylon, which in the main is in operation even now, was proclaimed on May 15, 1946.

The constitution of 1946, like the preceding act of the British imperialists, did not touch the basis of British rule in Ceylon and brought about only formal changes. The press of the metropolitan country and the pro-British press of Ceylon are trying to depict the regime established by this constitution as a most important change in the life of Ceylon.

However, an analysis of the constitution of May 15, 1946 shows that this is not the case at all. A British Governor is at the head of the government of Ceylon. Formally he fulfils his functions in conformity with the opinions of the corresponding Ministers, except in “extraordinary cases”, and seemingly he does not interfere in the activities of the government, although in actual fact he affects a real guardianship over it. The Governor is directly subordinate to the British Government (in the person of the Minister for Colonies), which thus retain its power in Ceylon. Questions of defence and foreign relations of the island, of foreign trade, questions connected with changes in the constitution and regarding the national and religious minorities are under the direct control of the Governor. Besides, the British Government had the right (till the granting of Dominion Status to Ceylon in 1948) to suspend or to revoke the constitution “when the necessity arose”.

The executive authority is implemented by a Cabinet of Ministers. The Prime Minister is appointed by the Governor from amongst the members of parliament, who enjoy the support of the majority in the parliament. The rest of the ministers are also appointed by the Governor on the representation of the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister must necessarily be at the same time also the Minister for Defence and Foreign Affairs. The Ministers have their own Parliamentary Secretaries. According to the constitution of 1946, the Ceylon Government is formally “a fully responsible government” in the matter of “internal civil administration”, but the questions relating to foreign policy, as already pointed out above, are openly under the control of the British authorities.

According to the constitution of 1946, a parliament consisting of two houses—an Upper House, the Senate, and a Lower House, the House of Representatives—was created.

The Senate is composed of 30 Senators, out of whom 15 are nominated by the Governor and 15 are elected by the House of Representatives on the principle of proportional representation. People who have attained the age of 35 can become Senators. Although the Senate cannot reject the adoption of a law, it has the right to delay it (the so-called “suspension veto”). Formally the Senate enjoys legislative initiative on all questions, with the exception of questions relating to finance. The term of office of Senators is fixed for 6 years. Every two years, one-third of the composition of the Senate renewed. As a whole the Senate is called upon to serve as one of the vehicles of British policy in Ceylon.

---

<sup>16</sup> Ceylon Report of the Commission Constitutional Reform, Cmd. 6,677, London, HMSO.

The House of Representatives consists of 101 members, out of which 95 are elected and 6 appointed by the Governor. The term of office is 5 years.

The scope of the parliament is restricted to questions of internal civil administration, with the exception of questions which fall within the scope of the British parliament. Apropos this the parliament of Ceylon is obliged to proceed from the principle of the supremacy of imperialist (British) legislation and cannot decide questions relating to the revision of the constitution. Thus, the British parliament is provided with the right of issuing laws for Ceylon “in special cases”.

With respect to the electoral system the 1946 constitution retains in the main the principles of the Donmor Constitution, with the exception of the change in the principle of representation. Under the guise of a quest for a compromise solution on the norms of representation of the different national groups in the parliament, the 1946 constitution confuses and complicates the problem still more with the aim of setting these groups against one another.

The introduction of the 1946 constitution retained the commanding position in the hands of the British and did not change in essence the situation in Ceylon.

The revolutionary struggle in China, Viet-Nam, India, Burma and other countries of East Asia strengthened the influence of democratic elements amongst the population of Ceylon. The demands for a change in the political condition of the island became more insistent.

Under conditions when the national-liberation struggle in all the colonies of S.E. Asia was growing, when the Chinese people were successfully struggling against American imperialism and the reactionary regime of Chiang Kai-shek supported by it—under such conditions Ceylon acquired exceptional value for British imperialism as a big strategic springboard. According to the calculations of the British imperialists, the consolidation of the political positions of the local bourgeoisie and the feudal circles in Ceylon could render substantial assistance to the imperialist camp in suppressing the anti-imperialist struggle not merely in Ceylon but also in other colonies and, above all, in India. Therefore, almost simultaneously with the implementation of the insidious “Mountbatten Plan” on the granting of “independence” to India, the British Government declared on June 18, 1947 that it was going to adopt measures with the object of changing the constitution of 1946 in the direction of “granting Ceylon self-rule within the bounds of the British Commonwealth of Nations”, as soon as agreements, satisfactory to both the sides (i.e., British imperialism), were concluded.

On November 11, 1947 the British authorities concluded with Ceylonese reaction: i) “Treaty on Defence” ii) “Treaty Relating to Foreign Relations”, iii) “Treaty on Position of State Officials.” It was only after this that Ceylon was granted Dominion Status.

These treaties completely preserve the authority of British imperialism over Ceylon and reduce to empty formality all the provisions of the Act about granting Dominion Status to it in which it is said that “the prerogative vested in it by His Majesty with respect to the promulgation of laws for Ceylon relating to questions of defence and foreign relations are hereby cancelled.”<sup>17</sup>

After a grandiloquent preamble, Article I of the treaty on defence says that the Government of Britain and Ceylon will render mutual military assistance and with this aim “the Government of the United Kingdom can retain bases for its naval and air forces and to retain its land military forces on the territory of Ceylon.” In Article II the Government of Ceylon is obliged “to render to the Government of the United Kingdom any assistance needed” including “the utilisation of naval and air bases, ports and

---

<sup>17</sup> Cmd. 7,257, 1947, London, HMSO.

military constructions, and the utilisation of means of communication.” The British armed forces on the territory of Ceylon enjoy extra-territorial rights. The treaty retains “the right of tribunals and administrative authorities (British—S. Pokrovsky) to exercise over the members of the above-mentioned forces the same control and to extend its jurisdiction in the same way as it is exercised at present.” The British have the right to train the armed forces of Ceylon and to supply weapons to Ceylon. Moreover, British officers and instructors are directing the military forces of Ceylon and the Ceylon Government has agreed “to establish such administrative organisation, which it will be desirable ... for their cooperation in questions relating to defence and for co-ordinating and defining their respective needs in this sphere.

Senanayake appointed an Englishman, Count Keitness, as commander-in-chief of the armed forces of Ceylon. In the summer of 1949 the British Navy carried out manoeuvres along with the Indian and Ceylonese forces. Thus, we may say, the Anglo-Singalese “Defence Treaty” is still more converting Ceylon into one of the cogs of the British imperialist military machine.

The treaty relating to the State officials of the Ceylon Government made it obligatory for Ceylon to retain all the British officials in the posts occupied by them earlier, and to pay them for leave, sickness, pension, etc.

The treaty relating to foreign relations strengthened Ceylon’s complete dependence on Britain in this matter. According to Article I of this treaty the Government of Ceylon has agreed “to ratify and fulfil the decisions of the preceding Empire conferences.” On the basis of a purely formal equality, Ceylon and Great Britain are exchanging their representatives known as High Commissioners. The treaty directly lays it down that the external relations of Ceylon with foreign countries must be effected through the British Government. In case the Government of Ceylon desires to exchange diplomatic representatives with any other foreign state, it can do so by virtue of Article IV of the treaty only through the medium of the British Government.

Having retained its dominating position in Ceylon in economic, political and military respects and after consolidating it by means of the treaties mentioned, British imperialism granted Ceylon the status of British Dominion on February 4, 1948.

The conversion of Ceylon into “a self-ruling state within the bounds of the British Commonwealth of Nations” did not change the essence of the British colonial policy in Ceylon, did not alter the position of Ceylon as a colony of British imperialism, but merely changed the form of subjection. In connection with this “knavish compromise of the greatest magnitude” the Labourite pupils of the hardened British imperialist Disraeli will do well to recall the words of the latter that “colonies do not cease to be colonies because they are independent.” Although Ceylon, like India and Pakistan, is now represented at Empire conferences along with other Dominions, it is still regarded as before—a colony and a dominion of a lower order than the “British”. The corrupt ruling top stratum of Ceylon is not even outwardly in opposition now; it serves its British masters.

It is no accident that the Anglo-American imperialists, “contrary to reason” and against all the rules of admission to the United Nations Organisation, are persistently endeavouring to drag in Ceylon as a member of the UNO. Again, in Article V of the Anglo-Ceylon agreement relating to foreign relations mentioned above, the British Government has assumed the “obligation” “to render all support to any request on the part of Ceylon to enter into the United Nations Organisation, or into any special international institution defined by Article 57 of the UNO Constitution.”

By following their policy of dictates on solving questions of international relations, the Anglo-American representatives in the Security Council slyly attempted to carry out the decision about the entry of Ceylon into the UNO—hoping to add (to “the majority subservient to it”) the vote of one more

satellite. The Soviet representative was entirely right in demanding that the consideration of the question of Ceylon's entry to the membership of the UNO be deferred till additional information on the situation in Ceylon was received.

“Instead, on the insistence of the representatives of the USA and Britain, the question was put to vote and the Soviet representative voted against the attempts to examine this question in spite of the fact that he had asked only for one thing—the postponement of this question for some time till additional information on the political status of Ceylon was received.” (A. Y. Vyshinsky, speech delivered in Special Political Committee on November 30, 1948, and printed in *Pravda* in the issue of December 3, 1948.)

Knowing that their trick did not succeed, the Anglo-Americans and their lackeys in various countries, including Ceylon, raised a slanderous uproar round this question. They tried to even accuse the Soviet Union of misusing the right of “veto” and to insinuate that the USSR was the impediment in the way of Ceylon's entry into the UNO. It is, however, well known that the Soviet Union fights against the discriminatory attitude of the Anglo-American bloc towards the People's Democratic States, which have no less, if not greater, justification for being admitted in the UNO.

The events of the recent period show that the reactionary ruling circles of Ceylon are trying to include Ceylon into various “regional” groupings of countries, serving as an appendage of the North Atlantic Union and embodying the claims of the USA to domination over the entire world. The representatives of Ceylon took part in the conference of the group of countries of Asia and the Far East which took place in Delhi in January 1949, where, apart from the Indonesian question, there was also discussed the question of forming a grouping of those countries of S.E Asia which were under Anglo-American control. Not content with the projects inspired by them for forming groupings of the countries of S.E. Asia, the Anglo-American instigators of war are attempting to form a “Pacific Bloc” comprising the countries of the British Empire as well as the countries not within the Empire. According to the reports of the Australian newspapers, the British representatives had conducted negotiations with Pakistan, India, Ceylon, S. Africa and Canada, for the conclusion of a Pacific Pact.

In these criminal plans, the Anglo-American instigators of war do not want to realise

“that it is one thing to construct all sorts of groupings and to be collecting signatures to more and more pacts cooked up in the chancelleries of the American State Department and British Foreign Office, and an entirely different thing to really achieve the ends pursued by the inspirers of such groupings and pacts”. (*Statement of the USSR Foreign Ministry on North Atlantic Pact*)

The Anglo-American band-masters of the Senanayake government are trying in vain to present the voice of their lackey, Ceylonese reaction, as the voice of the peoples of Ceylon, since

“it goes without saying that the servile attitude of certain leading persons in the governments of these countries will not suffice for the people of Asia to consent to embark on the slippery path on to which they are being persistently goaded by the Powers which have become entangled in colonial affairs and by their wealthy patrons” (*Ibid.*)

This statement also applies entirely to Ceylon, since in Ceylon as well as in the other countries of the East, a mighty upsurge of the national-liberation movement is taking place. The mass meetings of the toiling people of Ceylon which were held on May 1, 1949, took place under the slogan of “Unity With the Workers of the Whole World in the Struggle Against Imperialism and Capitalist Exploitation.”