

CLASSIFICATION CONFIDENTIAL CONFIDENTIAL
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY REPORT
INFORMATION FROM
FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS CD

COUNTRY Yugoslavia DATE OF INFORMATION 1949
SUBJECT Political
HOW PUBLISHED Bimonthly periodicals DATE DIST. 31 Jan 1950
WHERE PUBLISHED Belgrade NO. OF PAGES 23
DATE PUBLISHED Sep 1949 SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO.
LANGUAGE Serbo-Croatian

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHIN THE MEANING OF ESPIONAGE ACT 50 U. S. C. 31 AND 32, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR THE REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS IN ANY MANNER TO AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Komunist, Vol I, No 5, 1949.

LENIN ON RELATIONS AMONG SOCIALIST STATES

Milovan Djilas

The war which the leadership of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolshevik) and the Soviet Union have undertaken against the Yugoslav Communist party and the workers of Yugoslavia, and which appears, both overtly and covertly, to be a clash between the Cominform and the CC (Central Committee) of the KPJ (Communist Party of Yugoslavia), every day, with tremendous and uncontrollable force, brings to the surface the very essence of the clash: the question of relations among socialist states. It was also brought to the surface by the present situation itself -- the existence of a group of socialist states side by side with an essential weakening of capitalism.

This basic source of the conflict can neither be avoided nor concealed, for it arose itself from the essential social changes that developed out of World War II. Actually, through this conflict a new stage in international development is coming into being. This new phase arose out of the general conditions of the age of imperialism, just as the October Revolution and the creation and development of the Soviet Union represented a new phase in international development within the framework of the age of imperialism. Typical of this new phase are the spread of socialism, the creation of a number of socialist states, and an essential weakening of world capitalism. Unlike the Soviet type of capitalist economy, a socialist economy develops in very diverse forms. This new phase and its characteristics can be described only theoretically, as Marxism-Leninism has not provided and cannot give ready-made formulas for it.

All the critics of the KPJ -- who suddenly changed into low and mean slanderers of the proletarian party of the socialist revolution, of the building of socialism in Yugoslavia, of the heroic resolutions, and of the history of the Yugoslav people, and at the same time changed into shatterers of the international solidarity of workers and into violators of the equality of nations and states in socialism and of labor movements in general -- are trying by all sorts of means to conceal and hush up the above-mentioned essence of the clash and to present it as a struggle against the "treason" of the Yugoslav leaders.

CONFIDENTIAL

CLASSIFICATION		CONFIDENTIAL		DISTRIBUTION													
STATE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAVY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NSRB															
ARMY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> AIR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FBI															

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

The slanders of the KPJ, without a doubt, belong to that type of "heoretician" who suffers from a quoting mania and to whom single passages from the classics of Marxism-Leninism do not serve as guides for interpreting complicated theoretical and tactical conditions of the class struggle, but as finished paragraphs into which they press reality itself. But in considering all this, they characteristically do not make any use of quotations from the classics in their struggle against the KPJ, with the exception of a few cases (for example, the well-known positions of Lenin regarding bourgeois nationalism), and yet they hold single passages which have no connection either with the Yugoslav or with the international situation, as proof of their condescending theses. During these rare moments they actually tried to give some sort of "ideological" basis to their slanders in order to cover up the essence of the clash, which does not consist in a few mistakes and in the "treason" of the KPJ, but in the following: What kind of relations should exist and on what principles should the relations among socialistic countries and labor parties be based?

This phenomenon is not at all accidental. The contentions of the classics of Marx and Lenin, especially those of Lenin, which treat this question extensively, it being an integral part of the national question, are so clear that it is impossible that the slanders of the KPJ and the shatters of the internal unity of the labor and democratic movement can make use of them without revealing that their present practice actually means a revision of these contentions and of the basic principles of Marxism and Leninism. Previously thick books have been written on labor movements when an expulsion of international importance has occurred. For the "removal" of the KPJ it was sufficient to start and conduct a campaign with the help of false information and slanderous articles, the goal of which was to succeed quickly and early. But in this manner only a temporary confusion in international democratic public opinion is provoked, and the KPJ is strengthened both ideologically and organizationally by defending its principal contentions. The essence of the conflict itself (the question of the relation among socialist countries and labor parties), through the maneuvers of slanders, has rushed to the foreground in full force and is on the daily agenda of the international labor movement.

Attempts to hide the essence of the principal clashes are not new in the labor movement, and those who have participated in this sinister occupation have quickly resorted to utter unscrupulousness -- in this way they have concealed their rewriting of the basic Marxist principles.

It must be remembered that the anarchists and other enemies of Marxism did not openly attack Marx because of his ideas, but presumably because he was suspected of being a Prussian spy in the pay of Engels' bourgeoisie and aristocracy. Expressly because of that, all kinds of revisionists have thrown mud at Lenin. The leaders of the Second International did not openly attack Lenin because of his ideas, but presumably because of "treason" against democracy and the "anarchy" and "terrorism" which he caused in Russia. Russian Mensheviks, Social Revolutionaries, and others attacked him because he committed treason against his fatherland as a "German spy."

In a similar manner, during the struggle for the building of socialism in the USSR, the Trotskyites, Bukharinites, and others have accused Stalin of being a traitor to the revolution and leading a "regime" of "personal" dictatorship. Unprincipled criticism, lies, and slanders are not new in the labor movement. They are the necessary by-products of revisionism. And yet, the proletarian truth has always come out on top despite the flood of lies and slanders. Today very few people know about these false accusations, about these attempts to conceal the essence of the clash with other excuses. Marx and Engels remain the creators of the modern labor movement, the creators of the scientific outlook in the world; Lenin the leader of the greatest revolution in the history

- 2 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

of men, the creator of the first country of a labor population, and the proletarian theoretician of the imperialistic epoch; and Stalin the leader of the building of socialism in one country. In all this there is a certain rightness: truth in the labor movement is the condition of its further development, and its further development is the prerequisite of the downfall of capitalism. It cannot and could not have been otherwise. The struggle of the labor class for its own liberation and for the liberation of humanity is based on science, that is, on knowledge of actual facts, or truth. The irresistible force of dialectical materialism, or Marxism-Leninism, is that in its truthfulness, in that it is based on the analysis of actuality, on the actual relation of forces, and on actual tendencies of development, it consequently makes use of real and true arguments in a dispute.

The labor movement does not have to invent anything against the bourgeoisie. The evil sides of capitalism are so deep and universal that nothing can be stronger and more convincing or more forceful than a truthful revelation of them. Only those who have described dialectical materialism and actually gone over to the side of idealism, only those who have clashed with reality but are unable to grasp its development and its new manifestations, only those who are trying to stop the inexorable and victorious movement of life are forced to make use of lies and of false arguments in the struggle. But those who believe that in the labor movement the truth can be concealed and that the essence of the struggle of the labor movements can be misrepresented and either annulled or have forever lost faith in it and its principles. The very life, the very social reality which is constantly moving, the very class struggle which is inevitably unfolding between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, do not permit the truth to be hidden for long, no matter what power tries to conceal it.

The slanderers of the KPF, avoiding recognition of the essence of the struggle, have so far not tried to explain theoretically either the clash between the KPF and the VKP(b) [Communist Party of the USSR], or the relations among socialistic countries. They were not even in a position to do so, simply because they know very well that their procedures are not only in disagreement with the teachings of Marx and Lenin about the relations among socialistic countries and labor parties, but are direct and complete revisions of those teachings.

They will not and must not say openly what they think: that this teaching is antiquated, that it no longer corresponds to actual international conditions, and, above all, that it has to be replaced by a new doctrine, by a new theoretical solution of problems which are on the daily agenda of many parties and socialistic countries as well as on the agenda of the international labor and democratic movement as a whole. They are trying to cover up this revision, and their dishonesty and the reason for their unavoidable failure lies in that very concealment.

Just because they know that they are rewriting this doctrine, they necessarily had to invent a lie about Yugoslavia's defection to capitalism and to the imperialistic camp. They did this also in order to cover up and to acquire from the democratic world the moral justification for their acts.

For Marxism-Leninism has not given them, nor can it give them, the moral justification for waging a slanderous campaign of persecution against one socialistic country, which, as can be seen, is in the background of the stubborn effort of the Central Committee of the VKP(b) and of the government of the USSR, in order to force other socialistic countries and labor movements into an unequal relationship. Throughout the history of mankind, lies and slanders have been and have remained tools of unjust policy which has always had as its goal the subordination, or rather the exploitation, of other nations, and domination over them. And as in history there never have been and never will be just wars of conquest or righteous and progressive domination of other countries, lies and slanders, which have always been only a front, only the means for dominating other countries and progressive movements, cannot serve truly higher and truly more progressive goals. And although

- 3 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

the clash between the KPJ and the VKP(b) is a new historical phenomenon emerging on the basis of new historical conditions, historical experience regarding the essence and actual background of the lies and slanders as tools in the struggle is valid today for the above-mentioned phenomenon, and it will be valid so long as there are political struggles and politics in general in human society.

The exposition and analysis of Lenin's teachings are significant not only because in this very question present revisionism is being carried out in a most coarse and obvious manner, but especially because a number of European nations and the huge Chinese nation in Asia have entered upon the path of socialism. Moreover, millions of people in other developed countries (especially in France and in Italy) and in the colonies (Indochina, Korea, etc.) have actively and intellectually entered the struggle for socialism in one way or another. Socialism is no longer the practice of one backward nation, which in building socialism has passed from the unenviable social, economic, and cultural heritage of Tsarist Russia, but the practice of many countries, among which some are highly developed. In short, more than one-third of mankind today is marching toward socialism.

For this reason, one cannot conceal evasion of a solution of the problem of the relationship among socialistic countries and concealment of the essence of Lenin's teaching, if only because of the historical situation in which we live and which in the most diversified ways puts this very problem on the daily agenda.

Concerning the labor movement one asks whether the relations among socialistic countries will develop in such a manner that in the present stage of the struggle the internal forces will be strengthened individually as well as collectively, and in this way act as strong incentives for other nations to follow the path of socialism, or whether imperialists will be able to exploit these relations in their propaganda and struggle not only against the internal strength of every socialistic country and their mutual connections, but also against imperialist and against colonial nations, in order to hinder and confuse them in their struggle, and postpone their victory.

In the struggle which the party is carrying on against the slanderous persecutions and against all kinds of pressure organized and directed by the USSR, it is of the utmost importance for KPJ members to become better acquainted with the essence of Lenin's teachings, as regards the question under discussion, and that they strengthen and arm themselves ideologically.

Lenin's most important works already have been published in Yugoslavia, including those which treat the national question. But also in some other works of Lenin there are valuable and deep thoughts about the problem under discussion. But the complete works of Lenin have not yet been published in Yugoslavia and are inaccessible to a considerable number of readers, either because they lack a knowledge of Russian, or because these works are limited to a few copies.

It is self-evident that Lenin could not have foreseen in detail what concrete forms the relations between socialist countries would take. Moreover, Lenin did not foresee, nor could he have foreseen, that the question as to the relations among socialist countries and labor parties could acquire such a huge, actually disproportionate, significance for the international labor movement. But least of all could Lenin have foreseen that the first country in which the power was taken over by the proletariat would impose unequal relations upon the new socialist countries.

Lenin, obviously, could not even sense what forms -- on the basis of the inequality now actually existing among socialist countries -- the clashes between these countries would take and where they would lead the socialist countries and the socialist and democratic movement in the world. How could Lenin have sensed, for example, that the USSR would make excess profits in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, etc., through various organizations and through other methods, and would exploit weak and backward socialist countries, at the same time noisily declaring all this to be "aid"?

- 4 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

How could he have sensed that the leaders of the USSR themselves would deny and falsify the Yugoslav revolution and the role of liberation movements of other nations and other countries in the general struggle of humanity for socialism? This is one side of the problem.

Lenin likewise could not have known, because social experience did not give him, nor could it have given him, any evidence as to which way and in what manner, in what forms, and with what speed the unification of the socialist world would proceed, and what would be the solution of state relations of future socialist countries. Lenin was not a prognosticator, but a revolutionary novice. But just because he theoretically explained the essence of the contemporary and imperialistic epoch of capitalism -- the laws of the movement and downfall of capitalism under present-day conditions, and because in Russia he actually created the forms of its downfall -- Lenin foresaw and expounded the basic principles on which the mutual relations of the new socialist countries which will form during the period of the downfall of capitalism would have to be founded, provided these countries, or the labor movement as a whole, truly wanted to go ahead. Lenin did not live to see the period of the formation of several socialist countries and he gave, and could have given, only the basic theoretical principles on which the relations among socialistic countries would have to be based.

What the actual forms of these relations would be, in what way, and by what means individual socialist countries would be formed Lenin could not have foreseen, and he did not even occupy himself with such types of "prognostications." But this does not mean that his concept of the essential points does not represent a coherent whole. On the contrary. If Lenin does not have, and he could not have had, foreknowledge of the actual forms of relations among future socialist countries and of the course of development of individual socialist countries, as well as of the actual routes of humanity in general toward socialism, his concept of the relations among socialist countries represents a coherent and integrated theory which can and must serve as the basis, as the starting point in the building of future relations among countries of working people.

Lenin always approached the question of relations among socialist countries from the standpoint of developing and strengthening the proletarian revolution and from the standpoint of the victory of socialism. The forms of the relations and the method of regulating the mutual problems of socialistic countries, according to Lenin, are, and must be, very closely connected with questions pertaining to further developing the proletarian revolution and strengthening socialism. The most important task for the proletarian party is the overthrow of capitalism, the building of socialism, and the rest is, as Lenin says, half, even one-tenth, as important as the above basic goal. The concept of the necessary connection of the problem of relations among socialistic countries with the problem of the proletarian revolution and the strengthening of socialism, and with the concept of a continuation of the successful struggle against capitalism, runs like a red thread through Lenin's numerous works on the national question.

In 1913 Lenin wrote: "The question of the right of self-determination (that is, assuring, by means of the constitution of the country, in a completely free and democratic way the solution of the problem of secession) must not be connected with the question of the advantage of secession by one nation or another. This last question must be solved in each individual case independently, from the point of view of the interest of the entire social development and the interest of the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism."

When and whether a nation shall secede from other nations and form its own independent country, or when, how long, and to what extent it will exist as an independent country, depends on whether this corresponds to the interests "of the entire social development and interests of the class struggle of the proletariat for socialism." It is the right of every nation to exercise self-determination, i.e., state

- 5 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

...tion, but which nations will exercise this right and what form and to what degree depends above all on international conditions, on the general conditions of the struggle for the further development of socialism, and also on the situation in each particular country. By evaluating these conditions the proletarian party "in every individual case completely independently" determines whether its nation at the state level will secede from another and form its own country or whether it will enter into this or that relation with this or that (socialist) country.

Accordingly, if one or another form of state relation is desirable to the movement as a whole, on the basis of a correct appraisal of international relations, the proletarian party must choose exactly such a form as strengthens the movement as a whole. Today, for example, when US imperialists are trying to dominate such large, developed, and highly cultured nations as France and Italy, when the ideologies of new world domination advocate the formation of a world state, individual proletarian parties in a completely independent manner, and the labor movement as a whole, must ask the question whether the unification of socialist countries into one state organism, or the development of socialist countries as separate state organisms under the closest possible and universal mutual cooperation, corresponds to the interests of the development of the struggle for socialism and democracy, in a time when there is such a bitter struggle of nations for independence. In addition, one has to ask the question as to whether the first or second method will strengthen or weaken the struggle of, for example, the French, the Italians, the colonial nations, etc.

Accordingly, without even speaking of very important internal conditions of the development of individual socialist countries, one must ask and solve the question of the unification of socialistic countries into one state organism, or as to their separate, independent state life, because this is not and cannot be a primary and decisive question. Of primary and decisive importance is the strengthening of socialism and the revolutionary and democratic movement as a whole, but the question as to this or that form of state relations among socialist countries, as Lenin often expressed it, is a second-rate, no tenth-rate, question subordinate to the development of the movement as a whole.

The right of self-determination is not in the least endangered by this or that attitude of the proletarian party. The question is not, according to Lenin, whether a nation should or should not secede. That is, exercise its right or not, whether its secession corresponds to the interests of the movement as a whole, as well as of the nation itself, because, according to Lenin, the actual interests of one nation cannot be contrary to the interests of other socialist nations. If the strengthening of socialism, or the further weakening of imperialism, demands it, nations can separate into independent countries, and also enter into state unions which would best correspond in a given situation to the interests of the development of the movement in general as well as to the interests of the nations concerned.

According to Lenin, the party must individually and concretely take a stand in every individual case, and enter into agreements based on the principles of free will and equality with other parties.

Going by these principles, Lenin, because he was a consistent internationalist and an irreconcilable enemy of every national intrigue and of all deceit of working people, allowed the possibility of secession of individual nations into separate socialist countries. Lenin allowed this possibility not only for nations outside of Tsarist Russia, but also for the people of Tsarist Russia itself.

In his "Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine Regarding the Victory Over Denikin" written at the end of 1919, Lenin says: "Until the Ukraine is completely freed from Denikin, its government, until the All-Ukraine Congress of Soviets, is the All-Ukraine Revolutionary Committee, the All-Ukraine Revkom. In this revolutionary committee, in addition to Ukrainian Bolshevik Communists, Ukrainian Borot'bist Communists are also active as members of the government. The Borot'bists are mainly

- 6 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

distinguished from Bolsheviks in that they defend the unconditional independence of the Ukraine. The Bolsheviks do not regard this as a reason for schism and disunity, they do not see in this a hindrance preventing the proletariat from working harmoniously. In the struggle against the capitalist yoke, let there be unity of the proletarian dictatorship, but Communists are not to split on questions of national boundaries, or federal or other connections among countries. Among the Bolsheviks there are those who advocate (1) complete independence of the Ukraine, (2) a more or less narrow federal connection, and (3) a complete merger of the Ukraine with Russia.

"A split because of such questions is not permitted. These questions will be solved by the All-Ukraine Congress of Soviets."

Starting from the point of view of "unity in the struggle against the capitalist yoke" as "the basic task, Lenin in the above letter showed the Great Russian and Ukrainian workers the dangers of nationalistic dislocations which could seriously endanger this unity. The insistence of Great Russian Communists on "the merging of the Ukraine with Russia" can provoke the suspicion among Ukrainians that the Great Russians are not doing so for the sake of "unity of the proletariat in the struggle against the capitalist yoke," but because of Great Russian imperialistic motives.

The insistence of Ukrainian Communists on "the unconditional independence of the Ukraine" can provoke the suspicion among the Great Russians that the Ukrainians only do so "because of petty bourgeois, peculiarly national prejudice." The task, obviously, consists of the following: **The Great Russian Communists should let the Ukrainians themselves arrange their relations with Russia, and the Ukrainian Communists should not allow the destruction of the proletarian "unity in the struggle against the capitalist yoke".** This is the kernel of the entire question. According to Lenin, neither the Ukrainian nor the Great Russian Communists can or should yield on this question. However, as far as the question of the form of the state relations between the Ukraine and Russia is concerned, the Great Russian Communists should yield.

About this Lenin says: "The best means for this is united effort in defense of the proletarian dictatorship and Soviet power in the struggle against the landowners and capitalists of all countries, against their attempts to establish their omnipotence. Such a united struggle will clearly show in practice that the Great Russian and Ukrainian workers urgently need a close military and economic alliance for the solution of any problem regarding national independence or state borders, because otherwise the capitalists of the "Entente," that is the alliance of the richest capitalistic countries, England, France, America, Japan and Italy, will strangle and choke us one after another.

"For that reason we, the Great Russian Communists, must with greatest vigor drive out of our midst even the smallest manifestation of Great Russian nationalism, because these manifestations, being in general treason against Communism, cause great damage, separating us from our Ukrainian comrades and thus playing into the hands of Denikin and his sympathizers.

"For that reason we, the Great Russian Communists, must be lenient in disagreements with Ukrainian Communists, both Bolsheviks and Borot'bists, when these disagreements concern the independence of the Ukraine, the form of its relationship with Russia, and the national question in general. We all, Great Russian Communists and Ukrainian Communists, and Communists of any country whatever, must be uncompromising and irreconcilable as regards (1) the basic, essential, and, for all nations, common problems of the proletarian struggle, (2) the dictatorship of the proletariat, and (3) prohibition of agreements with the bourgeoisie and (4) the prohibition of splitting of the forces which defend us against Denikin.

- 7 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

"... In this long and difficult struggle, we, the Great Russian and Ukrainian workers, have to enter into the closest mutual alliance because we shall certainly not be victorious if everybody is on his own. Whatever be the borders of the Ukraine and Russia, whatever be the forms of their mutual relation, these are not so important. Allowances can and must be made. One can try to do one thing or another, or something else. Thus the aim of the worker and peasant, the aim of victory over capitalism, will not fail."

Hence, "a close military and economic alliance is urgently needed, lest the capitalists choke them both, one at a time. Consequently, it is not obligatory for the Ukrainians and the Russians to have any solution of the problem of national independence or state borders."

What this solution will be and what form the relations between Great Russians and Ukrainians will have, depends, ultimately, on the general interests of the movement in the given situation and directly on the freely expressed demands and wishes of the Ukrainian workers and peasants themselves.

This same thought was formulated even more strongly by Lenin in a different passage.

"As internationalists, we are obliged, first of all, to struggle with special energy against the remainder (sometimes unconscious) of Great Russian imperialism and chauvinism among "Russian" Communists; secondarily we are obliged to make allowances as regards the national question, which is of minor importance (the internationalist question of boundaries is only half, no, one-tenth, as important a question).

"Other questions are important. The basic interests of the proletarian dictatorship are important. The interests of the unity and discipline of the Red Army fighting against Denikin are important. The part the proletarian leadership plays in relation to the peasantry is important. It is a much less important question whether the Ukraine will be a separate country or not. We should not be at all astonished -- and we must not be frightened -- by the possibility that the Ukrainian workers and peasants are trying various systems and within a period of, let us say, several years will actually carry out both a merger with the RSFSR and secession from it into a separate, independent USSR, and into various forms of close alliance, etc."

From these passages one can see Lenin's teachings as a whole. He wrote them in the period of the liberation of the Ukraine, which was a constituent of Czarist Russia. Thus Lenin permitted secession into a separate socialist country to a nation which in its long coexistence in the same country with the Great Russians found a more or less similar social life and which was more or less on the same level of development, and which during the Revolution experienced the same conditions and types of struggles. In addition, one must remember that Lenin wrote this during a period when the revolutionary movement was seething throughout the world, but especially in Central and Western Europe. This movement was incited by the war and strongly boosted by the October Revolution. It seemed quite natural to Lenin that the October Revolution should turn into a revolution of several great countries. Therefore, under such internal (the struggle against Denikin in the Ukraine) and external (the spread of revolutionary movements in many European countries and colonies) conditions, in which the slogan of the world soviet federated republic stood out, Lenin considered the question of the nature of state relations as nonessential, and thought that this was not sufficient reason for Communists to split. For him the basic question is the victory and strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia as well as in the Ukraine.

Hence, in the period when it seemed that the revolution would be victorious simultaneously in many large European countries and would develop into a "world revolution" from which only a "world federated soviet republic" could arise, while

- 8 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

the struggle for victory of the revolution in one part of Starik Russia, the Ukraine, the still going on, Lenin was neither "astounded" nor "frightened" by the possibility "that the Ukrainian workers and peasants are trying out various systems and within ... a few years actually will carry out a merger with the RSFSR and secede from it into a separate, independent USSR, and various forms of close alliance."

The KPD never held the viewpoint that socialist countries should not unite into one state organism. But it never was definitely in favor of this union. In treating this question, it always proceeded from the standpoint of the interest of the movement as a whole. It proceeded from the question of whether a union with this or that nation would strengthen or weaken the development of socialism and democracy. In this regard one should look, for example, at the principles which it has adopted at various times concerning national unification with Bulgaria and Albania. The KPD never considered unification with these countries a question of primary importance and obligation, whether for Yugoslavia or for the nationals of these countries. Under all circumstances, at all periods, the party has considered "a close military and economic alliance obligatory and necessary," and it has complied with all socialist countries in strictly carrying out these obligations. It was the KPD which took the initiative in arriving at economic and military alliances with Albania, Bulgaria, and other people's democracies. It never and in no way initiated the weakening of these relations. Moreover, it tried to do everything in its power to preserve and develop the existing cooperation between Yugoslavia and other socialistic countries, even after the disreputable Tomshoff Resolution.

However, this is not the case with the slanderers of the KPD and especially with those from the USSR. The above-mentioned principles of Lenin, as well as the fact that Yugoslavia is a socialist country and that it is rapidly building socialism, are very well known to them, much better than to Yugoslavia. And yet they have taken a question of secondary or tenth-rate importance (that is, the question of the nature of state relations) as a primary question. The leaders of the USSR believe that Yugoslavia, as a country, must be subordinated, and must subordinate its economic policy and its development in general to the "leading" socialist country, that is to the USSR. Simultaneously they have also driven the other socialist countries to do the same and to violate what Lenin, as we have seen, regarded as obligatory for all Communists of all countries if they do not wish to be traitors to Communism. Lenin regarded a close economic alliance obligatory. However, beside these despotic and provocative procedures, the existing military alliances between Yugoslavia and the other socialist countries are nothing.

Having prepared themselves according to a plan for such anti-Leninist, anti-socialist, and anti-democratic assaults to conceal their rewriting of Lenin's teachings, they have invented the lie that Yugoslavia is not a socialist country and that it is not building socialism. With this lie they expected to achieve in the eyes of international proletarian and democratic public opinion a moral justification for their treatment of Yugoslavia -- for example, Yugoslavia is a capitalistic country; "it is developing into an ordinary bourgeois republic" and is headed by an "anti-democratic and anti-communistic regime," and accordingly all methods are permissible and justifiable against it. But inexorable reality sees through this falsehood. The leaders of the USSR do not apply the methods which they inconsiderately use against "capitalist" socialist Yugoslavia to a single capitalist or fascist country (for example, Spain and Greece). This reveals the fact that they were much more concerned about dominating socialist Yugoslavia than about the victory of democracy and socialism in the capitalist world.

Having asked such a question about the relation among socialist countries and having build it into a complete theory, Lenin permitted, under the conditions of the growth of the revolution in Europe, the possible union of socialist countries into one single federation; all this at a time when the October Revolution seemed to be developing into a "world revolution," i.e., into a revolution among developed European countries, and at a time when the Soviet Union was in unusually great economic and political difficulties and in an actual struggle against the united capitalist world.

- 9 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

The simultaneous world revolution, or rather, the simultaneous revolution of a number of developed countries, proved to be unrealistic, as has been established in the History of the WEP(b) and by Lenin's works and the essence of his teachings about imperialism and revolution. However, the outbreak of the revolution and the victory of socialism in several countries, and even in one country, proved to be a possible and legitimate phenomenon. Accordingly, one must approach Lenin himself from the standpoint of the possibility and legitimacy of the outbreak of revolution in single countries and not at the same time in many large countries. The question of a world socialist state, of a world soviet federated republic, and of world proletarian dictatorship must be approached similarly. These expressions were used by Lenin as mobilization slogans during the period when the revolutionary movement was flourishing (after the imperialist war and the October Revolution) in "several developed countries" of Europe ("under the conditions of world revolution") and when it appeared that a victorious revolution would develop even in these countries, so that the Soviet Union would not remain alone.

In many developed countries of Europe and even in Yugoslavia, as well as in many colonies, the situation was truly revolutionary at that time. The united imperialists attacked the single soviet republic and Lenin used the above expressions and phases, evolved from concrete situations, in order most successfully to combine the proletariats of all countries in the mutual struggle. It was Lenin's duty to initiate the movement everywhere by means of various slogans according to the situation and he accomplished that completely. However, he could not guarantee the success of the movement itself in all countries because that did not depend on him alone, but also on objective and subjective conditions and on the ratio of forces in the world and in individual countries.

In "The First Plan of the Thesis on the National and Colonial Questions," written in June 1920 for the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin, on the basis of the experience of the RSTSR, stated that "the federation showed its unity in practice" and that it is the "steppingstone toward a complete unity of the workers of various countries." Lenin emphasized in this "Plan" that the duty of the Comintern "consists in indoctrinating and convincing, in convincing by experience, those new federations, which are based on the soviet system and soviet movement. Recognizing the federation as the steppingstone toward complete unity, it is necessary to strive for a closer and closer federal union. One must keep in mind (1) the impossibility of defending soviet republics surrounded by imperialistic countries, (2) the need for a close economic union among soviet republics, without which the revival of the productive forces destroyed by imperialism cannot be realized, and without which the welfare of the workers cannot be assured, (3) the tendency toward creating a single world economy united and regulated by the proletariat of all nations according to a general plan. This tendency has already manifested itself clearly in capitalism and will continue to develop and reach complete fulfillment in socialism.

Lenin acted from such concrete conditions when he regarded federation as a steppingstone toward a complete union (when there will not be any countries). Posing the question of federation in this way, Lenin acted from concrete conditions: from the possibility of creating "a proletarian dictatorship of at least several large countries," then, from the impossibility of defense against the imperialists of the whole world, and from the economic uplift of soviet republics formed on the territory of Czarist Russia. But even in this case and in this situation he incorporated into his doctrine the greatest possible consistency of theory and the greatest political flexibility: "recognizing the federation ... striving toward a closer and closer federal union" and "a close economic union" (because of the impossibility of defense and reconstruction and because of the tendency toward an economic union of the world). "The recognition of the federation as a steppingstone toward complete unity" does not mean, according to Lenin, the obligation of all nations to join the federation. In the above "Plan" he recognized the recognition of the federation as a steppingstone, based on a concrete situation. It is natural that he should see in the federation, under the given conditions, the most convenient form of defense of the existing soviet republics and the further rapprochement of the workers of different nations through the "federal union."

- 10 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

He regards the federation primarily as a possibility for the developed European countries in which a strong revolutionary movement existed, and which proceeded toward the revolution simultaneously and in the same manner "on the basis of the soviet system and the soviet movement." This can be seen from all his writings (otherwise he would not have demanded concessions for backward nations in the last thesis). And it is not accidental that in the entire "Plan" there is not a word about "the world soviet federal republic."

In this "Plan", Lenin is completely consistent with his basic principles: free will for every nation in the choice of relations with other socialist countries, that is, the right of nations to self-determination. For this reason he demands of Communists "special care," "special attentiveness," and concessions to nations which were long oppressed. (See Lenin, XXV, 290.)

Hence, Lenin in the above concrete international and internal conditions approached the question of relations among socialist countries both concretely and from the standpoint of strengthening socialism in general, and the strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship. For this reason also Lenin's quotation from the above "Plan" must not be separated from its context. He foresaw the possibility of a federation for nations which simultaneously and in the same manner ("on the basis of the soviet system and soviet movement") turn to socialism in order to defend themselves against attack from the united imperialists. He also admitted the possibility of separation and prescribed all necessary consideration and concessions for oppressed nations. Lenin, as can be seen, is not in favor of a world socialist country, even in the above "Plan." This is completely understandable. A world socialist country ("world soviet federal republic," "world proletarian dictatorship") could only emerge from a simultaneous world revolution. Just as the "theory" of world revolution proved to be unrealistic under conditions of imperialism, the world socialist state will prove to be equally unrealistic.

Only one who believes that the socialist country and the building of socialism are possible without the proletariat coming into power can separate one from the other. One is inseparable from the other. And to assert that Lenin was the ideologist of "the world soviet federation," or of the world socialist country, is just as absurd as to maintain that Lenin is the creator of the "theory" of world revolution, to be more exact, of the impossibility of victory of the revolution and socialism in one country without a simultaneous world revolution.

If there is not a simultaneous world revolution -- and it does not exist, as even children know today -- there is not and cannot be a world socialist country ("world proletarian dictatorship," "world soviet federal republic," etc.). To attribute to Lenin and to Leninism something of this sort is completely unjustified, absurd, and contrary to all international development since the October Revolution. This actually means not only trying to extract from Lenin single passages with evil intentions, but also to present them in distorted fashion as the essence of his teachings. On the contrary, Lenin, as is known, worked out the theory of the possibility and inevitability of the victory of the revolution and socialism in one country and thus changed the theory of Marx and Engels of the simultaneous revolution in several developed countries, on the basis that it was antiquated for the conditions of the imperialistic era. Lenin, as is known, approached the question of world revolution on the basis of the law of the unequal development of capitalism, which is sharply brought out, especially in the age of imperialism. Lenin also approached the question of breaking the imperialistic yoke at one place and then another, as well as the question about the unavoidable, possible, and legitimate outbreak of the revolution and victory of socialism at first in a few countries, or even in one country, and then in other countries.

Connecting the question of state relations among socialist countries with the question of the struggle of capitalism, Lenin, during the entire period of his revolutionary activity, during all periods without exception, regarded and unconditionally insisted that these relations, whatever their nature, always must be based

- 11 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

on principles of free will or on the respect for and assurance of the right of nations to self-determination. Lenin saw the only possible way for a successful struggle and victory of the proletariat in the consistent recognition of the right of nations to self-determination. (See Lenin, XVII, 118.)

The principle of unconditional free will which Lenin emphasized as the basis for solving mutual relations of socialist countries is necessary because free will is the only way for socialist nations to achieve real rapprochement. Without applying the principle of free will in the relation among socialist countries, there is not nor can there be an actual rapprochement among the workers of these countries. The rapprochement of nations, a more universal and closer connection of the working people of various nationalities, and the erasing of the differences among them is the final goal of Communism.

Union and rapprochement of peoples and countries existed before the socialist epoch. However, they had a forced character and from the beginning carried within themselves the germ of their internal weakness, the germ of their own destruction. A formally expressed willingness and a formal unity could not play an essential part (as, for example, among the people of Yugoslavia in 1918) if the actual will and actual unity no longer existed.

Obviously Lenin, as a consistent internationalist, was not and could not have been in favor of the separation of nations. Such an act, without regard for apparent and temporary reasons for its occurrence, is always ultimately reactionary. Lenin was unconditionally in favor of the mutual rapprochement of nations and even in favor of their future merging into Communism. However, he saw this rapprochement as possible only through a voluntary rapprochement, through a consistent and actual recognition of the right of nations to self-determination. Lenin was an irreconcilable fighter against every national intrigue. He resolutely stood on the principle of the rapprochement of nations, at the same time comprehending that this rapprochement can only be realized by way of free will, by way of recognizing -- both in words and in action -- the right of nations to self-determination. Free will in choosing the nature of state relations plus the right of self-determination equals the rapprochement of socialist nations. Lenin's comprehension of the relations among socialist countries actually is based on this formula.

In other words, rapprochement is only possible when the principles of free will and self-determination are respected. (Of Lenin, XIX, 227-228.) For Lenin the principle of free will in the relations among socialist countries is another aspect of the principle of the right of nations to self-determination. The application of the principle of free will in relations among socialist countries is in effect the application of the right of every nation of self-determination to create its own independent country or voluntary entry into and voluntary choice of the nature of state (federation, confederation) connections with another country.

There is not, nor can there be free will when the right of self-determination does not exist, and the right of self-determination is (1) the right to one's own national country and (2) the right of a voluntary choice of this or that state relation with another country. The principle of free will and the right of self-determination are actually one and the same thing. The entire problem revolves around a different approach to one and the same thing. The right of self-determination is the recognition of the right of nations to organize voluntarily their relations with other nations, and the recognition of this right of nations means that they can order the above relations as they see fit. The use of the term "principle of free will" in the relations among socialist countries only explains the application and the method of application (voluntary, as opposed to forced) of the right of nations to self-determination.

It is self-evident that Lenin did not approach formalistically the question of the right of nations to self-determination, that is from the point of view of the formal right of a nation. The principle of self-determination and equality is also recognized by the bourgeois democrat, and even sometimes by the out-and-out imperialist.

- 12 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

Lenin, in agreement with his entire teachings, was concerned with the actual right, with the actual recognition of the right of nations to self-determination.

In contradiction to the leaders of the USSR of today (especially in relation to Yugoslavia and the international workers' and democratic movement), Lenin never said one thing, did another, and thought something else. Between his words and deeds, between his theories and practice there never was disagreement. This was also the reason why he did not treat the right of nations to self-determination and to free will in the question of choice of state relations with other nations as a formal right, which is also advocated by bourgeois democracy (for example, Wilson during World War I and Churchill and Roosevelt in World War II), but instead he created it as an actual right which can be realized only in a true socialist democracy. Those who today appropriate the monopoly of being the only true students and disciples of Lenin do not act according to Lenin. While they still speak about the right of nations to self-determination and about free will in the relations of individual nations toward other nations, in practice they apply methods of force against socialist countries and do away with the actual free will of nations. In their case there was a definite split between words and deeds, between theory and practice. It is not clear how long they intend to violate the right of nations to self-determination and the principle of free will in the relations among socialist countries. It is equally unclear by what method, provided they continue such a practice, they think they will struggle against imperialism and assist labor parties, especially in France and Italy today, and struggle against US imperialism and its servants in socialist countries. But there cannot be any doubt that they thereby destroy the unity and weaken the strength of labor movements, and the labor and democratic movement as a whole.

Lenin did not consider the right to self-determination to be valid only during the period of the struggle for power and only for the proletarian dictatorship. He did not think that the proletariat would emphasize this idea only so long as it was struggling against the bourgeoisie, and that when victory was won, would ignore it in practice. No, Lenin would consider that as deceit of a nation and as undermining the unity and cooperation of the workers of different nations. Truthfully, some problematical individuals today, who like to give the appearance of consistent Leninists and internationalists, are trying to represent the state of affairs in that very light. However, Lenin would not be Lenin -- that is, his words and deeds would not be completely consistent -- if he recognized the right to self-determination only during the period of the struggle for power, and not also during the period of the building of socialism.

For Lenin the right to self-determination was identical with the right of a nation to separate from another, that is with the right of one nation to separate from a state under which it lived with another nation or nations and to form its own independent country. This can be clearly seen from almost all the notations given, and is generally known. On the basis of this principle of Lenin, the recognition of the right of nations to self-determination to the point of separation was incorporated in the constitution of the USSR as well as in the constitution of the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia.

Theoreticians say that Lenin recognized the right to self-determination of nations and the principle of free will in relations among socialist countries, but that this is not valid for Communists, that is, that for Communists, especially when they are in power, only the task of uniting socialist countries into one country comes into question. (They do not discuss the task of compulsory rapprochement of workers, but freedom in the choice of the nature of state relations according to general and national conditions.) They do say that for the policies of Communists of one country the principle of free will does not apply (that is, that when they are in power they do not have the right to decide what attitude will prevail as regards governmental relations between their country and some other socialist country).

- 13 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

This is a very transparent and, to be sure, a shameless falsification of Lenin, first, because, in a unified socialist state (federation), only socialist and not socialist and capitalist countries can be united -- the principle of free will obviously can be realized only by the people of a socialist nation (but capitalist nations fight for the actual recognition of this principle). Second, because neither socialist countries nor socialism can or could exist without the authority of the working class, which is led by the Communist (or whatever its name may be) class labor party. The principle of free will in the relations among socialist countries, or the right of nations to self-determination, that is, the right to form their own socialist countries, is valid also for Communists, whether they are in the opposition and struggling for the actual recognition of these principles, or whether they are in power and creating them. Third, Lenin himself says in many places that the retraction of the right of nations to self-determination in socialism (hence, when labor parties are in power, because in socialism the capitalists cannot be in power, even according to the "logic" of the Cominform) is absurdity and helpless confusion.

Actually, behind the "theory" of the obligation of Communists to work for union into one socialist country is hidden the practice of universal subordination of socialist countries to "a leading" (the USSR) socialist country, and the Communist parties of these countries to "a leading" (the VKP(b)) party.

When Communists are in power in various countries, it is grotesque even to speak of the equality of countries which they govern when the governing (workers') parties themselves are not equal. The equality of countries and peoples in socialism can be realized only through the equality of the governing parties. This occurs, for example, when the governing party of a country, on the basis of the interest of the movement as a whole, freely and independently, as Lenin says, decrees the attitude of the governmental relation of its country toward other countries. A nation under socialism solves the question of union with other socialist countries through its freely chosen representatives or by means of a referendum. In either case, since there is no other way, the nation must know that precisely this question is being concerned, for otherwise its actual will can be falsified and thwarted, and the future unity would be based on false grounds and would be pregnant with internal weaknesses. This would necessarily come about and capitalism would take advantage of it in the first major crisis in the socialist country.

The attitude of the labor party toward the application of the right of nations to self-determination has an exceptionally great significance. This is clear because the people do not exercise self-determination spontaneously, but their political leadership (the party) decrees the attitude and publicizes it among the people. If the party is not independent and enjoys equality, it is almost impossible that the people will be independent and equal in its decisions. The party in question is, of course, a real workers' party, because no other could be in power in a socialist country. Accordingly, if a party does not enjoy real equality, but is subjugated to another party, its policy will necessarily also be subjugated to that party, or to another country. This way the right of self-determination of nations, the right of nations to go their own way toward the common goal, toward socialism and Communism, will be subjugated and lost.

An understanding among parties in power based on free will, on the principle of equality, is one of the general conditions in practice for achieving actual equality of nations and their sincere cooperation in socialism. Every other method leads to the weakening of the unity of workers, to the weakening of cooperation and rapprochement of nations, and to the actual loss of the right of self-determination.

It is impossible to abolish specific and special traits in the development of individual countries because they are the product of historical development and of the relation of forces which are never identical, especially during various periods when revolutions were initiated and socialism was developed in individual countries. Their abolition can be detrimental not only to socialism in individual countries, but also to socialism as a whole, because the strength of world socialism consists of its

- 14 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

individual forces. For that reason, the recognition of the right to self-determination in socialism, the recognition of the principle of free will in relations among socialist countries, actually means the recognition of the historically conditioned specific and special traits in the development of individual countries. In addition, the recognition of this right means the understanding and recognition of actual and concrete conditions from which socialist revolutions and socialism develop in individual countries. Ultimately it means the understanding and recognition of actual and concrete conditions on the basis that socialism can be victorious throughout the world.

If the simultaneous outbreak of revolution in the whole world (and even in several capitalistic countries) is absurd, and it is, and if the outbreak of revolution and the victory of revolution in individual countries taken separately are legitimate, then obviously, the difference in the methods of the struggle for power, in the methods of power itself, is necessary and legitimate in the same degree, if not more, in which the outbreak of the revolution itself is necessary and legitimate. The different forms of revolution, of power, of the way and the speed to socialism are not products of the imagination of "original" minds and megalomaniacs, but are historically conditioned and necessary phenomena. The proletarians in individual countries do not pursue these different methods because they wish to be different from proletarians in other countries, but because they do not have available a different road to power, to socialism, to the final goal of humanity -- to the erasing of all differences among people and differences among nations. He who does not see this legitimate, historically conditioned, and necessary difference in the destruction of capitalism, and the different roads of individual nations to socialism, truly has to abandon dialectics and its laws about the variety of development, and necessarily has to waver between Trotskyite "theories" about "permanent" revolution ("the necessity" for the simultaneous outbreak of the revolution throughout the world or the majority of developed countries) and strict nationalism in order to form his own revolution and his own road to socialism.

The slanderers of the KPJ, led by the theoreticians and revisionists from the USSR, deny difference of form in the roads to power and in building socialism of the working class of individual countries. They deny other nations that might which these would like to contribute to the general treasury of socialism. With this, they have reverted in practice and in theory to idealism and are negating the lawfulness of dialectics as to the variety of development which is valid for nature as well as for social phenomena. In retracting this necessary, legitimate variation in the forms of power of the working people and in the roads to socialism, they have necessarily clashed with reality, not only as regards individual socialist countries, but also as regards individual labor movements in the world. For this reason it is not at all accidental that Communists in individual countries more or less publicly speak about the "Russians," not understanding their country and not comprehending their situation.

This denial of differences in the progress of individual countries toward socialism, which has been fatal alike for a real unity of the socialist countries and for the policy of workers' parties in capitalist countries, actually resulted from the fact that the leaders of the USSR have passed from internationalist to nationalistic positions. It was they primarily who introduced principles of capitalist commerce into the socialist states. The basis of exchange among the socialist states is the dollar, as is the principle of selling the poorest possible goods at the highest possible price, while buying the best possible goods as cheaply as possible. Inevitably, this means excess profits and the exploitation of the weak and undeveloped by the strong and developed. In such an economic situation, a political ratio also is formed: governments must be secured in the socialist countries which will consent to discrimination against and exploitation of their country for the sake of higher "international ideals." Thus obedient vassal governments and vassal countries are formed, instead of free and equal socialist states.

- 15 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

Plans for setting up such a government have been drawn up for Yugoslavia. The Hebrang-Tujovic combination was groomed at length for such "service." The methods of imperialist exploitation inevitably produced the well known imperialist political methods of slander, espionage, border incidents, the killing or arrest of innocent people whose minds would not stoop to such policy and such methods, the control of all governmental activity in socialist countries by the Soviet intelligence service, the formation of secret factions in the various parties to control their policies, forums, and leadership; propaganda based on conditions and problems in the various countries, including threatened occupation; using the international struggle for peace to frighten socialist states and workers' parties, persecuting and silencing those who refuse to yield to political discrimination among socialist states and workers' parties, entering into deals and agreements with imperialists, as in the case of the Koruska region and of Greece, because of individual socialist countries or workers' or democratic revolutionary movements, etc. As a result, an equivocal relationship has arisen between Communists in the USSR on the one hand and Communists of other parties and Communists in the socialist states (excluding Yugoslavia) on the other. Many opportunists and suspicious elements directly linked with imperialist intelligence services, who abound in positions of leadership in the socialist states and workers' parties, are proclaimed revolutionaries and patriots. On the basis of apparent fidelity and obedience to the USSR, they strengthen the imperialist intelligence net and spread demoralization in the workers' movement. On the basis of the fallacious, nationalistic, unprincipled policy of the Soviet leadership, which in practice denies any independence or equality of socialist states and workers' parties, the imperialists build their own policy and their own tactics against the socialist and democratic world, which far outweigh in magnitude and importance those forged by fascism and the plots of Trotsky, Bulharin, and company.

The leaders of the USSR overlook the concrete problems of the various countries and try to subordinate the policies of the workers' parties and democratic movements in the capitalist countries to their own national policy. They act not upon the assumption that they should offer moral and political aid to these movements, while guarding their essential independence, which the actual internal and international situation postulates, so as to strengthen them in the struggle for democracy and socialism, but upon the assumption that these parties and movements must adapt their own policies to the immediate interests and instructions of the Soviet government.

As Soviet policy is internationalist, these parties and movements inevitably either come into conflict with Soviet policy or are removed from the struggle for their country's welfare. Thus the "theory" has arisen in the various workers' parties in the capitalist countries that fidelity to the workers' movement and proletarian internationalism is measured not by revolutionary consistency in the struggle against their own bourgeoisie and foreign imperialists, but by recognition of the leading role of the USSR. The struggle against their own and foreign bourgeoisies is adapted to the daily statements and diplomatic changes of the Soviet government, and the conviction is spread throughout Communist circles that their countries can only be liberated by direct action of the Soviet Army. This means waiting for a new war. No one knows when it will break out or how it will develop.

Necessary agreements between socialist states or the Soviet Union on the one hand and imperialist countries on the other (as, for example, during World War II) are not described as necessary, but are justified by unity of ideological aims (using such terms as democratic bloc, democratic agreement, democratic cooperation, etc.), which only confuses the policies of the workers' parties. For example, in a speech of 7 November 1944 Stalin declared that if the Allies could cooperate in war, they could cooperate much more so in peace. Like most predictions, this was not fulfilled. However, it was the basis for misunderstanding and illogical policy in many parties.

- 16 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

In going over to the nationalistic position, the Soviet leaders on the one hand are propagating internationalism for the other parties (by internationalism they mean acknowledgment of the leading role of the USSR), while in their own country they are fostering the most vulgar nationalism, under the mask of Soviet patriotism. Their propagandists speak of the exceptional capacity of the Russian people for scientific discoveries, and of the superiority of Russian culture -- which is indeed a great culture -- over that of other peoples. The Soviet leaders are making virtually no effort to acquaint their people with the revolutionary, socialistic, and cultural attainments of other peoples, even of those that are already on the path of socialist development. They have invented the anti-Marxist theory of the prime importance of preeminence in science (especially, that Russian scientists were the first to discover this or that), and thus have appropriated innumerable scientific discoveries from almost every country. This theory, like that of the exceptional capacity of certain peoples, is of course new only to the USSR, and has long been advanced, in some form or other, by all sorts of racialists and nationalists. There is no mention in Marx, Engels, or Lenin, or even in the published works of Stalin, of the exceptional importance of the preeminence of certain peoples in science and culture.

Soviet propagandists belittle the cultures of other peoples and proclaim, for example, the French language, the language of Rabelais, Moliere, Diderot, and St. Simon, to be the language of feudal aristocracy, and the English language, the language of Shakespeare, Dickens, and Smith, to be the language of commercial bourgeoisie, while they call Russian, which actually is the language of one of the greatest cultures, the language of socialism, though not a language to which the other languages in the socialist world should be equal.

The Soviet propagandists speak of the inalienable right of their country to preeminence in the struggle for socialism. Thus they try to make socialism, which is an international phenomenon and not the property nor the product of the struggle of any predetermined people, but of the international proletariat and its struggle, and which neither is unique nor was first developed in Russia, into a national phenomenon and a national possession and monopoly of the Russian people.

It is no coincidence that Soviet propaganda retains virtually no vestiges of criticism of czarism and czarist imperialistic policy in general, in particular against small, oppressed peoples.

One factor in the development of national pride is to free a people from the feeling of inferiority to other peoples implanted in it by its own worthless reactionary classes while ascribing special characteristics to a people, belittling and scorning other peoples, and appropriating their accomplishments is something else. The former is a struggle against national nihilism, on behalf of socialistic patriotism, while the latter is nationalism in its most vulgar form.

To what depths of nationalistic absurdity have the Soviet leaders descended when they depart from Lenin's course and in practice begin to deny the capacity and ability of certain peoples in the struggle for socialism, when they begin to deny the individuality and diversity of the various countries in their progress toward the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism, toward the development of cultures national in form and democratic and socialist in essence!

The Soviet leadership uses the traditional relations in the past between Russia and the Yugoslav people or Yugoslav states (Serbia and Montenegro) in its attack on Yugoslavia. However, two kinds of relationships are traditional. Yugoslavia encourages the progressive tradition of relations between progressive Yugoslavs and progressive Russians, such as between Svetozar Markovic and Chernishevskiy's group, or such as between the Yugoslav realistic school and Russian realism. But Yugoslavia does not encourage the tradition of reactionary relations with Russian czarism.

- 17 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

Although the Soviet leaders accuse Yugoslavia of an anti-Russian policy, the Yugoslav people cannot but love the Russian people, who have greatly enriched the culture of mankind, especially in recent times, and have materially influenced the development of history in a progressive direction. The Yugoslavs admire the heroic efforts and accomplishments of the Russian people, respect their immeasurable sacrifices on behalf of their own liberty and that of mankind, and will always be grateful for the aid they have rendered to Yugoslavia and other countries. But the role of liberator does not give the Soviet leadership any moral right to decree unequal relationships with other peoples. According to Lenin, every workers' party and every people in the struggle against capitalism is obligated to give its utmost and make the greatest sacrifices. This does not entitle it to any privilege whatever.

The KPJ does not and never will pursue an anti-Russian or pro-Russian policy or a policy directed against any other people. It has pursued and will pursue a policy of socialist revolution and of building socialism, a policy of solidarity with all truly socialist and truly democratic movements and peoples fighting for their freedom, independence, and equality. When the first socialist country is attacked, the KPJ will rouse its people to the attack, combining the Yugoslav socialist revolution with the execution of its international obligations. The slanderers of the KPJ cannot be said to follow the same principles, either in respect to Yugoslavia and the KPJ or toward the other socialist countries and workers' and democratic movements.

Every Marxist concerned with the question of nationalism must be familiar with Lenin's stand on the superiority (in the initial stage, the period of struggle to establish power) of the large state over the small and on the necessity for economic union in socialism.

In respect to the superiority of the large socialist state over the small, Lenin considers that the large state gives its workers greater opportunities for successful resistance to imperialist states, for the development of production facilities, and for a better standard of living. Insofar as the large states are better equipped for a quick victory of socialism and for improvement in the workers' standard of living, Lenin was, quite justly, on the side of the large state. But as to the superiority of the large state over the small, Lenin did not unconditionally favor the large state. Lenin insists unconditionally upon the strengthening of socialism, and therefore upon assuring the right of self-determination and the principle of free will, while the superiority of the large state, which generally has the advantage in the development of production facilities, especially in the initial phase of the struggle for socialism, is conditional upon the above unconditional principles. (Cf. Lenin, XVIII, 328, and XIX, 255-256.)

Speaking of the superiority of the large state in general, Lenin specifies conditions and limits; for example, that the small state should "relinquish" equality in all respects, but that it should build up its own state. To Lenin, such a policy is the only course toward strengthening socialism generally. In harmony with all his teaching, he states unequivocally that the small nation retains the unconditional right of free separation from the large state. This is not a fundamental problem in the relationship of states, but in a "facilitated process of voluntary rapprochement and separation of nations," alliance, federation, and secession. It was clear to Lenin that the workers of other nationalities would not separate from the large state for purely economic reasons. Such separations will be fewer, the more consistent the large state is in guaranteeing the right of the small state to secede. Even a separation of states need not mean an actual economic separation. Such a separation, as Lenin states, in socialism can only be "the basis of a rich cultural life, the guarantee of a facilitated process of voluntary rapprochement and separation of nations."

- 18 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

Thus, Lenin, the future logical internationalist, i.e., the irreconcilable partisan of reciprocal equality of peoples, clearly saw that the great socialist state can be formed only through free choice, and that it does not exclude but, on the contrary, presupposes the actual recognition of the right of a people to self-determination and to free choice in relations among socialist states, and of the right of any people, be it only five hundredths of an oppressed nation before the final victory of socialism, to secede.

Lenin approached the question of economic unity of the various socialist countries similarly. On the assumption that capitalism, especially in its imperialistic phase of development, has shattered all economic isolation, and that socialism has completed the process and established all the necessary conditions for mutual rapprochement of peoples, Lenin held that economic union of the socialist states was necessary for the rapid advance and victory of socialism. As shown in his attitude toward the superiority of large states, he considered further that the existence of separated socialist states must not mean economic isolation. However, he did not even regard economic unity as unconditional. Lenin had to be against unconditionality on this point too, because in all his works he defended the right of self-determination and the principle of free will, and a logical defense and development of these ideas is impossible if economic unity is unconditional, i.e., if one nation forces another into a union and into an unequal economic relationship. Furthermore, self-determination, independence, and free will mean economic self-determination, independence, and free will, i.e., the free will that results from economic freedom and independence. However, whether or not economic separation may be to the interest of a given country is another matter. It is not and cannot be to its interest. But unity in economic as in other matters can be achieved, according to Lenin, only through a voluntary alliance. An agreement between equals, in economic questions also, is the only means of accomplishing rapprochement and unity.

As seen from Lenin (XXIV, 154-155), free will is the prerequisite for achieving the necessary economic union.

Lenin has never postulated economic union upon a union of states. For example, he alluded favorably to the secession of Norway from Sweden, which was accomplished by democratic means, because the dissolution of the bond of force led to an actual rapprochement of the two countries, cultural as well as economic. (Cf. Lenin, XVII, 327.)

However, people who now try to parade as the successors of Lenin speak very differently in their campaign of slander against the U.S.S.R.

In relations between small and large states they act contrary to Lenin's provision for consultations with the Communists of the large state. They dispute the right of small states to build their own government, and emphasize the size and strength of the USSR, though it is clear from Lenin that, if peoples are to be equal, size and strength do not have and cannot have real importance in the international relationships of socialist states.

They have transformed the economic union based on "unselfish and undominating aid," which Lenin regarded as essential to socialism, into capitalistic commerce based on capitalist principles. "Unselfish and undominating aid," which to Lenin is a prerequisite for the rapprochement of socialist peoples, has been transformed into exploitation of the weak and undeveloped by the strong and well developed. Against socialist Yugoslavia, which is making unprecedented efforts to rise from the ruins of war and age-long backwardness, they have organized an economic blockade, for which Yugoslavia has given them no cause.

The USSR and the people's democracies have not adopted such blockades against any capitalist country. On the contrary, they are negotiating for the greatest possible exchange with capitalist countries, and are struggling in international forums against the economic discrimination which US monopolies have tried in vain to organize. Such blockades are rare phenomena even in the history of capitalism.

- 19 -

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

The KPJ, however, has been fighting and continues to fight for the economic union of the socialist countries, but for true union on the basis of "unselfish and undominating aid," not for "unity" on the basis of capitalistic trade or on the basis of exploitation of the weak and undeveloped by the strong and well developed. The former leads to real rapprochement, to reciprocal alliance, to brotherly cooperation, the latter to essential schism, national isolation, and disputes between nations. Yugoslavia and the KPJ, by giving great aid without interest, repayment notes, or deadlines to weak and undeveloped Albania, alone have put into practice Lenin's "unselfish and undominating aid."

Lenin has excluded all possibility of compulsion and force in relations among socialist states (Cf. Lenin, XX, 123 and XIX, 266-267). Lenin has spoken on this question in many places, both while the Bolshevik Party was fighting for power and after it came to power. Lenin's stand has always been the same: against all force in relations among socialist states. Lenin expressly stated that socialist countries in which the working class is in power "will not drive other peoples into paradise with a club" or "impose upon their friendship," but will try to win their friendship "on a basis of equal to equal, as among allies and brothers in the struggle for socialism."

The postwar policy of the Soviet leadership and their supporters in other countries, and especially since the Cominform Resolution, seems ample proof of whether they follow Lenin in this matter. What are slander, lies, and persecution if not the use of force? What are economic, cultural, and other blockades of a socialist country if not the use of force? What are border provocations and invasions by terrorist and diversionary groups if not the use of force? What is the recruiting of citizens of a socialist country for espionage, for the purpose of putting their country into an inferior position, if not the use of force? What is the insertion in the bourgeois press of reports of troop concentrations on the Yugoslav border if not a war of nerves of the imperialistic type and intimidation by force?

To what limit, up to what period in the development of a nation does Lenin grant the opportunity for the existence of separate, independent (in the socialist sense, i.e., with the right to choose its own forms, with an equal right to build its own state, etc.) socialist states? So long as the state exists, until a Communist society is built and the nations disappear, so long as the right of peoples to self-determination and free will in relationships among socialist states exist and prevail among Communists.

The right of peoples to self-determination and free will in relations among socialist states, valid so long as nations exist, as the only means of true rapprochement among socialist and Communist peoples, is based ultimately upon Lenin's tenet on revolution, i.e., that the proletarian revolution cannot break out all at once over the world, or even in several large countries, but must necessarily being in only one country. The victory of socialism thus will not proceed, and has not proceeded, from one country to the whole world, but begins in one country and passes, through various phases, into others. Thus the proletarian revolution does not develop uniformly and smoothly, but heterogeneously and by fits and starts. This is inevitable, for the revolution breaks out, in its primary phase, in the capitalist world, and the development of capitalism in the age of imperialism is highly irregular and sporadic.

If the proletarian revolution breaks out in different countries at various periods, the forms of the socialist states, arising from different revolutionary conditions, must inevitably differ, and their paths to socialism must likewise be different. So long as these differences exist, so long as each country has its own forms of development, rapprochement of nations is possible only through adopting the principle of free will and respecting the right of peoples to self-determination. Any compulsion or artificial forcing of unsuitable forms, any imposition of forms from the outside or "driving into paradise with a club," can

- 20 -

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

only denumb the progress of a given country toward socialism, the rapprochement of socialist peoples, and the development of socialism in general. The process of applying particular forms of government and other forms in a given country takes a long time. For different peoples will proceed toward Communism by different paths and by different stages. The time limit cannot be predicted. According to Lenin, only one thing is certain: so long as a people has a real desire or objective need to develop socialism in its own way, it has the right to do so, for this is the only way toward real rapprochement with other peoples. Any denial of this right is a denial of national liberty and equality. According to Lenin, a situation cannot be imagined wherein a people (Lenin is speaking, of course, of the five hundredths of the oppressed nations before the final victory of the proletariat) would not signify a desire to enrich the general treasury of socialism and socialist culture with its own forms of building socialism, evolved from its own historical and actual conditions. Variation in forms is proper and inescapable. It is a prerequisite of development itself, a prerequisite of the rapprochement of peoples and the union of mankind in socialism and Communism. As they advance into socialism, peoples progress to more and more consistent and complete democracy and liberty. Supposing that they will all proceed toward socialism in the same way, according to the same formula, would be absurd. Freedom of individual nations to develop is freedom of socialism, and is the only means of achieving rapprochement and true brotherhood of nations.

The adoption of Communism will produce still greater and more universal forms of economic and cultural progress. Only through the free and undisturbed development of peoples in this regard will mankind arrive at its true rapprochement and unity, erasing all the differences (class, national, white collar versus blue collar) inherited from class society. This is the only path toward the true unity of mankind and toward the true brotherhood and true equality of all people.

Lenin places the right to self-determination in "democratic institutions," which will die out during the course of development of socialism into Communism, like all democracy, for democracy, however democratic, is also a form of class government, a form of state organization. In many other passages Lenin connects the recognition of the right to self-determination and the principle of free will in relations among socialist states with the period of formation of states in general, including socialist. (Cf. Lenin, XIX, 230-234.)

Lenin recognizes an excess of self-determination only when democracy itself is superfluous, i.e., at the beginning of the period of Communism, the period of erasing differences among peoples, including national differences, when the nations begin to merge (Cf. Lenin XIX, 229).

For the same reason that necessitates a dictatorship of the proletariat, the right of peoples to self-determination must be fostered and realized "when we come to power," for otherwise Communism, the "blending of nations," and the "destruction of the rule of force of one part of society over another" cannot be attained (Cf. Lenin, XIX, 40).

So long as states exist, boundaries also will exist. According to Lenin, these must be drawn on the basis of the wishes of the population (Cf. Lenin, XIX, 243 and 244). Lenin (XIX, 245 and 246) confirms unequivocally that until the nations disappear, i.e., until Communism, the right to self-determination is valid for Marxists, as are the other Marxist or Leninist principles for solving national problems and for conducting relations among socialist states, as well as the inevitable existence of boundaries so long as there are states.

Lenin's teaching on relations among socialist states boils down to this: if the proletariat and workers in general are to be able to fight capitalism and build socialism cooperatively and successfully, they must, when they come to power, guarantee all peoples the right to self-determination, i.e., the right to their own separate, independent national government. Without any compulsion or pressure from the outside,

- 21 -

CONFIDENTIAL

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL
CONFIDENTIAL

each state must voluntarily decide into what sort of governmental relations it will enter with other peoples (federation, confederation, or independent state).

To believe that the truth of the relations among socialist states, if they are improper, can be concealed by any kind of propaganda is sheer nonsense, for the bourgeoisie has never permitted and never will permit the proletariat to hide its errors. It is to its interest to reveal them, as a weapon against the proletariat. To appease their own proletariat and their own people, at home and in their colonies, the imperialists today are even more eager that the relations among socialist states should resemble those between their own and dependent countries and colonies. One who does not and cannot see this does not and cannot see that the bourgeoisie, especially the American, is not so frightened at anything else today as at real liberty and real, voluntary cooperation of peoples on the basis of equality, because it strives to the utmost to maintain the mastery of one people, or a few monopolists, over the whole world, over all other peoples.

Today discrimination among socialist states exists, rooted in the capitalist relationships prevailing among them. Everyone sees it, even if he remains silent. However, since it really exists, it cannot be concealed or defended by any means. This discrimination is already being felt keenly by the workers of Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and other countries. It would be absurd to think that such unjust and unequal relations will not be reflected in the entire development of socialism in the world, or that the imperialists will not use them fully in possible political or military crises. Instead of real equality among socialist states as one of the fundamental motive forces toward the expansion of socialism and democracy in the world, the actual inequality among them can create and has already created one of the basic weapons of the imperialistic bourgeoisie in the struggle against the internal unity of the socialist world and the expansion of the progressive movement throughout the world.

In one way or another, the peoples will fight for equality. The workers' and democratic movements will not permit this powerful weapon of their own struggle for socialism and democracy to become a weapon of the reactionary imperialist powers.

The current revision [of Leninism], which has its roots in the USSR, is a legitimate and inevitable historical phenomenon. A revision is always announced in the workers' movement when a new stage of development, a new relationship of forces within the framework of the age of imperialism, comes into being. The stage of establishing a socialist state surrounded by imperialist states that fight among themselves has come to an end, and the stage of establishing a number of socialist states that cannot be surrounded by imperialist states (including the USA, which is trying to establish its absolute mastery and leadership) has come into being. The Marxists must still elaborate the theory and tactics of this stage as well as the conditions of the struggle of the proletariat in it, for Lenin could only present the fundamental ideas and principles on which relations among the socialist states and the struggle of the working classes and of separate peoples for freedom, socialism, and democracy under these new conditions were to be based.

However, Marxism does not develop and is not enriched simply through the minds of geniuses. Its enrichment is most possible when revolutionary development in a given stage has reached its highest point. Revolutionary practice alone can supply the necessary material for theoretical generalization. Revolution does not stand still, but goes from one country to another. In Marx's and Lenin's time it was in Western Europe, in Lenin's and Stalin's time in Russia. During World War II and since then it has been best carried out in Yugoslavia and China. Tomorrow it will pass over into other countries and enrich the international workers' movement with its experience, adding its mite to the teaching of Marx and Lenin and the general struggle of mankind for liberation. What party provides this theory, which today is essential to the international workers' movement, and to what extent, is of little importance. What matters is that it should come into being and that it should become the property of the workers' and democratic movement.

- 22 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

50X1-HUM

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

The Soviet leaders, reconsidering Leninism and not understanding the truth, have arrived, in theory and in practice, at amazing conclusions. They have divided the world into a capitalist orbit ruled by US imperialists and a socialist orbit ruled by the USSR, rather than into a world of capitalism, in which the extinction of individual peoples is sought under US domination, and into a world of socialist states and workers' and democratic movements all enjoying equality. They are trying in every possible way to bring this division into being and to legalize it in practice. They have invented the anti-Marxist "theory" of the leading role of the USSR, or rather of the Russian people, and have postulated acceptance of this role as a condition of internationalism and communism. They have forgotten that in the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and even Stalin, until very recently, there is not one word on the necessity for leader states, parties, or nations in socialism. They have forgotten what Engels wrote on the leading role of individual movements. They have forgotten that Lenin applauded Engels' stand.

There are no leading nations and governments, and in socialism dominant nations and governments cannot be created, as is actually the case today. Only equality of governments, peoples, and parties, only agreements and cooperation among them, only Marxist teaching, only faith in it and a consistent struggle to realize it can be dominant.

Herein lies the essence of Lenin's concept of relations among socialist states and workers' parties, which is very closely bound up with Marxist and Leninist teaching as a whole. This is the only way to real unity of the socialist countries, to real unity of the workers' and democratic movements of the world, to victory over capitalism. Every other road leads to strengthening of capitalism, to retarding the revolutionary and democratic struggle, to shattering the unity of the workers' and democratic movements, and to weakening brotherly cooperation among liberated peoples.

- E N D -

- 23 -

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL