



SHARPENING OF CRISIS OF COLONIAL SYSTEM AFTER WORLD WAR II

By E. M. Zhukov

CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM Series — II

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1950
REPRINTED IN 1951

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

This is the second in the series of reports and articles published by the Pacific Institute, Academy of Sciences, USSR, in Russian in the volume:

"CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM"

[National Liberation Struggle of the Peoples of
East Asia]

Price: Annas Six

Printed by Jayant Bhatt at the New Age Printing Press, 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4, and published by him for People's Publishing House, Ltd., 190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.

SHARPENING CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM AFTER WORLD WAR II

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

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

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

The great victory of the democratic forces headed by the mighty Socialist power over German, Japanese and Italian imperialism inspired the colonial peoples to intensify the struggle against imperialist oppression

and exploitation and strengthened their faith in the ultimate triumph of their just cause.

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

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

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

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

The armed struggles of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries against imperialism and its local agents has assumed the broadest sweep in Burma, in Viet Nam, in Malaya, Indonesia and in the Philippines. The toiling masses in the various corners of

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

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

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

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

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

* * *

The process of the sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system found its clearest expression in the countries of the Pacific basin. This is explained by the fact that it was precisely here that the liberation role of the Soviet Union which defeated the Japanese aggressors on the plains of Manchuria and Korea was graphically demonstrated. The defeat of militarist Japan which for decades had been the bulwark of imperialist rule and the gendarme of East Asia stimulated to a very great degree the mass upsurge of the demo-

cratic national liberation movement in the Pacific countries. In the course of the Second World War, the prestige of the imperialist powers in the colonies and semi-colonies declined sharply. The peoples of the colonial and dependent countries witnessed the military incapacity, the impotence, cowardice of the representatives of the colonial authorities of the imperialist powers—Britain, Holland, France, USA. The intention of the colonisers who had proved themselves bankrupt during the war period, to return to their former possessions after the defeat of fascism and once again to sit on the necks of the people who had participated in the common struggle against the fascist aggressors, could not but evoke indignation and rebuff.

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

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

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

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

* Member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Great Britain, and the author of a number of studies on colonial problems.
—E.M.Z.

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

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

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

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

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

This important change in the character of the

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

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

The economic enslavement of the colonial and dependent countries is the main content of colonial exploitation. The colonial policy of metropolitan countries operates in the direction of arresting the development of productive forces in the colonial and dependent countries. The very backwardness of the colonies is favourable to the imperialists, because it facilitates the possibility of exploitation by retarding the development of the anti-imperialist national liberation movement and makes it possible for the imperialist bourgeoisie of the metropolitan country to utilise the cheap or even the free labour power of the population of the colonies. Imperialism is interested in the colonies being without industry which creates the pre-requisites of economic independence, and which is capable of throwing goods on the market competing with the goods produced by the metropolitan country. There is no doubt that the

rule of the imperialists in the colonies is linked with encouraging certain types of industrial production there. But it is invariably directed into that channel and permitted only to that extent which corresponds to the interests of the metropolitan country.

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

The imperialist countries refuse to export industrial equipment to the dependent and colonial countries. The head of the British Department of Foreign Trade, Bottomly, "explained" in June 1948 that even if the production of steel-casting industry were to

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

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

This impedes the national bourgeoisie from extending the sphere of exploitation and of its influence.

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

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

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

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

"Every nationalist movement (in the colonial and dependent countries—E. Zhukov) can only be a bourgeois-democratic movement, for the bulk of the population in backward countries are peasants who represent bourgeois-capitalist relations. It would be utopian to think that proletarian parties, if indeed they can arise in such countries, could pursue Communist tactics and a Communist policy

in these backward countries without having definite relations with the peasant movement and without effectively supporting it."

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

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

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

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

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

This directive of Lenin is all the more important since it is well-known that the national bourgeoisie of the colonial countries does not wish to renounce its leading role and always endeavours to secure it for itself. It attempts to hold back the masses under its influence, and sometimes disseminates false illusions about "its irreconcilability" in relation to the foreign imperialists.

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

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

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

And more than this, since this diverted the military forces of the Kuomintang from the struggle against the Japanese invaders, it was as though the Japanese imperialists were invited to deal with the democratic forces of China. The reactionary Kuomintang Generals

systematically provoked armed conflicts between the Government troops and the People's Liberation Armies. The attitude of the Chiang Kai-shek Government to the partisan movement in those regions that were for the time being occupied by the Japanese was one of open hostility. Not only were the partisans not rendered any assistance, but on the contrary measures were undertaken to crush the partisan movement since it was fostered by the growing political activity of the workers, peasants, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, it was profoundly democratic.

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

While in the war period the ruling bloc of semi-feudal and big capitalist monopolist cliques in China did not accede to the introduction of reforms under the false excuse that the military situation "did not permit" the implementation of any serious measures of a social, economic and constitutional character, after the capitulation of Japan Chiang Kai-shek advanced as a "condition" for the democratisation of the country the preliminary disarming of the democratic forces—the disbanding of the People's Liberation Army. Kuomintang reaction whose many conspicuous representatives had earlier flirted with the Japanese now wholly and completely orientated itself towards American imperialism. Through this it finally exposed the treacherous anti-national character of its policy.

Immediately after the termination of the Second World War, American imperialism took to the path of intervention in China, and assumed the role of pro-

tector of Chinese reaction. By actively assisting in the instigation of civil war in China the ruling circles of the USA reckoned on defeating the organised forces of Chinese democracy and converting China into an American colony.

However, these calculations did not come true.

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

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

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

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

ism and wholly and completely renounced the defence of the national interests of China and betrayed it.

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

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

China which appeared to the men of Wall Street as the future inexhaustible source of super-profits for American monopolists, as a new military satellite and as a supplier of cannon-fodder for the American militarists, as a gigantic spring-board "favourably" situated on the borders of the Soviet Union—this China has upset all the plans and all the calculations of the imperialists.

There is no doubt that the defeat of the American imperialists' plans in China and the bankruptcy of the top stratum of the Kuomintang is the biggest factor in the further sharpening of the crisis of the colonial system as a whole. Historic experience teaches the masses to understand that national liberation cannot be attained without the most active participation of the people themselves, that the parties of the exploiting classes are interested not in liberation but in crushing the workers, and therefore, hinder and disrupt the

introduction of urgently necessary democratic reforms. Already in 1927, Comrade Stalin pointed out from the example of China the restricted and the nominal character of the participation of the bourgeoisie in the national liberation movement and in the colonial revolution. In his works on the Chinese Revolution, Comrade Stalin gave a number of very valuable directions arming us with an understanding of the basis of the strategy and tactics on the questions of the national and colonial revolution as a whole, not only in China but also in other countries.

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

Thus the first stage of the colonial revolution is mainly directed against foreign imperialism; the second stage, above all, against the internal enemies, against the feudal regime. However, if the first and the second

stages do not entirely succeed in completing the task of over-throwing the power of the imperialists, then it is bequeathed to the following, the third stage, the Soviet stage.

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

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

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

The situation in India and Indonesia speaks eloquently of this. The Indian big bourgeoisie which has formed a bloc with the semi-feudal landlords has brought dishonour to itself by a deal with imperialism at the expense of the basic national interests of its country. Having attained formal autonomy it has taken to the path of dealing ruthlessly with the working class and peasant movement, with all the progressive forces fighting against imperialism and reaction.

A clear illustration of the collaboration of the Indian national bourgeoisie with rank reactionary feudal elements were the events in Hyderabad, in the autumn of 1948. The Government troops of the Indian Union entered within the bonds of the Princely State of Hyderabad as though to abolish the regime of feudal despotism—the rule of the Nizam—and to render assist-

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

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

Thus the Indian big bourgeoisie has become a

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

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

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

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

By hindering the national liberation struggle of the Indonesian people, by sabotaging the carrying out of the promised democratic reforms, by making advances to the American colonisers, the bourgeois nationalists of the type of Soekarno and Hatta have prepared for the conversion of Indonesia into an ordinary bourgeois republic, as much enmeshed in the network of political, economic and military dependence on USA as 'independent' Philippines.

The efforts of the bourgeois nationalists directed towards taking the Indonesian Republic along the beaten track of Burma and the Philippines, that is, on the path of fictitious 'independence' have evoked the legitimate indignation of the toiling masses of Indonesia. The People's Democratic Front led by the Communist Party has come out against the treacherous

policy of the Hatta Government. The popular masses of Indonesia have demanded a breaking off of the Renville Agreement thrust upon them by the imperialists and the realisation of the necessary democratic reforms in the country ensuring the possibility of mobilising all the national forces and resources to repulse the imperialists. The nationalisation of industry, the transfer of land into the hands of those who till it, the arming of the people, such were the main demands of the popular democratic front headed by the Communists.

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

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

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

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

Democratic reforms ensuring the advance of the activity of the popular masses and enabling them to free themselves from the clutches of want and back-

wardness are the only serious guarantee of the success of the national liberation struggle as a whole.

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

* * *

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

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

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

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

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

An exaggeration of the specific features of the development of individual countries is directed straight towards attempting to tear away the colonial and de-

pendent countries from the democratic and anti-imperialist forces headed by the Soviet Union.

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

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

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

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

Communist Parties in the colonial and dependent countries in waging a struggle against the various manifestations of ideology hostile to the working class are justly developing special attention to an exposure of bourgeois nationalism (Gandhism, Pan-Islamism, Zionism, etc.) and are taking into account the fact that it is being utilised by imperialism as the most important ideological weapon in the colonial world. To the

international unity of the workers, imperialism attempts to counterpose the line of dividing peoples. Experience, however, shows that when the leadership of the liberation movement passes firmly into the hands of the working class, national divisions cease to play the role of a hindering factor in the development of the anti-imperialist struggle. An example of this is the struggle in Malaya. Till the war, British imperialism in Malaya utilised with great advantage to itself the existence there of three compact national groups—Malay, Chinese, and Indian. These groups—not without incitement from British imperialism—were in a constant state of antagonism against each other. During the Second World War, in the course of the struggle against Japanese imperialism, when the leadership of this struggle in Malaya passed into the hands of the underground organisations of the working class, close cooperation was established between these three national groups—the Malaysians, Indians and Chinese. After the war the three trade union centres in Malaya, led by the Communists began to operate as a single force rallying workers of Malaya against the imperialists. The passing over of the leadership of the Malayan national liberation movement to the working class has led to this—the former imperialist game of playing upon the national differences of the Malaysians, the Chinese and the Indians is played out.

* * *

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

In North Korea and over a considerable part of the liberated territories of the People's Republic of China this struggle has already been crowned with big successes. A number of measures have been carried out ensuring the passing of real power into the hands of the people, the expropriation of the landlords has been realised, "local" capitalist exploitation has been seriously restricted and imperialist oppression has been

abolished. New People's Democratic power in North Korea "backed by the mass of the people was able within a minimum period to carry through progressive democratic reforms such as bourgeois democracy is no longer capable of effecting." (A. Zhdanov, *The International Situation*, Moscow 1947, p. 9)

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

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

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

and raw-material appendage to the metropolitan country remains unchanged.

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

It must be emphasised that the essential pre-requisite for granting Burma formal illusory independence was the temporary advent of unstable vacillating elements to the leadership of the national liberation movement of Burma. It was precisely this which conditioned the reformist path, the renunciation of consistent, resolute forms of struggle against British imperialism. This led to a hindrance and a forcible suppression of the revolutionary activity of the popular masses. This resulted in capitulation before imperialism under the guise of a compromise with it, and the establishment in Burma of a bourgeois "democratic" regime called upon to defend the imperialist interests was a screen for capitulation.

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

The continuation of the brutal exploitation in the enterprises, mines, plantations, belonging to the British,

the subservience of the "left" Government to foreign imperialism, the retention of British military bases, the persecution of the workers for participating in strikes, the dealing with the Communists—all these have overfilled the cup of sufferings of the Burmese people.

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

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

But the Burmese 'experience' shows that even this path is not safe for the imperialists. The popular masses discern the hypocrisy of the imperialist manoeuvres and demand not fictitious independence under the

fig-leaf of a bourgeois republic but are fighting for real emancipation.

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

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

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

cracy in the East and People's Democracies of Central and Eastern Europe consists.

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

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

* * *

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

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

darme, consistently following a line of crushing every activity of the popular democratic forces.

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

The colonising policy of the USA in South Korea can serve as an example of the attitude of American imperialism to the national liberation struggle of the people. American imperialism attempts not merely to hold back the Korean people from realising their national aspirations by impeding the unification of North and South Korea into a united and independent people's democratic State, but has even impudently thrust upon the Koreans a semi-colonial puppet regime of Li Sung Man, guarded by American bayonets.

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

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

The aggressive plans of the American monopolists thrust them towards a still more intensive and predatory utilisation of the human and material resources of the colonies both those which are directly subject to the USA as well as those belonging to the Marshallised

countries (Britain, France, Holland, Belgium). The colonial policy of the USA subordinated to the plans of aggression, i.e. to the struggle for world domination, for the oppression of all mankind is directed towards establishing American control over as large a number of foreign lands as possible, with the aim of monopolising the extraction of strategic raw materials and of gaining the possibility of exploiting the cheap or free labour forces for all kinds of military construction.

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

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

However, the hypocrisy of American demagogic promises is being exposed in practice. The postwar policy of USA in all its aspects is a policy of preparation for a new war, seizure of colonies, crude militarism,

encouragement to reactionary forces, suppression of free peoples and their conversion into an object of imperialist exploitation. The postwar colonising practice of the USA has sown the seeds of hatred towards American imperialism among the people of the colonial and dependent countries not only in the Western Hemisphere which has already become the preserve of the North American monopolies but also in Asia.

* * *

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

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

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

Comrade Stalin in his classical work on the national question (1919) pointed out that "Russia stands between Europe and Asia", and, therefore, her role as a factor in awakening Asia is exceedingly great. This was still in respect of pre-revolutionary Russia.

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

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

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

* * *

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

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

The successes of the struggle in the colonies are possible, thanks to the ideological and political support from the USSR, thanks to the support from the mighty camp of democracy and Socialism. This determines the entire development of the national and colonial struggles after the Second World War and is conditioning the further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism.

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

OUT SOON

CRISIS OF THE COLONIAL SYSTEM

**(National Liberation Struggle of the
Peoples of East Asia)**

This book contains a series of reports presented by Soviet Academicians to the Pacific Institute, Academy of Sciences, USSR, in 1949. The countries covered in these reports include: India, Ceylon, China, Korea, Malaya and Viet-Nam. These reports have been already published in India in the form of separate pamphlets, but now, for the first time they will be available in one volume.



About 300 pages. Hard cover. Rs. 4/-

Orders can be placed right now



**PEOPLE'S PUBLISHING HOUSE, LTD.,
190-B, Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.**