



N.S. KHRUSHCHOV

**THE NATIONAL
LIBERATION
MOVEMENT**

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV

THE NATIONAL
LIBERATION
MOVEMENT

Selected Passages
1956-63

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
MOSCOW 1963

Н. С. ХРУЩЕВ
О НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-ОСВОБОДИТЕЛЬНОМ
ДВИЖЕНИИ

(Из выступлений 1956—1963 гг.)

(На английском языке)

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This collection, issued in response to numerous requests from abroad, deals with the main problems of the national liberation movement at the present stage. It is made up of selected passages from reports, speeches and interviews of N.S. Khrushchov which appeared in the Soviet press between 1956 and 1963. The book traces the close interconnection of the anti-colonial liberation struggle with the world socialist system and the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries; describes the beneficial influence exerted by socialism on the national liberation movement and the tremendous and diverse assistance the socialist countries are rendering to the newly-free countries and the peoples fighting for their emancipation; analyses the ways for the further development of the young sovereign states, etc.

The Foreign Languages Publishing House is simultaneously putting out four more collections of N. S. Khrushchov's selected passages on the other basic problems of our time: **Imperialism—Enemy of the People, Enemy of Peace; Socialism and Communism; The Revolutionary Working-Class and Communist Movement and To Avert War, Our Prime Task.**

CONTENTS

I. EXPOSE COLONIALISM UNDER WHATEVER GUISE	7
The "Civilisation" of Robbers	7
The Colonialists Are Using Force to Keep Countries in Bond- age. Colonialism Is the Cause of Many Conflicts	12
Imperialist "Aid"—a Means of Perpetuating Economic Dependence	24
II. SOCIALISM AND THE PEOPLES' STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION	29
III. THE SOVIET UNION ON THE SIDE OF THE STRUGGLING PEOPLES	39
Every Assistance to the Struggle for National Independence	39
We Support the Liberation Wars of the Peoples	43
The U.S.S.R.—a Dependable Shield for the Newly-Free Peoples	47
It Is Our Internationalist Duty to Help the Peoples of the Less Developed Countries	51
IV. ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE—THE PLEDGE OF VICTORY	58
V. THE ALTERNATIVE CONFRONTING THE NEWLY-FREE PEOPLES: SOCIALISM OR CAPITALISM?	61
VI. FOR THE COMPLETE AND FINAL VICTORY OF THE NATIONAL LIBER- ATION MOVEMENT	69
Asia, Africa, Latin America—Important Centres of the Revolu- tionary Struggle Against Imperialism	69
Put an End to Colonialism Once and for All	71
VII. THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE—AN IMPORTANT CONDITION FOR THE VICTORY OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT	90
Peace Is the Requisite for Progress in the Newly-Free Countries	90
Work for Peace and Disarmament Facilitates the Struggle for National Independence	94

I. EXPOSE COLONIALISM UNDER WHATEVER GUISE

THE "CIVILISATION" OF ROBBERS

Imperialism turned entire continents into prisons for the peoples. It put chains of slavery on hundreds of millions of people and fenced them off for centuries from civilisation. It warped the economies of the Asian, African and Latin American countries, making them one-sided, with an emphasis on agriculture and raw materials. . . . In terms of the capitalist economy countries inhabited by more than two-thirds of the population of the non-socialist world produce as little as about one-tenth of the output of the manufacturing industry, approximately 3 per cent of the machinery and equipment, and 5 per cent of the metals. In the underdeveloped countries of Asia and Africa the annual income per head of the population is 20 to 25 times lower than in the United States of America.

After the many years of "care" which the capitalist "civilisers" dispensed to the colonies, millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are literally starving to death. The average life span in those regions is about half of what it is in their former metropolitan countries. In Africa child mortality is extremely high. Over 80 per cent of Africa's adult population and over 40 per cent of Latin America's can neither read nor write. Such is the terrible price paid for the so-called civilisation of the "free world". It is only natural

that the peoples are tearing down the disgraceful system of relations created by the colonialists.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 181-82.)

Much is being spoken in the West about liberty, equality and fraternity. They talk about them even in the colonial powers. The ruling circles would have us believe in all seriousness that the colonial system is a progressive thing, and they claim that this system of bondage "renders aid to backward nations", "introduces these nations to the higher civilisation". But what this "higher civilisation" means in practice to the peoples who are enslaved by the colonialists is only too well known to tens and hundreds of millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

As a result of this "civilisation" the population in a number of colonies—the Congo, for example—has dwindled to almost half its former size. Everyone knows how the aborigines in Australia were exterminated. Mr. Menzies, who has spoken here, should not forget this. The same thing happened in the United States of America. There the native inhabitants—Indians—were wiped out and the rest herded into reservations.

Although the Negroes in America ultimately received their freedom after the abolition of slavery, they are still subject to discrimination and their elementary rights are restricted to the utmost. In many American states Negro children cannot attend school together with the whites. Negroes are barred from hotels, theatres and restaurants frequented by white people. There you have the true image of the "civilisation" the imperialist colonialist powers plume themselves on! There you have civilisation! It was forced upon the peoples against their will. The colonialists sent troops, cannon, and

machine-guns, and in the wake of the troops came missionaries with the cross.

Only recently Mr. Macmillan painted here a striking picture of Britain's good deeds in regard to the peoples in the colonies. But this is what the British press reports about the situation in the colonies. Kenya, Rhodesia and other colonies are seething cauldrons! The colonialists are obliged to send reinforcements to Rhodesia. What kind of reinforcements are these? Bread, medicines, doctors, teachers? No, they are reinforcements in the shape of troops, machine-guns, shells and bullets. Send us more bullets!—the colonialist benefactors demand.

Yes, you can no longer cover up the nakedness of colonial robbery with prayers these days. The peoples who are having this "civilisation" grafted upon them know only too well that this operation has cost the lives of their brothers. The colonialists should have the mask torn from their faces and be shown up for what they really are—people who have brought disease, poverty, hunger and death to the enslaved countries. The colonialists should not be allowed to go on screening themselves behind lying phrases about "rendering aid" and "introducing civilisation", about the peoples in the colonies not having matured yet for self-government.

All this is claptrap, the ravings of slave-traders and slave-owners. What they are out for is not to introduce civilisation, but to continue using the cheap labour of the people in the colonies, to continue exploiting the wealth of these countries, to wring profits out of the oppressed peoples and grow fat by robbing them.

(Speech at the U.N. General Assembly on the Need to Consider at a Plenary Session the Question of Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960*, Moscow, 1961, Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 480-81.)

As far as I am concerned it is a question of minor importance whether the colonialists are out for uranium, for co-

balt, or for the devil knows what. They are out for robbing people in the colonies, for wringing profits out of them, for destroying the peoples of the enslaved countries. When the Belgian colonialists came to the Congo there was a population of over twenty millions there, and now, when the colonialists have gone after a stay of many years, the population, instead of increasing, has dropped to almost half of what it was. Why? Are less children being born among the Negroes? No. If anything, more children are being born with them than with Europeans. But the conditions they are born into are so unbelievably inhuman that they do not survive, and those who did not die in infancy do not live long. Their span of life is shorter than that of people who live in normal human conditions. Or take the Australians. Mr. Menzies here made a speech at the U.N. Assembly. He could have told us the story of how Australia was conquered, how the colonialists hunted and exterminated the people there like so many wild beasts. They exterminated practically the whole of the aboriginal population. And that is called civilisation! The peoples will remember this "civilisation", and hatred for their enslavers will live on for centuries to come.

We are opposed to the policy of the colonialists. With all our heart and soul we protest against this policy, and we shall do everything in our power to hasten the end of this accursed, moribund system of colonial slavery, and enable all the peoples to win freedom and independence for themselves.

(Let Us All Join Forces in the Struggle for Peace. A Meeting with Journalists at the United Nations, October 7, 1960. Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 2. pp. 433-34.)

... There are, of course, different notions about friendship. Imperialists like to talk of their "friendship" with the colonial peoples. But what they want in this friendship is that the "friend"—for that is the kindly term they use

—should in fact be their slave, that he should work humbly for his “friend”, the colonialist, and that the latter should enjoy all the fruits of his work.

It is this sort of “friendship” which the imperialist powers want. What they change occasionally is only the forms of that “friendship”, while seeking to perpetuate its essence—the exploitation of one nation by another. The colonialists often try to produce the impression that the enslaved peoples are all but dreaming of such “friendship”. Their reasoning is roughly as follows:

“Yes, these countries were conquered once. But why were they conquered? It was not as simple as that; educated people came there and brought civilisation with them.”

But since the aborigines in those countries—Moslems or American Indians, for instance—wanted to live in accordance with the laws and creeds of their forefathers, the colonialists exterminated considerable numbers of them. “Civilisation” triumphed in the end, and the colonialists implanted a regime of their own in the countries they had conquered.

The predatory enslavement of peoples has been and is still being carried out under cover of hypocritical claims about the noble mission of the colonialists.

As a result of this practice of installing “civilisation”, many nations which were once the well-springs of the progress of human culture, came, during the years of foreign domination, to lag far behind the countries which were ruling the subject countries. And now the colonialists maintain that they cannot withdraw from those countries as their peoples have not yet reached the stage in their development which can make them capable of self-government.

(Speech at the Meeting of Friendship Between Peoples of the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, May 15, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 377-78.)

**THE COLONIALISTS ARE USING FORCE
TO KEEP COUNTRIES IN BONDAGE.
COLONIALISM IS THE CAUSE OF MANY CONFLICTS**

When Britain, France and Israel attacked Egypt, the ruling circles in the United States declared that they condemned this aggression. But it is abundantly clear that if they really did condemn this aggression, Britain and France, who depend a great deal on the U.S.A., not to mention Israel, which lives on American alms, would have had to knuckle under, to toe the line. In fact, this was merely a distribution of roles among the imperialists. They calculated that, by the time the United Nations were assembled to discuss the situation, the imperialists would finish their dirty work and set up in Egypt a puppet government consisting of Arabs willing to carry out the policies of the colonialists.

Meeting with a rebuff on the part of Egypt, on the part of all the Arab nations, and as a result of the action taken by other peace-loving countries, including the Soviet Union, the scheme of the imperialists was foiled. The Soviet Union told the U.S.A. that if it really condemned the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression and stood for its suppression, then it was necessary to take joint action against the aggressors. We knew that U.S. ruling circles would not accept our proposal in view of the true role which they had taken upon themselves in this three-power aggression against Egypt. By rejecting our proposal, however, the U.S. rulers exposed their own insincere policy and showed that this policy had been designed to mislead the Arab world and create the impression that the U.S.A. was ready to give its protection to the Arab countries. Thus, we consider that in giving its grave warning to the aggressors, the Soviet Union played no little part in putting a stop to the aggression against Egypt.

Only when the policy of the French and British colonialists was discredited did the U.S.A. decide to make a show of

coming to their help by putting forward the notorious "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine". But this "help" on the part of the U.S. imperialists, designed as it is to maintain imperialist influence in the Middle East, is like the "good turn" which a rope does to a hanged man. While making believe that the U.S.A. supports British and French interests, they are doing everything in their power to oust Britain and France from the Middle East, to strike at the roots of their influence in the colonies and dependent countries, and occupy their place there. To achieve this end they pursue a more disguised policy than the British and French colonialists did.

What this leads to is shown by the example of Viet-Nam. When the national liberation movement developed there, the Americans tried hard to push France into a struggle against the peoples of Viet-Nam. We all know that as a result of the splendid resistance put up by the Vietnamese people, the French colonialists exhausted their strength and suffered defeat. A people's democratic government has been established over half the country, that is, over its northern part, while South Viet-Nam, whence the French have also been ousted, has come under American control....

U.S. ruling circles have proclaimed what they call the "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine" and declare that they will tolerate no "vacuum" in the Middle East. The policy of a vacuum, in plain language, means that the American imperialists do not recognise the rights of nations to shape their own destinies without outside patronage. But those days have gone for good!

The American imperialists are pursuing their colonialist policy in more modern forms—in kid gloves, so to speak, but this does not make it any easier for their victim. They are ousting British and French imperialism from the Middle East area. The smell of oil goes to the head of the imperialists, they lose self-control and are prepared to go all lengths so long as the monopolies can enrich themselves.

Therefore, when the Arab countries, first and foremost

Egypt and Syria, offered resistance to American imperialism, when the "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine" received a setback, the American imperialists decided to overthrow the governments they considered undesirable. They started to engineer a revolt, to seek traitors within the Arab countries. Failing in this, they tried to organise an attack upon Syria by Jordan and Iraq. Here again they failed, failed not because the governments of Jordan and Iraq refused to be involved in such an adventure, but mainly because the latter could not rely upon their armies. They told the Americans plainly that if the Iraqi and Jordan troops were sent into action they would go over to the side of Syria and Egypt.

The Americans, knowing how unpopular an attack by Israel upon Syria would be, for all her readiness to perform this gendarme function, knowing that such an attack would evoke the anger and protests of the Arab peoples, told Israel to toe the line and sit still. They decided to use Turkey, a Moslem country, against Syria. But that plan, too, was frustrated thanks to the determination displayed by the peoples of the Arab countries, first and foremost Syria and Egypt, and also to the action taken by the peace-loving states, including the U.S.S.R.

The Soviet Government issued a warning, declaring that if the imperialists sparked off a war in the Middle East the Soviet Union would not stand aloof. In doing so the Soviet Union pursued no political or economic aims of its own. All it was concerned about was to maintain peace and the security of the nations. The Soviet Government published its well-known statements, and we consider that, thanks to the efforts of the peace-loving forces, the first stage of the struggle for frustrating the aggression that was being prepared against Syria, has been successfully dealt with.

We must be vigilant, however, because the colonialists have not given way completely, because oil is a power which

draws the imperialists like a magnet. They will seek new methods of getting their own way.

(An Interview Given to Mohammed Hassanein Heikal, Editor-in-Chief of the Egyptian Newspaper *Al Ahram*, November 18, 1957. For a *Lasting Peace and Peaceful Coexistence*, Moscow, 1958, Russ. ed., pp. 268-71.)

The Soviet people adhere to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Communism is the most humanist of ideologies. It is strongly opposed to all and every kind of oppression, to all and every kind of exploitation. The Soviet people consider the colonial system, under which the bulk of the world's population were doomed to poverty and disfranchisement, to be a shameful, unjust page in the history of man. That is why, in keeping with Lenin's precepts, we have always come out strongly in favour of liberating all peoples from colonial bondage.

There is no denying that colonialism in recent years has been dealt sledge-hammer blows, and no little credit for this goes to the people of Indonesia. Countries like India, Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, Tunisia, Ceylon, Morocco, Ghana, and Guinea, to mention only a few, have cast off the yoke of the colonialists. About fifteen hundred million people, who in the recent past were living under colonial oppression, have straightened their backs and taken the path of national regeneration. Today we are witnessing the progressive destruction of the colonial system on the African continent.

The last hour of colonialism is striking and millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America are rising to a new life, winning national independence, and with it, the right to independent national development. The wave of the national liberation movement is mounting. Under its powerful impact the pillars of colonialism are tottering to their fall even in countries whose peoples, the colonialists would

have us believe, only recently had no thought of getting rid of their European "benefactors".

Together with all the freedom-loving peoples we rejoice at the successes of the great liberation movement among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, and are confident that the day is not far off when the nations, for good and all, will throw off the shameful yoke of colonialism.

The colonialists these days are no longer able to act the way they did in the past, when the destinies of nations throughout the world were shaped in the European capitals. They are seeking new ways and means for enslaving the countries which have recently won independence and have not found their feet yet.

A special menace to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America are the various forms of collective colonialism. We cannot overlook such forms as the military and political blocs. I need hardly mention this to you, the representatives of the Indonesian people. Provocations and conspiracies against Indonesia, Cambodia and Laos are but a few of the disgraceful acts of the SEATO bloc operating in your area.

We cannot rule out the possibility of things turning out the way the well-known Indonesian proverb puts it: "To escape the jaws of the crocodile only to fall into the jaws of the tiger." Isn't this what happened to some Asian countries, who allowed themselves to be drawn into the military and political groupings of the Western powers?

We are far from considering the struggle against the colonialists to have ended. Only naive people can believe that the colonialists will voluntarily give up their positions.

(Speech to the Members of Parliament of the Republic of Indonesia. February 26, 1960. Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 152-53.)

The events in the Middle East, when certain Western circles launched an open military attack on Egypt, are still

fresh in everyone's memory. By organising the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt, those circles planned, under cover of the hue and cry raised over the Hungarian events, to suppress the national liberation movement in the Middle East, to restore their colonial domination both in Egypt and in the other countries in that area.

The heroic resistance of the Egyptian people, and also the firm stand and assistance of the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other countries of the socialist camp, had a sobering effect on the bellicose circles of Britain, France and Israel and made them end the aggression and withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory.

The successful struggle of the Egyptian people against the foreign invaders resulted in the consolidation of the freedom and independence, not only of Egypt, but of other Arab states as well. Seeing in this a threat to the domination of the American monopolies in the Middle Eastern countries, the United States put forward the so-called Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine. This doctrine has the aim of facilitating—under the pretext of filling the “vacuum” allegedly formed following the defeat of Britain and France—the American monopolies' task of replacing Britain and France in the Arab East and putting down the national liberation movement in Africa and the Middle East.

It is common knowledge that the Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine met with resistance in the Middle Eastern countries, whose peoples have learned sufficiently well from their own experience what colonial oppression is like.

Having suffered a defeat in this fresh attempt to establish their domination in the Middle East, the initiators of this colonialist doctrine began to hatch plots against Syria. By conspiring against the lawful Syrian Government they counted on creating a military conflict between the countries of this area, on aggravating the situation in the entire Middle East, on strangling Syria's independence and thus attaining their own selfish ends.

At this difficult moment the Syrian people received the help and support of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries, which prevented the aggressive circles from carrying out their plans.

The war against the Algerian people, who are upholding their lawful right to self-determination and independence, is still continuing. A peaceful settlement of the Algerian question through the satisfaction of these just demands of the Algerian people and with due consideration for the historical relations between France and Algeria would be in line with the interests of world peace. We are deeply convinced that such a settlement will be in keeping with the interests of the peoples both of Algeria and France.

By ending the war against Algeria and thereby eliminating the possible danger of its growing into a large-scale military conflict, which cannot but alarm the Soviet people, France would contribute greatly to the strengthening of world peace.

The systematic raids by British troops on the peaceful towns and villages of Yemen are also continuing.

These actions of Britain, inflicting numerous losses among the peaceful Yemeni population, are arousing the just anger of all decent people.

An object of foreign intrigues and dangerous provocations at the present time is the Lebanon, where the Western powers are openly meddling in the internal affairs of that state with a view to establishing a colonial regime there and dealing a blow at the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab East in general.

Some states which are members of the aggressive SEATO bloc have embarked upon the path of military interference in the internal affairs of the Indonesian Republic where they are rallying together the local reactionary forces, supplying them with arms, and even smuggling armed hirelings into the country to fight against the lawful Government of Indonesia.

Recent events show that the ruling circles of the Western

powers continue to do everything to step up the arms race, from which a handful of monopolists are enriching themselves at the expense of millions of ordinary workers, and continue to oppose the easing of international tension and to cling to the cold war policy.

(Speech at a Meeting of Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty, May 24, 1958. **For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism**, Moscow, pp. 397-99.)

The landing of troops there envisaged not only what had already taken place, but also a subsequent attack on the Republic of Iraq and its liquidation, the unleashing of war in that area in order to destroy the United Arab Republic and thereby create conditions for a return to the old colonial system which formerly existed in those countries. Times have changed, however. All this proved to be not so easy to accomplish as the initiators of those plans had imagined. The people of Iraq have successfully carried out a revolution. Complete order has been established in the Republic of Iraq. The people are supporting the new government and the republican system that has been established in the country. A wave of popular protest has swept all countries, including those whose governments have sent troops into the Middle East, especially Britain. The aggressors are therefore compelled to camouflage their predatory actions. But the danger has not as yet been removed. The interventionists have so far been stopped—they have now put a halt to their active operations in carrying out the task they had set themselves. But the build-up of forces is continuing. In these conditions the peaceful countries must be exceptionally vigilant. All peoples must raise their voices still louder and vigorously press for the withdrawal of the troops of the United States and Britain from the Lebanon and Jordan, and must put an end to the intervention of the colonialists in the internal affairs of the Arab countries.

It should be noted that the fact that nearly 1,000 million people are now building their life in accordance with socialist principles is of great importance in strengthening peace, in the struggle for peace. This is a great force that is restraining the aggressors and all who have not given up attempts to unleash war.

(Interview with Indian Journalists, July 29, 1958. *For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 633-34.)

Life, however, reminds us each minute that the struggle of the colonial and dependent peoples for their national freedom is far from complete. On the other side of the barricades in this struggle stands a strong and experienced enemy who has not the slightest intention of surrendering its positions, who is ready to perpetrate any crime to suppress the natural striving of the peoples for freedom, and wherever possible to restore its former domination.

The Portuguese colonialists seek to drench in blood the national liberation movement in Angola and commit to the flames and destruction towns and villages in that country.

The intrigues of international imperialism in the Congo are becoming ever more refined.

Look how the Dutch colonialists were raging when the Indonesian Government presented the legitimate demand to liberate age-old Indonesian territory, West Irian.

The United States has been openly intervening in the domestic affairs of South Viet-Nam for a number of years. No longer relying on their placemen, the American brass themselves started an undeclared war against the Vietnamese patriots who are fighting for the peaceful reunification of North and South Viet-Nam.

There are many other seats of tension and unrest resulting from the attempts of the imperialists to block the way of the peoples who are fighting for their national independence.

The American imperialists pay lip service to the establishment of an independent Laos which would apply a neutral policy. But it was after the Laotian Government had announced that Laos would pursue a neutral policy, that the U.S. Government engineered actions of the reactionary forces which unleashed war against the lawful government of Laos. The United States implanted the so-called rebel government, armed the reactionary forces and is supporting them now.

We have no doubt that the imperialists' intrigues are doomed to failure. The people of Laos will gain victory and will have a government that will pursue a policy in the interest of the people, and not in the interest of the imperialists.

The imperialists can no longer settle the destinies of the peoples. The peoples of all countries, whether small or large, have the right to independent existence, to select the social system they wish to establish in their country.

(For Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness. Speech at a Meeting of Voters of Kalinin Electoral District, Moscow, March 16, 1962. *Prevent War, Safeguard Peace*, Moscow, 1963, Russ. ed., pp. 34-35.)

The colonialists, however, have not laid down their arms. By interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign nations, very often by force, they are trying to undermine these countries' independence and sovereign rights and set up barriers against the revolutionary liberation movement of the peoples. By interfering in the liberation struggle of the peoples, the imperialist colonialists have created seats of tension, conflicts and military clashes in many parts of the world.

Look what is happening in Yemen. For centuries the people of this country, deprived of political rights, suffered from oppression and exploitation. And then, at long last, a revolution takes place in the country. The people break

through the heavy layers of medievalism to a new life, like a thirsting plant in the desert, which, receiving a drop of water, pushes up from under the ground. And straightaway the united forces of imperialism and reaction are up in arms against them. Who took up arms against the Yemen revolution, against progress? Saudi Arabia and Jordan.

Of course, the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Jordan, who are hanging by a thread themselves, would never have dared to send their troops against the Republic of Yemen if more powerful countries had not instigated them. Who, then, is helping the Saudi Arabians and Jordanians, who is supplying them with weapons and for what purpose? The peoples of the Arab East know very well that it is Britain and the U.S.A., the so-called "free countries", who are putting weapons into the hands of the Saudi Arabians and Jordanians so that Arab may shoot Arab.

And so we find the so-called "free world" helping Saudi Arabia, a country who, until recently, had official slavery and still has it today in actual fact. And this country is given weapons in order to bring "freedom into Yemen". One can easily imagine the kind of "freedom" Saudi Arabia is bringing to Yemen and what those "free countries" are who are helping to do it!

The Soviet Government condemns the imperialist intrigues against the Yemen Arab Republic and declares its profound respect and support for the just national aspirations of the people of Yemen.

In other areas of the world, too, the imperialists are trying to crush the national liberation movement. Suffice it to mention the events in the Congo, in Angola, South Vietnam and South Korea. And now a revolt has broken out in the protectorate of Brunei, in Borneo, and the British colonialists are hastening to crush it.

(The Present International Situation and the Soviet Union's Foreign Policy. Report Made at the Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., December 12, 1962. **Prevent War, Safeguard Peace**, Russ. ed., pp. 405-06.)

Though doomed, colonialism still has considerable power of resistance and does untold harm to many peoples. All the moribund and reactionary elements are rallied round it. Colonialism is the direct or indirect cause of the many conflicts that threaten humanity with another war. Colonialism, which has caused bloodshed on so many occasions, is to this day a source of the war danger. It manifests itself again and again in outbursts of malicious fury, as eloquently illustrated by the bloodshed in Algeria, the Congo and Laos; it still holds tens of millions of people in its tenacious clutches. And not all the peoples that have won national independence enjoy its fruits, because their economies are still dominated by foreign monopolies.

The peoples of the socialist countries, the Communists and progressives all over the world, see their duty in abolishing the last remnants of the colonial system of imperialism, in safeguarding from the intrigues of the colonial powers the peoples now liberating themselves, and in helping them to realise their ideals of liberation.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. Results of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties. January 6, 1961. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 56-60.)

It is amazing how appeals for humanity combine with colonial plunder in the politics of the Western powers.

Wherever the oppressed peoples rise to fight for their independence, for liberation from colonial oppression, the imperialists instantly bare their swords and try to maintain colonial, slave-owning systems by force. They respond with bloodshed, terror, bombs and napalm to the righteous demand of the colonial peoples for freedom. They burn down

villages and kill defenceless people—old men, women and children.

No matter what they say, they will never obscure the imperialist policy aimed against the peoples fighting for their independence and their freedom.

Whenever many countries speak out in the United Nations against colonial piracy, some spokesmen of the imperialist powers, those very powers that today dispense words of love for fellow men, offer support to the colonialists, and those who say nothing side thereby with the colonialists.

Mankind cannot reconcile itself to their bloody crimes. Colonialism cannot be destroyed by pious wishes. The fight against colonialism calls for the joint efforts of all the freedom-loving peoples. It is obvious that success in the struggle of the peoples against colonialism largely depends on how firm and united is the common front of the forces working for peace and progress, against aggression and the oppression of nations.

(Speech at a Soviet-Indian Friendship Meeting, September 8, 1961. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, p. 410.)

IMPERIALIST "AID"—A MEANS OF PERPETUATING ECONOMIC DEPENDENCE

Imperialism is losing the open battles with the national liberation movement, but is not laying down its arms. Its methods are becoming subtler. The monopolists want to carry out a far-reaching plan for the preservation and consolidation of their positions in the underdeveloped countries, and are concealing the real essence of this plan with pious talk about aid. In this, the U.S. imperialists are second to none.

Of course there can be no question of the imperialist powers giving disinterested aid to the underdeveloped countries. The monopolies cannot give up their super-profits.

Their aims remain what they have always been—to keep the underdeveloped countries in the position of agrarian appendages and sources of raw material, and to go on exploiting their peoples. If, nevertheless, the imperialists proclaim an “aid” policy, it is an insincere measure, and one that has been forced upon them. It never occurred to the financial oligarchy to extend aid of any kind to the underdeveloped countries while imperialism was in sole control of the world. The situation changed when the Soviet Union and the world socialist system broke the imperialist powers’ monopoly of machinery deliveries, of granting loans and credits, and of technical know-how. The imperialists were then forced to change their tactics, and start talking of economic “aid” to the underdeveloped countries.

They expected that in these countries prayers would be sent up and gratitude expressed to those who made dollar hand-outs. Instead, the U.S. imperialists heard curses addressed to them. Why? Because actually the U.S.A. is granting but a tiny fraction of the tremendous sums it extracts from the underdeveloped countries. Indeed, between 1946 and 1959 each dollar invested by the U.S.A. in all the underdeveloped countries brought in \$2.5 profit. Soviet economists have calculated that the monopolies of the U.S.A. and other Western countries annually extract \$20,000 million from the underdeveloped countries. If that is aid, then what is robbery? And robbers are never thanked, they are only cursed.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U., October 18, 1961. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 276-77.)

Imperialism seeks to find new means for attaining its colonial ends, tries to launch a joint drive on the young national states. Of late the imperialist monopolies have been pinning especially big hopes on the so-called Common Market.

The ideologists of imperialism are praising to the skies this organisation, extolling the blessings it supposedly holds out to the member states. But their assertions are far removed from reality. The Common Market is in fact a state-monopoly agreement of the financial oligarchy of Western Europe which threatens the vital interests of all peoples, the cause of universal peace, since the aggressive circles of imperialism use it to strengthen NATO and step up the arms race.

The Common Market is also spearheaded against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Our countries, however, have now become such a powerful force that no Common Market is dangerous to us. The situation is different for the young states of Asia, Africa and Latin America that recently gained political independence and have not yet become economically independent.

One of the main purposes of the Common Market is to harness a number of liberated countries to the economies of the imperialist states, to keep them enthralled. This aim, of course, is concealed by high-sounding phrases about "assistance" to the peoples of the less developed countries, the advantages of selling their products duty free, in the Common Market, etc.

But what is happening in fact? The imperialists compel the countries who link their destinies with the Common Market to retain the old, lop-sided, colonial pattern of the economy. The question is put this way: you produce cocoa or ground nuts, continue producing these crops, supply them to Europe as cheap as possible. As regards everything else, especially manufactured goods, open your market, duty free, to European commodities, buy them at prices dictated

by the monopolies. And should you try to build a national industry—nothing would come of it, the duty free European goods would totally destroy the shoots of national production.

The imperialists understand that industrialisation is the foundation of the independent development and economic progress of the young states, and consolidates their independence. This is why the Common Market organisers seek to erect insurmountable obstacles to the establishment of a national industry.

(Speech at the Soviet-Mali Friendship Meeting,
May 30, 1962. *Prevent War, Safeguard Peace*,
Russ. ed., pp. 135-36.)

The Rockefellers cannot afford to help underdeveloped countries build up their own industry so that this industry could compete with them, for the country in question could do without purchasing the goods manufactured by the capitalist monopolies. I have referred to the Rockefellers, but all the monopolists are alike in this.

Here is the way the imperialists would like to render assistance: to ship to countries in need some wheat, butter and other goods which cannot be sold and by this "gesture of good will" show the whole world that they are helping the hungry. They are advertising that they are rendering disinterested assistance to people in need, but in fact they wish to make the poor permanently dependent on the rich. And they themselves do not conceal that if they do not render such aid this will still further impel the peoples of the colonial countries and those who have cast off the colonial yoke to fight for their genuine independence in all respects.

If underdeveloped countries are to be helped, this must be done in a way to enable them to increase their economic potential, in order to strengthen these states, and help them stand on their own feet. But the imperialists cannot accept this because it contradicts the essence of imperialism.

(Speech at Reception by Vice-President of United Arab Republic, Marshal Abdul Hakim Amer, October 21, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, p. 681.)

II. SOCIALISM AND THE PEOPLES' STRUGGLE FOR LIBERATION

The renovation of the world along the principles of freedom, democracy and socialism, in which we are now taking part, is a great historical process wherein different revolutionary and democratic movements unite and interact, with socialist revolutions exerting the determining influence. The success of the national liberation movement, due in large measure to the victory of socialism, in turn strengthens the international positions of socialism in the struggle against imperialism. It is this truly Leninist concept of the historical processes that is the basis of the policy of the Communist Parties and socialist countries, a policy aimed at strengthening the close alliance with the peoples fighting for independence and peoples that have already won it.

Bourgeois and revisionist politicians claim that the national liberation movement develops independently of the struggle for socialism waged by the working class, independently of the support of the socialist countries, and that the colonialists themselves bestow freedom on the peoples of the former colonies. The purpose of these fabrications is to isolate the newly-independent states from the socialist camp and to try and prove that they should assume the role of a "third force" in the international arena instead of opposing imperialism. Needless to say, this is sheer humbug.

It is a historical fact that prior to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the peoples failed in their attempts to break the chains of colonialism. History proves that until socialism triumphed in at least a part of the world there could be no question of destroying colonialism.

The imperialist powers, above all the United States, are doing their utmost to hitch to their system the countries that have cast off the colonial yoke and thereby strengthen the positions of world capitalism, to infuse fresh blood into it, as bourgeois ideologists put it, and to rejuvenate and consolidate it. If we look the facts in the face, we have to admit that the imperialists have powerful economic levers with which to exert pressure on the newly-free countries. They still manage to enmesh some of the politically independent countries in the web of economic dependence. Now that it is no longer possible to establish outright colonial regimes, the imperialists resort to disguised forms and means of enslaving and plundering the newly-free countries. At the same time, the colonial powers back the internal reactionaries in all these countries; they try to impose on them puppet dictatorial regimes and to involve them in aggressive blocs. Although there are sharp contradictions between the imperialist countries, they often take joint action against the national liberation movement.

But if we consider all the factors shaping the destinies of the peoples that have shaken off colonial rule, we shall see that in the final analysis the trends of social progress opposing imperialism will prevail.

However, these matters are solved in bitter struggle within each country. The Statement of the Meeting* contains important propositions on the basic issues concerning the development of the national liberation movement. It defines the tasks of the Communist Parties and their attitude to the various classes and social groups. The Statement expresses the identity of views held by the Marxist-Leninist parties, and calls for the maximum utilisation of the revolutionary possibilities of various classes and social strata and for the drawing of all allies, even if inconsistent, shaky and unstable, into the struggle against imperialism.

* Reference is to the November 1960 Meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties.—Ed.

The Communists are revolutionaries and it would be a bad thing if they failed to see the new opportunities, to find new ways and means of reaching the set goal with the greatest certainty. Special note should be taken of the idea set forth in the Statement about the formation of national democratic states. The Statement describes the main characteristics of these states and their tasks. It should be stressed that in view of the great variety of conditions in those countries where the peoples, having achieved independence, are now making their own history, a variety of forms for solving the tasks of social progress is bound to emerge.

Correct application of Marxist-Leninist theory in the newly-free countries consists precisely in taking note of the peculiarities of the economic, political and cultural life of the peoples and in seeking forms for uniting all the sound forces of the nations, ensuring the leading role of the working class in the national front, in the struggle for the final eradication of the roots of imperialism and remnants of feudalism, and for paving the way for the ultimate advance of socialism.

Today, when the imperialist reactionaries are striving to foist the policy of anti-communism on the young independent states, it is most important to give a truthful explanation to the communist views and aspirations. The Communists support the general democratic measures of the national governments. At the same time, they explain to the masses that these measures are not socialist at all.

Nobody appreciates and understands the aspirations of the peoples now smashing the fetters of colonialism better than the working people of the socialist countries and the Communists of the whole world. Our world outlook and the interests of all the working people, for which we are fighting, impel us to do our best to ensure that the peoples follow the right road to progress, to the flowering of their material and spiritual forces. By our policy we must

strengthen the peoples' confidence in the socialist countries.

The aid extended by the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist states to the newly-independent countries has but one aim—to help strengthen the position of these countries in the struggle against imperialism, further the development of their national economy and improve the life of their people. Noting that the working class of the developed countries is deeply interested in the advance “towards independence” of the colonial countries “as rapidly as possible”, Engels wrote: “One thing alone is certain: the victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing.”*

The international duty of the victorious working class consists in helping the peoples of the economically underdeveloped countries to smash the chains of colonial slavery, and in rendering them all-round aid in their struggle against imperialism, for the right to self-determination and independent development. However, it does not follow that socialist aid exerts no influence on the prospective development of the newly-free countries.

The Soviet Union has always been, and remains, a sincere friend of the colonial peoples; it has always championed their rights, interests and aspirations to independence. We shall continue to strengthen and develop our economic and cultural co-operation with countries which have won their independence.

The Soviet Union submitted to the Fifteenth U. N. General Assembly a Declaration for Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

After an acute political struggle which raged round this proposal both within and without the U.N., the General Assembly adopted the Declaration. The basic point made

* Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, p. 423.

in the Soviet Declaration—the need for abolishing colonialism in all its forms and manifestations rapidly and for all time—was in the main reflected in the resolution adopted by the United Nations. This was a big victory for the progressive forces and all the socialist countries, which are firmly and consistently championing the freedom and independent national development of the peoples.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. **Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples**, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 55-59.)

The imperialists are doing their best to prolong their domination in Asia and Africa. And since the colonialists still command substantial forces the danger threatening the peoples of the East should not be underrated. Nevertheless, ineluctable historical facts show that imperialist domination in the East is nearing its end.

The great power of attraction of the example of the Soviet Union, which has established beacons of socialism in the East—the prosperous Soviet republics of Central Asia—and the example of the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries are an inspiration to the peoples of the East in their fight for freedom and independence. The peoples of Asia and Africa have disinterested friends—the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which consistently pursue a just policy fully in keeping with the interests of the peace-loving peoples.

From the earliest days of its existence our state has firmly rejected in its international relations all that was founded on plunder, force and conquest, and resolutely proclaimed the principle of good-neighbourly relations and equal economic ties with all countries.

On November 8, 1917, Lenin said from the platform of the Second Congress of the Soviets as he substantiated the provisions of the Decree on Peace: "We reject all the points that envisage plunder and the use of force, but we shall

gladly accept all those points which contain good-neighbourly terms and economic agreements; we cannot reject them.”*

{Forty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Report at the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., November 6, 1957. Moscow, p. 67.}

The new balance of forces of socialism and capitalism in the world is having a beneficial effect on the situation in the countries that have only recently won national independence.

In the past U.S. imperialism refused to reckon with the neutral policy of the newly-free countries. Now the United States is increasingly compelled to recognise the admissibility and legality of the neutral policy pursued by a number of Asian and African countries.

It stands to reason that it would be naïve to consider these changes in imperialist policy to be due to Western statesmen having become more enlightened and progressive. No, that is not the case. The imperialists are compelled to reckon with the realities whether they like it or not. They have no other choice. In framing their policy they are compelled to heed the growing power of the socialist countries, their economic and military might, the development of the national liberation movement of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples fighting for their independence against imperialism, and the greater struggle of the masses in the capitalist countries against the monopolies. All this is weakening the positions of imperialism in the international arena.

The imperialists naturally have not abandoned the idea of involving one or another neutralist state in their aggressive policy, drawing it into their military blocs. They

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 26, p. 223.

are going to great pains to undermine the non-alignment policy pursued by the newly-independent states. They are trying to divert them from the correct path, to distort the purport and substance of the processes of society's development under way in the world.

In this connection I should like to say a few words about some statesmen in countries which have embarked on independent development who do not always correctly assess current developments. Yet a correct appreciation and understanding of these developments is very important for shaping the policy of these countries in their effort to reinforce their independence.

This is evident, firstly, in the question of military blocs, which in our time radically differ in purpose and nature. The statesmen of some countries that call themselves non-aligned and adhere to neutralist positions, for one reason or another define the substance and nature of existing military blocs incorrectly and draw a sign of equality between the aggressive blocs of the imperialist countries, such as NATO, CENTO and SEATO, and the defensive union of the Warsaw Treaty countries, the countries of the socialist community.

The political-military groupings of the imperialists should not be confused with the Warsaw Treaty organisation. What is the purpose of the military blocs established by the imperialist states? They want to preserve conditions for exploiting the peoples in the remaining colonies. They want to pursue a power policy towards nations liberated from the colonial yoke, to impose their own terms on them and to exert pressure on their internal development so as to compel them to follow the capitalist path. To this end they take all kinds of measures to bring political and economic pressure to bear, and occasionally openly resort to armed intervention, as, for example, in South Korea, South Viet-Nam, and the Congo. The American imperialists threaten war against Cuba and other countries.

The facts prove that the military groupings established

by the imperialist countries are spearheaded against the socialist states, against the national liberation movement, the interests of the working people in the capitalist countries, against the interests of all the peoples. These alliances are built upon imperialist soil and have an aggressive character due to the very nature of imperialism.

The various military blocs have been set up on the initiative of the imperialist states, which the socialist countries have always opposed, and oppose now. It may be said: how come you call for the dissolution of military groupings while there is the Warsaw Treaty Organisation which embraces European socialist countries? But everyone knows how and why this organisation arose. It was established after the military NATO bloc, aimed against the socialist countries, appeared. The socialist countries could not ignore this obvious menace to their security and were compelled to set up their own military organisation, to pool their economic and military strength for the defence of the revolutionary gains of the working people.

The military organisation of the socialist countries was established not for attack on other countries, not for aggression, but to prevent the war danger. It was a measure we were compelled to take. It is fitting to recall that as soon as the Warsaw Treaty Organisation was founded the socialist countries declared that, as before, they favoured the dissolution of all military blocs and were prepared to abolish the Warsaw Treaty at once, provided the imperialist countries agree to dissolve their military groupings. We have repeated this time and again, and adhere to the same positions today.

Such are the substance and nature of the imperialist military blocs and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation. Such is the fundamental difference between them.

Now about the other side of this question. Some statesmen of countries freed from colonial oppression incorrectly understand, wittingly or unwittingly, where the dividing line passes in the contemporary world. They divide the

world into two military blocs, referring the imperialist countries and their military alliances, NATO, CENTO and SEATO, to one bloc, and the countries of the socialist community to the other.

But in our time does the dividing line in the world pass only between the military groupings? Of course, not. Look at it from the purely military point of view and you will easily see that not all countries in the capitalist world are aligned with the military pacts. The Warsaw Treaty Organisation, too, represents only European socialist countries. There are two diametrically opposite social systems in the world—the socialist and the capitalist. But military blocs should not be identified with systems. The division follows not only the principle of military organisations, military blocs, and membership of countries in these blocs.

To obtain an accurate picture of the contemporary world, it is essential to see the dividing line that follows the political, economic and social principle. On the one hand, there are the capitalist, imperialist countries which have preserved the old social system of exploitation and oppression. These countries are headed by monopolists who want to save and perpetuate the exploiting system. On the other hand, countries where the working people have overthrown capitalism, abolished its oppression and exploitation, established people's rule, and are following the path of socialist and communist construction, are developing and gaining in strength. The number of these countries will increase, while the capitalist world will shrink.

Thus, it is not a question of military blocs but of two different social systems. Military alliances, blocs and pacts arise out of the practical policies of the imperialist states, which see them as a means of safeguarding their exploiter interests, suppressing the struggle of the working people, and preparing and starting military conflicts. Military alliances, blocs and pacts are brought into being by international treaties and agreements. The rise of a new social system is in no way a result of the arbitrary activity of

particular individuals or the product of an international agreement. It is an objective law of social development, a result of the internal contradictions of society, the contradictions between the productive forces and relations of production.

Many countries which have recently freed themselves from colonial oppression want to take the socialist path. At the same time statesmen of some of these countries say they intend to manoeuvre between the two military blocs, thereby mixing up the concepts of "blocs" and "systems". This confusion does no good to the working class and the peoples who have won their freedom from colonial oppression. This confuses the minds of the newly-free peoples and makes it easier for the colonialists to maintain their positions in the young independent countries.

Most of the former colonies have gained their freedom and independence. But the independence of many of them is so far nominal. There is no ignoring the fact that the colonialists still keep their administration, their people and their capital in many of those countries. They are not resigned to the liberation of those peoples and are doing their utmost to retain the opportunity of further exploiting one-time colonies by taking advantage of their economic backwardness.

As for the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, they have rendered, and will continue to render, all-round assistance to the peoples of the former colonies in consolidating their political and economic independence, to all the peoples engaged in a just struggle to abolish the disgraceful colonial system. This assistance will grow as the might of the countries of the socialist community increases.

(Speech at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, January 16, 1963. Moscow, 1963, Russ. ed., pp. 22-26.)

III. THE SOVIET UNION ON THE SIDE OF THE STRUGGLING PEOPLES

EVERY ASSISTANCE TO THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Colonialism cannot be destroyed by appeals and well-meaning wishes alone.

The decision to grant independence to all colonial countries and to abolish completely the disgraceful system of colonialism, adopted at the Fifteenth U.N. General Assembly, has yet to be put into practice. The countries of monopoly capital, the imperialists and colonialists, have gone to great pains to prevent its realisation. The representatives of Britain, France, the United States and other countries, who are either colonialists themselves or allies of colonialists, abstained during the voting on these proposals in the United Nations. They could not vote against the proposals to abolish colonialism and grant complete independence to the peoples of the enslaved colonial countries, because the peoples would never forgive them for it. But they have always done their utmost to prevent the final collapse of the disgraceful colonial system.

However, the struggle of the peoples against the colonialists in the enslaved and dependent countries goes on. A man's longing for freedom and independence, and especially a nation's longing, cannot be killed. This is why the peoples' struggle against colonial oppression, far from abat-

ing, is gaining continuously in intensity. It is not only in words, but in deeds as well, that we side with those who fight for their independence. We have always helped and shall continue to help them in every possible way to win their freedom and national independence.

(Speech at a Luncheon for the President and Head of Government of the Republic of Ghana, July 11, 1961. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*. Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 311-12.)

The winning of political independence does not yet mean the final liberation of the peoples of the former colonies and semi-colonies from the yoke of the foreign monopolies. The countries that have won their freedom are faced with the task of achieving economic independence, speeding up economic development and social progress, and improving the conditions of life of the peoples. These countries have a great deal to do to overcome their backwardness due to centuries of colonialist, imperialist, rule.

It goes without saying that in their struggle for economic independence and social progress the newly-free countries rely mainly on their own efforts. But it is very difficult for them, exhausted and ruined as they are by colonial rule, to overcome their economic backwardness in a short space of time without help from outside, to bridge the vast gulf that exists between the former colonies and the industrially developed countries.

The Soviet Union and all the other socialist countries regard it as their internationalist duty to give the utmost support and every possible assistance to the national liberation movement.

What, in effect, does rendering assistance to the national liberation movement mean? It means, first of all, fighting against imperialist interference in the internal affairs of the newly-free countries, and giving every possible support, including arms, to the peoples who are waging a just

struggle against the foreign yoke. Secondly, it means opposing all forms of neo-colonialism, helping the peoples of the young states develop their economies, and giving them every possible support internationally.

These are the principles by which the Soviet Union is guided in its relations with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The countries of socialism extend a helping hand to yesterday's colonies and semi-colonies. Our aid is not governed by considerations of political expediency. It reflects the fundamental features and principles underlying the policies pursued by the countries of socialism. Indeed, how could it be otherwise? Our ideal is equality and fraternity of all nations, the abolition of all exploitation, class as well as national exploitation. The needs and interests of the working people are near and dear to us, whether they live on the tropical islands of Indonesia, in the African savannas or the vast expanses of South America.

The peoples of the Soviet Union express their solidarity with the struggle of the Vietnamese people for the reunification of their homeland, for the liberation of South Viet-Nam from the yoke of American imperialism and the mercenary clique of Ngo Dinh Diem. The peoples of the Soviet Union express their solidarity with the struggle of the Korean people for the reunification of their homeland, for the liberation of South Korea. We are in sympathy with the struggle waged by the progressive forces of the Laotian people for strengthening their country's independence and neutrality.

We do not demand military bases and concessions in exchange for our assistance, we do not impose fettering agreements upon anyone. We do not humiliate the young states with offers of "charity" and do not insult them by demanding humiliating terms of credit. Our principle is equal rights and mutual respect. No wonder it is the socialist countries that the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America look to as their true friends.

In our relations with the young national states we are guided by the precepts of our great teacher Lenin, who, before the October Revolution, said that the triumphant proletariat would be a bulwark of national liberation to all the peoples oppressed by imperialism. We are firmly convinced that the pledge of success in the struggle against imperialism lies in the interrelation and unity of action among the great revolutionary forces of the modern world—the countries of the world socialist system, which is becoming a decisive factor of world development; the international revolutionary working-class movement; the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples; all the forces who stand for peace, democracy and progress throughout the world. Unity of all these forces is the guarantee of new successes in the anti-imperialist struggle.

(Speech at the Soviet-Cuban Friendship Meeting, May 23, 1963. *Pravda*, May 24, 1963.)

Marxists-Leninists are striving to unite and consolidate the unity of all the forces opposed to imperialism: the world socialist system, the international working class, the national liberation movement and the broad democratic movement of the masses for peace and progress.

We realise that the unity of these forces will serve as the pledge of success in the struggle against imperialism, for the triumph of the ideals of peace, freedom, democracy and socialism. Those who hinder the solidarity of these leading forces of our time, regardless of the motives prompting them, are undermining the forces of the anti-imperialist front and, consequently, play objectively into the hands of the imperialists.

We, the Communists of the socialist countries, see our duty in rendering every support to the struggle of the peoples for their national independence, for freedom and a better life. It is generally known that from the moment of

its birth the Soviet state has been giving wide political and other support to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting against the colonial yoke.

This assistance is acquiring especial importance now when more than one socialist country exists and the economic, political and military might of the forces of world socialism has risen immeasurably. Today too we, more than ever before, see our task in rendering all-round support by every possible means to the peoples fighting against all forms of national dependence and oppression.

Marxists-Leninists understand that so long as imperialism exists the war danger will remain. The Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries are reinforcing their defences, are doing everything to enable our armed forces to retaliate with a crushing blow to the aggressors' blow. We are keeping our missiles equipped with the most formidable thermonuclear weapons in constant combat readiness.

But the Soviet Union will never be the first to use these weapons, to unleash a world war. We place all our might on the scales of peace, and are trying to consolidate peaceful coexistence between the socialist and capitalist countries. We are not begging the imperialists for peace, but are actively working for it, relying on the economic and military might of the socialist countries, the solidarity of the international working class, the national liberation movement and all the peace-loving peoples.

(Speech at Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Meeting, July 19, 1963. *Pravda*, July 20, 1963.)

WE SUPPORT THE LIBERATION WARS OF THE PEOPLES

There will be liberation wars as long as imperialism exists, as long as colonialism exists. Wars of this kind are revolutionary wars. Such wars are not only admissi-

ble, but inevitable, for the colonialists do not freely bestow independence on the peoples. The peoples win freedom and independence only through struggle, including armed struggle.

Why was it that the U.S. imperialists, though eager to help the French colonialists in every way, did not venture directly to intervene in the war in Viet-Nam? They did not do so because they knew that if they gave France armed assistance, Viet-Nam would receive the same kind of assistance from China, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and that the fighting could then develop into a world war. The outcome of the war is known—North Viet-Nam won.

A similar war is being waged today in Algeria. What kind of a war is it? It is an uprising of the Arab people of Algeria against the French colonialists. It has assumed the form of a guerilla war. The U.S. and British imperialists are helping their French allies with arms. Moreover, they have allowed France, a member of NATO, to transfer troops from Europe to fight the Algerian people. The people of Algeria, too, get help from neighbouring and other countries who appreciate their love of freedom. But this is a liberation war, a war of independence waged by the people. It is a sacred war. We recognise such wars; we have helped and shall continue to help peoples fighting for their freedom.

Or take Cuba. A war was fought there too. But it began as an uprising against a tyrannical regime backed by U.S. imperialism. Batista was a puppet of the United States and the United States helped him actively. However, the U.S.A. did not directly intervene with its armed forces in the Cuban war. Led by Fidel Castro, the people of Cuba won.

Can such wars recur? Yes, they can. Are uprisings of this kind likely? Yes, they are. But they are wars in the nature of popular uprisings. Can conditions in other countries reach the point where the cup of popular patience

overflows and the people take up arms? Yes, they can. What is the Marxist attitude to such uprisings? It is most favourable. These uprisings cannot be identified with wars between countries, with local wars, because the insurgent people fight for the right of self-determination, for their social and independent national development; these uprisings are directed against corrupt reactionary regimes, against the colonialists. The Communists support just wars of this kind whole-heartedly and without reservations, and march in the van of the peoples fighting for liberation.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. Results of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties, January 6, 1961. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 42-43.)

... We are against aggressive wars, but we recognise the lawfulness and even the necessity of defensive and national liberation wars. What kind of wars are these? A defensive war is a war waged when a country is attacked by an aggressor and it has to defend itself, is compelled to do so; a national liberation war is a war waged when a people oppressed by the colonialists takes up arms to win liberation.

An oppressed people has a right to do so. Moreover, it not only has this right, but sooner or later rises up to fight for its liberation. If the colonialists offer resistance, as was the case in Algeria, for instance, the peoples will be compelled to rise up in arms and fight.

Indeed, what other way out can the people find? The United Nations General Assembly has passed a resolution on the granting of independence to all the peoples in the colonies, but the colonialists refuse to fulfil this decision. What must the oppressed peoples do? Put up with club law and suffer in silence? No, they no longer wish to tolerate

slavery and they rise up in arms against the oppressors. And they are perfectly right. Only in this way will they be able to gain freedom and independence. This is the kind of wars we regard as liberation wars. We are in sympathy with such wars.

(Interview Given to the American Publisher
G. Cowles, April 20, 1962. *Prevent War,
Safeguard Peace*, Russ. ed., p. 39.)

Our sympathies are always with those who fight for their freedom, their independence, their liberation.

Some people abroad say: look, Khrushchov says he is for peace but he himself calls to war. This is a crude distortion of our views. We are for peace between states, but we are for the class struggle, we are for the struggle against the colonialists, we are for national liberation wars. The peoples kept in colonial bondage have no other way out than to fight for their liberation. What will you do with a robber if he raises his knife over you? Will you go down on your knees, begging him for mercy, will you implore him? But your pleading will not save you, the robber will kill you all the same. What is to be done? One must grab the robber by the hand and wrest the knife from him. This is the position the colonial peoples are in.

At the U.N. General Assembly the Soviet Union proposed that an end be put to colonialism. And such a proposal was accepted. Even the delegates of colonial powers voted for it. What next? The proposal was accepted but the blood of the oppressed peoples is still being spilled. The colonialists of Spain, the colonialists of Portugal, the colonialists of France, the colonialists of the Netherlands and of other states persist in the brutal suppression of the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. It is the colonialists that I mean and not the peoples of France, Por-

tugal, the Netherlands or Spain. These are entirely different things.

What are the exploited peoples to do? The imperialists, the colonialists, are waging war against them. Is there no such thing as the right to defence? There is such a right. The working class has it, the peoples struggling against colonialism have it. No people must be deprived of this sacred right to defend its freedom and independence. Moreover, it is a sacred duty of every people, if it has the opportunity, to render assistance to this struggle for freedom and independence. And we have been supporting, and will continue to support, such peoples in their struggle to the best of our abilities.

(Speech at a Friendship Meeting in Obnova Village, Bulgaria, May 18, 1962. *Prevent War, Safeguard Peace*, Russ., ed., pp. 88-89.)

THE U.S.S.R.—A DEPENDABLE SHIELD FOR THE NEWLY-FREE PEOPLES

People who say that they believe in God and are allegedly guided by divine principles began the aggressive war against Egypt. It was not the atheists, not the Soviet Government that started the war, but the Prime Minister of Britain, Sir Anthony Eden, and the Prime Minister of France, M. Guy Mollet, who after saying their prayers, gave orders to British and French troops to bomb Cairo and kill civilians, women, old men and children.

Meanwhile the Soviet Union, whose leaders are atheists, together with other peace-loving states, exerted great efforts to stop that war. And, as is common knowledge, the Soviet Union's contribution was great. Consequently the war was started by people who consider themselves religious and declare that they are performing works acceptable to God, while the Soviet Government, made up of atheists, did everything to stop it. The question there-

fore arises, whose morality is sounder and whose morality is more humane?

But to proceed. The leaders of some governments who constantly appeal to God were energetically inciting Turkey to an aggressive war against Syria. A new and bloody war was to have been unleashed in that area. The Soviet Union did everything it could to avert a new war. It should be frankly said that this is greatly to the credit of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government.

(Some Aspects of International Situation. Speech at Conference of Front-Rank Agricultural Workers of Byelorussian Republic, January 22, 1958. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 54-55.)

We have only one desire: the strengthening of the positions gained by the Arab peoples, and above all the United Arab Republic. In this you are backed not only by the Soviet Union, but by all progressive mankind. The peoples of the socialist countries applauded when you were selflessly striving, and they applaud when you now strive so selflessly for your independence, for reinforcing your national economy, for raising the standard of living of your peoples.

Grossly distorting our peace policy, the imperialist circles scream about the Soviet Union's "special" interest in this area. We indignantly deny these utterly false assertions. In our disinterested aid to the Middle Eastern countries we have never pursued any selfish aims. The concepts and methods of the colonialists, who believe that if they do not oppress this or that nation, others must do so, are alien to the Soviet socialist state. We Communists maintain that no one may impose his will on the people. The people themselves are the masters of their land, and only they can and must establish the way of life they prefer to have in their countries.

The imperialists, who are accustomed to oppressing the peoples they have subjugated, at one time established the disgraceful system of colonialism. They are so used to it that they regard the system of colonial oppression as a just and lawful system. We saw this particularly clearly in April 1956, when we visited Britain and had talks with Anthony Eden, Selwyn Lloyd and other statesmen. In one of our talks Sir Anthony Eden bluntly said that if the Arab nations did not supply oil to Britain, then Britain would be ready to go to war.

"We beg your pardon," we said then to the British statesmen, "but the sources of oil belong to the Middle Eastern peoples, and we presume that no one has the right to deprive these peoples of the wealth that belongs to them." It would be much more reasonable, we advised, not to try and seize this wealth by force, but to conduct mutually beneficial trade with those to whom those sources of oil belong. The Arab states would, of course, not sell their oil to those who did not offer a good price for it. The policy of colonial oppression and plunder was now unthinkable; it was doomed to failure.

The British statesmen then told us that the correlation of forces in that area was not in favour of the Arabs and that Israel could defeat the Arab states. We retorted by saying that those who thought so were cherishing vain hopes. The population of Israel amounted to approximately one and a half million, whereas the population of the Arab states was over 70 million. We said that if Israel were to unleash a war against the Arabs, the Arabs would, in our opinion, start a holy war against the invaders. And such a war would inevitably end in the defeat of the aggressors. All progressive mankind would be on the side of the Arab people. In such a case, moral support for the Arab people might entail material support and also the participation of volunteers in the Arab struggle against the invaders.

We advised the British statesmen not to start a war

against the Arabs, but they did not heed our counsel, launched aggression against Egypt and suffered a disgraceful failure.

We should like the colonialists to draw the correct conclusion from this and to refrain from using arms to annex foreign territories and subject other peoples to their policy. We want peace throughout the world. Second to Western Europe, where concentrations of large forces are facing each other, the Middle East is one of the most inflammable spots.

The Soviet Government has proposed that a summit conference be held in order jointly to find ways for solving urgent international problems. But the summit meeting and talks must be conducted with due regard for the interests of all countries, on the only acceptable principle of non-interference in the affairs of other states. We must reach mutual agreement, not at the expense of any other countries.

(Speech at Luncheon in Honour of Gamal Abdel Nasser, President of United Arab Republic, April 30, 1958. For *Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 356-57.)

The aggression of Britain, France and Israel against Egypt is an example of a local war started by the imperialists. They wanted to strangle Egypt and thereby intimidate the other Arab countries fighting for their independence, and also to scare the rest of the peoples of Asia and Africa. When we were in London, British statesmen, Mr. Eden included, spoke to us quite frankly about their desire to settle accounts with Egypt. We told them plainly: "If you start a war, you will lose it. We shall not be neutral." When that war broke out, the United Nations formally condemned it, but this did not disturb the aggressors; they went ahead with their dirty business and thought they would soon reach their goal. The Soviet Union, and the so-

cialist camp as a whole, came to the defence of Egypt. The stern warning which the Soviet Government issued to Eden and Guy Mollet stopped the war. Local war, the gamble in Egypt, failed ignominiously.

That was in 1956 when the balance of forces between the socialist and imperialist countries was not what it is now. We were not as powerful then as we are today. Moreover, the rulers of Britain, France and Israel expected to profit by the difficulties that had arisen in Hungary and Poland. Spokesmen of the imperialist countries whispered to us, "You have your difficulties in Hungary and we have ours in Egypt, so don't meddle in our affairs." But we told the whisperers where to get off. We refused to shut our eyes to their knavish acts. We intervened and frustrated their aggression.

There you have an example of how a local war started by the imperialists was thwarted through the intervention of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp.

(For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, Moscow, Vol. 1, pp. 40-41.)

IT IS OUR INTERNATIONALIST DUTY TO HELP THE PEOPLES OF THE LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

In near historical perspective we envisage a time when the states of Asia, who only yesterday were oppressed colonies, will join the advanced states of the world in the level of economic and cultural development. Like Prometheus unbound, the peoples of Asia are straightening their mighty shoulders and setting out to build a new life.

The Soviet people sincerely rejoice at the successes of the Asian states and the bright prospects for their independent national development.

We rejoice also at the successes of the liberation strug-

gle of the peoples of Africa, who have been set in motion and are waging a more active struggle against colonialist domination. The Soviet people wish the peoples of Africa new successes in this noble cause.

We rejoice that the peoples of Latin America as well are making a more determined stand for national and economic independence, and are waging a struggle against foreign enslavement under whatever guise it may appear. Our sympathies have always been, and will be, on the side of states like Cuba, who is defending her national and economic independence in an active struggle.

The Soviet Union has always given and will continue to give friendly disinterested help and support to all countries in their struggle for freedom and independence, in the fight against age-old economic backwardness.

Of course, we cannot apply one and the same measure to all industrially developed countries. We should bear in mind that some highly developed countries achieved economic prosperity and a high standard of living precisely because they oppressed and robbed the people in the colonies. Certain countries in the West are developed precisely because the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are not. It would only be fair if the Western countries now restored to the peoples who were once colonial dependencies at least part of the wealth they had been robbed of.

With the Soviet Union it is another matter. Our wealth, our industry have been built up by the Soviet people in the shortest space of time by dint of hard work. Although we dispose of no surplus capital we nonetheless render ever growing assistance to countries that need it. Hundreds of industrial enterprises and electric power stations are now being built in many less developed countries with the help of the U.S.S.R. We want these countries to find their own feet, to build up their own industry capable of producing not only the means of consumption, but the means of production as well. This will enable them to create an industrial basis of their own and speed up the rate of economic

development. We hold that every country that strives to consolidate its independence should develop its national industry, its economy, in order to raise the standard of living of the people and advance their culture.

By way of stimulating the economic development of the less developed countries the Soviet Union renders its aid to them chiefly in the form of credit and loans on the easiest possible terms. We make nothing out of this, since we cannot and do not wish to profit at the expense of the countries we are rendering aid to. We are actuated by a sincere desire to help the peoples of the former colonies as much as we can to achieve real economic independence in the shortest time possible and substantially raise their standard of living. Naturally, the Soviet Union's co-operation with the less developed countries is steadily developing on this fair basis, and will, we hope, continue to develop.

(Speech at a Session of the Indian Parliament, February 11, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960*, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 72-73.)

Soviet foreign policy towards the countries of the East is clear and simple. We are promoting the widest possible co-operation with these countries and give them disinterested economic aid. The co-operation, economic, cultural, etc., which the Soviet Union is establishing with the countries of Asia, contributes towards the establishment of normal relations among the states and the strengthening of peace. And that is the chief aim the Soviet Union pursues in its international relations. The Soviet Union has no other aims and never did have.

Assistance, of course, can be given in different ways. There are people who are ready to "help" someone out in an emergency, but afterwards charge such a rate of interest that the "beneficiary" feels bitter enough to kill himself. In the long run the "aid" recipient becomes

still poorer, while the "aid" dispenser grows richer at his expense. Part of these ill-gotten gains is used for further "aid", and in this way wealth keeps multiplying. Another principle may be applied in giving aid—one that follows the maxim "You can have it, we have no use for it"! One often comes across that kind of "aid" in international relations.

But there is also genuine aid, when one country disinterestedly helps another to strengthen its economy and to become really free and independent.

Any unprejudiced person today can see that the Soviet programme of economic and technical aid is winning recognition more and more. Our country's potentialities in this respect are increasing. Let me give you some examples. Until recently the Republic of Indonesia had no iron and steel industry of its own, although it has rich deposits of iron ore and non-ferrous metals. The Soviet Union is going to help Indonesia build large industrial plants, including ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgical works, chemical plants and textile mills, as well as facilities for the peaceful use of atomic energy. In India the big Bhilai Steel Works has been built and engineering and other plants are being built with the help of the Soviet Union. Soviet geologists and oil-industry workers have helped our Indian friends to discover oil deposits and lay the foundations of an oil-extracting industry. You probably know that the Soviet Union is rendering similar friendly aid to other countries as well.

We sincerely desire to help the underdeveloped countries to efface the painful legacy of colonialism and create the necessary conditions making for speedy economic and cultural progress. Soviet credits, on easy terms, are designed to finance the key economic projects. All the funds and material resources supplied by the Soviet Union by way of aid have been created wholly and exclusively by the labour of the Soviet people.

No aid, however, no co-operation will be of any use if

mankind fails to solve the vital problem of ensuring lasting and enduring peace, of building a world without arms, without tension, and without wars, hot or cold.

(Press Conference by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. in Jakarta, February 29, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*, 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 164-65.)

Our country's history shows that the basic and decisive factor in industrial development is the mobilisation of all untapped internal resources. The Soviet Union, as you know, managed without foreign aid and coped with all the difficulties that stood in its path.

We were obliged to do this not because we refused to accept foreign aid, but because no one wanted to help us. On the contrary, the imperialist powers tried to strangle our country. They organised armed intervention against it, and afterwards subjected it to a financial and economic blockade. The Soviet people overcame all the difficulties and obstacles in its path, achieved great successes in its economic development, and has now set itself the target of catching up with the United States of America in the level of industrial production.

The countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are in a much more favourable position as regards outside aid than the Soviet Union was forty years ago. Today, in the international field, we find such a comparatively new development as economic and technical aid rendered by industrially developed countries to countries that have entered upon an independent path of development. Not so long ago this was practically unheard of. Not because the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America suffered no want or privations. In many ways they were worse off than they are now. But they had no rights, they had no say in anything. Besides, the Soviet Union—the only socialist state existing at the time—was not strong enough economically to be able

to render any appreciable assistance to the less developed countries.

Only epochal victories such as the rise and rapid growth of the world socialist system, the downfall of colonial empires, and the competition between socialism and capitalism in the world arena put the problem of aid to the less developed countries on the agenda of world politics.

But not always can the provision of funds to countries who have taken the path of struggle for their economic independence be regarded as real aid.

The experience of the last few years clearly indicates that two different approaches to the problem of aid to the underdeveloped countries exist in the world today. The economic and technical co-operation with these countries on the part of the Soviet Union and other socialist states is aimed at stimulating the speedy development of the former colonies and semi-colonies and strengthening their national independence. Some people in the West use their "aid" as an instrument of a new colonialist policy, as a means of safeguarding the interests of monopoly capital and deepening the political cleavage of the world into hostile groups.

Your country has considerable potentialities for developing its economy and culture and raising the living standards of the people. Therefore, those who have been retarding and are still trying to retard the economic development of India and also of other countries who have thrown off colonial rule, will be put to shame. They figure on giving economic "aid" to these countries in the form of consumer goods. But these goods are quickly expendable, and the recipients of such "aid" are obliged again and again to turn for such goods to those who produce them, to those who, under the guise of aid, rake in enormous profits and keep the peoples of the less developed countries in a state of dependence upon them. We prefer to give genuine aid, so that every country which has freed itself from the domination of the colonialists could, in a short time, develop its economy and produce the goods it needs. We want the peo

ples of these countries to develop their own economies, their national cultures, we want them to make swift progress and become really independent of other states.

The economic and technical co-operation of the Soviet Union with the countries of Asia and Africa is founded on a sincere desire to help these countries in their drive against backwardness, poverty, disease, and illiteracy. Even before the October Revolution, the founder of the Soviet state, V. I. Lenin, said: "We shall strain every effort to draw closer together and merge with the Mongols, the Persians, the Indians, and the Egyptians," "shall try to give these peoples, who are more backward and oppressed than we are, our disinterested cultural help". The Soviet Union invariably follows these precepts of Lenin in its policy. We regard it as our internationalist duty to help the nations that have thrown off the political rule of the colonialists to free themselves completely from the fetters of dependence, to eliminate their economic backwardness, and achieve social progress and prosperity. Our economic and technical co-operation with the countries of Asia and Africa is a logical continuation of the fraternal assistance which we have always consistently rendered to the anti-imperialist liberation movement of the oppressed peoples.

(Speech at a Meeting in Bhilai, February 15, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*. 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 93-95.)

IV. ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE—THE PLEDGE OF VICTORY

History has pronounced its verdict upon colonialism. It has had its day and is now quitting the stage, cursed by mankind. But like everything that is old, decrepit and vile, colonialism is not going out of life without cunning attacks and foul deeds. Colonialism has been torn up by the roots, but some of its rootlets still remain. The colonialists are doing everything they can to prolong their domination. That is why the nations who have won freedom from the colonial yoke should be vigilant. The pledge of victory lies in economic independence, which, in its turn, will further strengthen political independence.

(Speech at a Mass Meeting in Moscow at the Sports Palace, March 5, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960*, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, p. 217.)

Large industrial enterprises are the tangible signs of economic progress in your country, which has freed itself from colonial dependence. But in order to eliminate the painful legacy of the colonial past and achieve a better life you still have a very difficult path of struggle facing you. Winning freedom is only the first step towards real independence on the part of the peoples of the former colonies and semi-colonial countries. In order to achieve complete independence you must have a highly developed national economy.

And the only way a country can make effective economic progress is by industrialisation. We know that only too well

by experience. The Soviet government inherited from the bourgeois-landlord system an extremely backward economy. Old Russia, like many a country of the capitalist system today, was a poverty-stricken country. In addition, world reaction forced the Soviet state to spend nearly twenty years in fighting wars imposed upon it and subsequently in rehabilitating the country's economy.

Nevertheless, the Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government advanced its welfare in a historically short space of time. Broad vistas have now opened up before us. In ten to twelve years' time our country will lead the world in per capita production. The Soviet Union will have the highest standard of living and the shortest working day in the world.

By throwing off the colonial yoke, your country, like the other countries of Asia and Africa who have gained freedom and independence for themselves, has started a persistent struggle for creating a genuinely national economy and improving the living standard of the people.

Many economists in the West claim that it would be better for countries like India to abandon the idea of industrial development and concentrate instead on the production of agricultural produce and certain mineral raw materials, exporting them abroad at a low price and receiving in exchange manufactured goods and machinery at an exorbitant price. These "theories" reflect and try to make out a case for monopoly capital's striving to perpetuate the abnormal international division of labour created by colonialism, which condemns millions of people to a life of poverty.

We have always been opposed to such "theories", and believe that all countries can and should have their own highly developed industry, the backbone of a nation's independence.

India's striving to develop her industry is something that we Soviet people readily understand. We wish you every success in this difficult but glorious path.

Only through industrialisation will the peoples of the countries who are lagging in their economic development as a result of the colonialists' domination be able to overcome this backwardness and achieve prosperity. . . .

The creation of an industry of its own is the basis of every country's political and economic independence, the bedrock on which its whole economy, its culture and the living standard of the people are built up. The metallurgical, engineering and other enterprises of heavy industry are the very foundation, the very heart of the country, to use a figure of speech. Without this there can be no real independence, without this no country can hold out—she will be crushed by her competitors. To live in this world without being exploited by other, economically more developed countries, you must create your own industry. This is a difficult job, but we all know that going uphill is difficult. But when you reach the top of the hill the horizons broaden, you see farther, and find it easier to go on to the goal before you.

(Speech at a Meeting in Bhalal, February 15, 1960. *Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960*, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 92-93, 98-99.)

V. THE ALTERNATIVE CONFRONTING THE NEWLY-FREE PEOPLES: SOCIALISM OR CAPITALISM?

Imperialist agents are more and more frequently advising the peoples of the newly-free countries not to be in a hurry with their reforms. They would have the peoples of the under-developed countries believe that they cannot avoid the lengthy path travelled by the capitalist countries of Europe and America before they reached the present level of economic development. They conceal, however, that that path was a bloody and painful one for the peoples. They prefer to say nothing about the roads and prisons in England, France and Germany from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries being filled with vagabonds and homeless people, about the workers in those countries being forced to work from 14 to 18 hours a day even in the middle of the nineteenth century, or about the last plots of land being taken away from the English peasantry to make way for sheep pastures, so that, as was said at the time, "the sheep ate people".

The capitalist path of development would be still longer and more arduous for the peoples of the colonies at whose expense the Western powers achieved their own affluence. Why should this long and painful road be imposed on peoples today, in the middle of the twentieth century? Communists believe that the age-old backwardness of peoples can be overcome through socialism.

We do not, however, impose our ideas on anybody; we are firmly convinced that sooner or later all peoples will realise that there is no other road for them to happiness and well-being.

(Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 22nd Congress of the C.P.S.U. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 33-34.)

The monopolists are trying to retain the underdeveloped countries within the imperialist orbit, to keep them in an unequal position in the capitalist world system of economy. This is a vain attempt. The peoples of the underdeveloped countries do not wish to remain tied to imperialism. They see the example set by socialism. It is not from books alone that the peoples now judge socialism, but first and foremost by its actual achievements. The peoples see that it has taken not centuries, but the lifetime of one generation for Soviet power to do away with the country's age-old backwardness, and for the Soviet Union to become a mighty world power.

The achievement of political independence by the former colonies has had a favourable effect on their economic development. The rate of growth of production has gone up. Before the Second World War these countries had an average annual rate of development of one per cent, but of late years this figure has gone up to four per cent. In many of these countries a state sector has been set up, and the national industry has begun to develop.

But these are only the first steps. The heritage of colonialism is still deep-rooted. The principal economic problems still await solution. Meanwhile, the upper crust of the bourgeoisie and the feudal landlords, who have linked up their destinies with foreign capital, are doing all they can to keep the underdeveloped countries in the system of world capitalism. The road on which the imperialists and their henchmen want to drive these countries can in no way solve the problems over which the peoples arose in struggle against the colonialists.

What is the way out? History provides a clear answer to this question: the way out should be sought along the non-capitalist path of development. Those who want to know what fruits are to be gathered on this path should take a glance at the flourishing republics of Soviet Central Asia and at the other parts of our country that, after the October Revolution, bypassed the thorny path of capitalist development.

A country cannot simply drift on to the non-capitalist path of development. Only active struggle by the working class and all working people, only the unification of all democratic and patriotic forces in a broad national front, can lead the peoples on to that path.

Marxist theoretical thought, by a deep study of the objective course of development, has discovered a form in which the unification of all the sound forces of a nation can be most successfully achieved. That form is national democracy. Reflecting as it does the interests not of any one particular class but of broad strata of the people, a state of this type is called upon to consummate the anti-imperialist revolution for national liberation.

It is the good fortune of the peoples who have achieved national independence that they are entering upon the road of independent development at a time when the forces of imperialism and their ability to affect the course of events are steadily declining, while the forces and influence of socialism are steadily growing. In the circumstances it will be immeasurably easier for them to solve the problems of economic and social development.

The Soviet Union, like the other socialist countries, has no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of the young, newly-free states, or of imposing socialism upon any of them. There has not been, is not, and will not be any export of socialism. But neither must there be any imposition of colonialism, or any export of counter-revolution.

The C.P.S.U. considers alliance with peoples who have thrown off the yoke of colonialism to be a cornerstone of its international policy. Our Party regards it as its internationalist duty to help peoples who have set out to win and strengthen national independence, to aid all peoples who are fighting for the complete abolition of the colonial system.

(On the Programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 277-79.)

The world bourgeoisie has committed many grave crimes against humanity, but one of the most heinous was their enslavement of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Like plunderers, they arrogated to themselves the right to rob whole continents, and cruelly exploit hundreds of millions of people. Who can plumb the depth of misery and afflictions, the blood and tears that fell to the share of the peoples enslaved by imperialism who formed the majority of the world's population.

This flagrant historical injustice had to end. The whole system of colonial oppression is in its death throes. Over 90 per cent of the territory of Asia and nearly 80 per cent of that of Africa now house sovereign states. In place of the former colonies over fifty independent states have emerged. The vast colonial prison which the imperialists set up in Asia and Africa has been destroyed. The very earth is trembling under the feet of the imperialists in Latin America.

Lenin's prophecy to the effect that the colonial system would inevitably collapse, that a time would come when all the peoples would have a say in shaping the destinies of the world, has come true.

The working people of the Soviet Union, by their victory in October, laid the foundations for a genuinely free life for the peoples. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the successes of the Soviet Union in the building of socialism have shaken the pillars of the colonial system and the rule of capital throughout the world. The path of October has been taken by the People's Republic of China and the other socialist countries of Europe and Asia. This has created still better conditions for the complete collapse of the colonial system.

The working people of the Soviet Union wish the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, who have thrown off the colonial yoke, to rally still closer in their struggle for the new life.

During their rule in the colonies, the colonialists worked

hard to establish capitalism there. When the colonial system collapsed and the imperialists were expelled, they left their roots in many of the former colonies. In a number of cases, therefore, the only change is that formerly the exploiters were white and when they left black owners of the land and capital took their place. These, too, are continuing mercilessly to exploit their countrymen, despite the fact that both exploiters and exploited are black.

In questions of the class struggle what counts is not the colour of a person's skin, but his ideological, class stand. In the countries that have freed themselves from colonial oppression the struggle will mount, and not until the exploitation of man by man is done away with, will the newly-free states achieve real prosperity.

(Speech at the Soviet-Cuban Friendship Meeting, May 23, 1963. *Pravda*, May 24, 1963.)

Progressive-minded people realise that only by following the path of socialism can their countries speedily achieve genuine freedom and progress. Only by abolishing the exploitation of man by man, by changing over to the socialist mode of production, under which the factories, the land and all the mineral wealth belong to society, can the national economy and culture make rapid progress. Only along this path can the peoples win happiness for themselves.

All this is an axiom to those who take a Marxist-Leninist stand. These truths, which are so obvious to us Communists, are unfortunately not always clear to many leaders of the national liberation movement. The national bourgeoisie, to which many leaders of the countries that have freed themselves from colonialism belong, is of a dual character. Under present-day conditions its progressive role is not yet played out. As the contradictions between the working people and the propertied classes

increase, however, this bourgeoisie reveals a growing tendency towards an agreement with reaction.

Among the leaders of those countries who have taken the path of independent development there are no few good men, who are prepared to give all their energies to the cause of the struggle for the freedom and happiness of their peoples. Many of them courageously fought and are still fighting imperialism, aware as they are of the terrible menace it represents to the free development of the peoples.

For all that one should not shut one's eyes to the weak points in their policies. Many leaders of the countries that have won national independence are trying to pursue a middle-of-the-road policy, which they call a non-class policy, and to ignore the class structure and the class struggle which actually exist in their countries.

But it wasn't us, the Communists, who divided society into classes. Their existence is the objective result of historical development. The Marxists merely noted this fact and drew from it appropriate conclusions for our struggle aimed at the revolutionary remodelling of society. Since the days of Marx and Engels history, time and again, has confirmed the correctness of our conclusion that only under the leadership of the working class can the oppressed masses win genuine emancipation, and that only through the class struggle can the victory of socialism be achieved.

Today, in a number of countries of Asia and Africa, who have cast off the chains of colonialism, there is talk about their building socialism. We can only rejoice at the fact that the newly-free peoples are linking their future with socialism, that they are rejecting the bankrupt capitalist path of development. It is significant, too, that many leaders of the newly-free countries are speaking of socialism these days as a way of overcoming age-old backwardness in a short period of time.

But what kind of socialism do they have in mind? What do they understand by this? In what forces do they seek backing in the building of socialism?

One thing we are sure of—time and the course of historical development will confront the former colonies with the alternative of taking either the capitalist or the non-capitalist path of development. What path they will choose, the peoples themselves will decide. And the leaders who have the best interests of the people, of the working masses, at heart, will sooner or later come to realise that only with the backing of the working class, as the most consistent and most revolutionary class in society, in alliance with the peasantry and with the support of all progressive forces, can victory and the effective solution of all cardinal social problems be ensured. Either they realise this, or other people will come after them who will better understand the requirements of life.

The national liberation movement of the peoples is gaining in strength. It will score decisive victory in a bitter struggle against imperialism.

(Speech at a Mass Meeting in Sofia, May 19, 1962. *Prevent War, Safeguard Peace*, Russ. ed., pp. 106-08.)

Now, when the most important thing for the peoples of the East in their struggle to consolidate their independence is the development of their national economy, and, above all, the creation of a home industry, the further expansion of economic co-operation between the socialist countries and the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America on a basis of equality and mutual advantage is a decisive factor in transforming the once backward colonies into advanced, industrially developed states. And no matter how hard the colonialists, the capitalist monopolies, may oppose this progressive process, they will not be able to turn back the wheel of history and restore the rotten colonial system.

After having made the first steps along their path of independent development and tasted the first fruits of life

without foreign oppressors, the peoples of the East will never allow themselves to be harnessed again to the yoke of colonialism. They are not alone in their struggle against the imperialist colonialists, for they know that they have true and powerful friends—the peoples of the socialist countries, the progressive forces throughout the world.

For centuries people dreamed of a better, a just life. Tales and legends were created of a time when there would be no rich and no poor, and when all people would be happy.

But those were tales and legends. Today people feel and realise that happiness is in their own hands. It is being forged in struggle and labour aimed at creating a new world, a world free of the ills and evils of the old one. More and more people are beginning to see that the way to this new world, the way to this new life has been correctly mapped out by Marxism-Leninism. The teaching of Marxism-Leninism is not an abstract theory, not a fantastic biblical legend of a paradise in kingdom come. It is a profoundly vital doctrine whose correctness is daily being confirmed by the practice of our communist construction, by the experience of hundreds of millions of people in the socialist countries, where everything has been put at the service of the people, where the free peoples are creating their own happiness by their own labours. This example, this experience, is highly valued by the peoples who are fighting for their independence, fighting for peace and a better life on earth.

(Speech at a Mass Meeting in Moscow at the Sports Palace. **Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union**. 1960, Russ ed., Vol. 1, pp. 211-12.)

VI. FOR THE COMPLETE AND FINAL VICTORY OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

ASIA, AFRICA, LATIN AMERICA—IMPORTANT CENTRES OF THE REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM

The peoples that have gained national independence have become another mighty force in the struggle for peace and social progress.

The national liberation movement is striking ever more telling blows at imperialism, helping to strengthen peace and accelerate the social progress of mankind. At present, Asia, Africa and Latin America are the most important centres of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Some forty countries have won national independence since the war. Nearly 1,500 million people have broken free from colonial slavery.

The Meeting noted with good reason that the breakdown of the system of colonial slavery under the impact of the national liberation movement is second in historical significance only to the rise of the socialist world system.

A splendid new chapter is opening in the history of mankind. It is easily imagined what great things these peoples will do after they completely oust the imperialists from their countries and feel themselves masters of their own fate. This multiplies enormously the progressive forces of mankind.

Take Asia, for example, that ancient cradle of human

civilisation. What incalculable strength the peoples of that continent possess! What a great role the Arab peoples with their heroic traditions and all the peoples of the Near and Middle East, those liberated or in the process of liberation from political and economic dependence upon imperialism, could play in resolving the issues now confronting mankind!

The awakening of the peoples of Africa is one of the outstanding events of our epoch. Dozens of countries in North and Central Africa have already won independence. The south of the continent is beginning to seethe. The fascist dungeons in the Union of South Africa will undoubtedly crumble to dust, and Rhodesia, Uganda and other parts of Africa will become free.

The forces of the national liberation movement are multiplying largely because one more front of active struggle against U.S. imperialism, Latin America, has come into being in recent years. Only a short time ago that vast continent was identified by a single concept—America. And that concept accorded largely with the facts, for Latin America was bound hand and foot by Yankee imperialism. Today, the Latin American peoples are showing by their struggle that the American continent is not a preserve of the U.S.A. Latin America is reminiscent of an active volcano. The eruption of the liberation struggle has wiped out dictatorial regimes in a number of Latin American countries. The thunder of the glorious Cuban revolution has reverberated throughout the world. The Cuban revolution is not only repulsing the onslaught of the imperialists; it is spreading and taking deeper root, and constitutes a new and higher stage of the national liberation struggle, one in which the people themselves come to power and become the masters of their wealth. Solidarity with revolutionary Cuba is the duty not only of the Latin American peoples, but also of the socialist countries, the entire international communist movement and the proletariat all over the world.

The national liberation movement is an anti-imperialist movement. Imperialism has become much weaker with the disintegration of the colonial system. Vast territories and large masses of people have ceased, or are ceasing, to serve as a reserve for it and as a source of cheap raw materials and cannon fodder. Asian, African and Latin American countries, supported by the socialist countries and the progressive forces of the world, are inflicting defeat upon the imperialist powers and coalitions with increasing frequency.

[For New Victories of the World Communist Movement. *Communism—Peace and Happiness for the Peoples*, Moscow, pp. 52-54.]

PUT AN END TO COLONIALISM ONCE AND FOR ALL!

The emancipation of peoples who for centuries have been kept off the high road of human progress by the colonialists, their rebirth to independent life, which are taking place before everyone's eyes, are a great sign of the times. In the short space of fifteen years about fifteen hundred million people, that is, half the world's population, have thrown off the chains of colonial oppression. Dozens of new national states have been set up on the ruins of the old colonial empires.

A new period has opened in the history of mankind, when the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have begun to take an active part in shaping the destinies of the whole world along with the peoples of Europe and North America. Unless this incontrovertible fact is recognised there can be no realistic foreign policy, a policy keeping abreast of the times and meeting the peace-loving aspirations of the peoples.

Is it conceivable at the present time for important international issues to be tackled without the participation of

the People's Republic of China? Is it possible to deal with these problems without the participation of India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Ghana, Guinea and other states? Those who think otherwise should try here, within the walls of the United Nations, to ignore the opinions and voices of the representatives of the Asian, African and Latin American states. True, the fact that new Asian and African states have made their appearance in U.N. inspires fear in some Western countries.

What is more, there has been talk of restricting the further influx of newly-established states in the United Nations.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I must say frankly that we are pleased to see a large number of new states joining the U.N. We have always been opposed to, and will oppose any infringement of the rights of nations who have won national independence. We hold in common with these states a desire to preserve and strengthen peace, to create on our planet the conditions for peaceful coexistence and co-operation among countries irrespective of their political and social systems, as laid down by the peaceful principles proclaimed at the Bandung Afro-Asian Conference. The facts show that the liberation of nations and peoples who were under colonial domination leads to a healthier international climate, to an expansion of international co-operation, and the consolidation of world peace.

The peoples of the new states have convincingly shown that they are not only capable of managing without the control and protection of the colonial powers and of governing themselves, but are active architects of their own new life and incomparably wiser administrators and more efficient masters of their country's goods and riches than the colonial authorities.

Early this year (1960—*Ed.*) I had occasion to visit India, Indonesia, Burma and Afghanistan. I must say I was

strongly impressed by the great advances in their national economy and culture. In these countries we saw big construction projects, new dams, roads, the buildings of new universities and colleges.

Is there anything like this to be seen in the colonies? There isn't, nor can there be. There foreigners rule the roost. Not only have the peoples of the colonies been deprived of the right to independence and self-government, but their national and human feelings and dignity are humiliated and trampled upon at every turn. The foreign monopolies, using methods of ruthless exploitation and plunder, are pumping all the wealth out of the colonies, barbarously pillaging the land.

As a result of colonialist rule the colonies are very backward in economic development, and the working population is living in squalor and misery. It is in the colonies that you will find the longest working day and the lowest national income, the lowest level of wages and the highest rate of illiteracy, the lowest life expectancy and the highest mortality rate.

There is no need here to go into details about the miserable lot of over a hundred million disfranchised people who are still languishing in colonial slavery. The U.N. files contain more than enough reports of various U.N. commissions, petitions and complaints describing the condition of the population in those countries and territories where the colonial regime, under various designations, is still being maintained. These documents are an indictment of the shameful colonial regime. What is happening in those countries and areas rouses the legitimate indignation and protest of all honest people the world over. But even in the still existing colonies the days when the foreign oppressors ruled the roost without hindrance have gone for good. Although the old order of things still exists in the colonies, the people there are not the same. They are becoming more alert to their position

and flatly refuse to bear the colonial yoke. And when the peoples rise to the struggle for their freedom, for a better life no power on earth can check this mighty movement.

Look what is happening in the colonies today! Africa is seething and rumbling like a volcano. For nearly six years the people of Algeria have been carrying on their heroic and selfless struggle for national liberation. The peoples of Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, Ruanda-Urundi, Angola, Mozambique, Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, Sierra Leone, South-West Africa, Zanzibar, as well as Western Irian, Puerto Rico and many other colonies are rising to the struggle for their rights with growing determination.

It should be clear to everybody that no powers or instruments can check the peoples' struggle for their liberation, since this is a great historical process which is developing with mounting irreversible force. The domination of this or that state over another may be dragged out for another year or two, but just as feudalism in its time was superseded by the capitalist system, and the socialist system is now taking the place of capitalism, so will the slavery of colonialism give way to freedom. Such are the laws of human development, and only adventurists can calculate on staving off the bright future with mountains of corpses and millions of victims.

An end must be put to colonialism, which brings misery and suffering not only to the peoples of the enslaved countries. Misery and suffering, tears and privation also fall to the lot of the peoples in the metropolitan countries. Who can say that the French mothers whose children are dying on the fields of Algeria are less unhappy than the Algerian mothers who are burying their sons in their native land.

Today, when the blood of the peoples in the colonies is flowing, it is impossible to turn away, to shut one's eyes to this bloodshed and make believe that peace reigns

everywhere. How can this be called peace when bitter wars are raging, wars in which the combatants are placed in unequal conditions? The troops of the colonial powers are armed to the teeth with all the latest weapons of destruction, while the peoples who are fighting selflessly for liberation are armed with primitive obsolete weapons. But no matter how destructive the wars which the colonialists are waging, victory will be with the peoples who are fighting for their liberation.

There are countries in which, though warm sympathy exists for the struggle of the oppressed peoples, there is also a fear of spoiling relations with the colonial powers, and therefore no voice is raised against these sanguinary wars and colonialism is tolerated. Others are themselves colonialists—you can't expect anything better from them. The colonialist policy with all its attendant crimes is supported by the allies of the colonial powers who are members of their aggressive military blocs.

The overwhelming majority of mankind, however, have long since delivered their final verdict on the colonial regime.

The Soviet Union, true to its policy of peace and support for the struggle of the oppressed peoples for their national independence—a policy proclaimed by the founder of the Soviet state V. I. Lenin—calls upon the United Nations to raise its voice in defence of the just cause of liberating the colonies and to take steps without delay to completely liquidate the regime of colonial administration.

The complete and final liquidation of the colonial regime in all its forms and manifestations is dictated by the entire course of world history during the last few decades. This regime is doomed, and its end is a matter of time. Practically speaking, the question now is merely whether the funeral of the colonial regime will be a quiet one or it will be attended by dangerous ventures on the

part of colonialism's supporters, who will play a desperate game. Events in the Congo are a fresh reminder of the existing dangers.

It is the duty of the United Nations, as an organisation called for serving the interests of peace and security of the nations, to do everything in its power to prevent new military conflicts in Asia, Africa and Latin America as a result of clashes between the colonial powers and the peoples who are fighting for their freedom and independence. There is no need to prove that the Great Powers may become involved in such conflicts, and then the war, at first local, will inevitably develop into a universal war, a world war. It is not enough to build up defence against the schemes of the colonialists and face one international crisis after another. We must safeguard mankind securely against these schemes, and make the world safe against colonial war adventurism. We must put an end to colonialism once and for all, throw it onto the scrap heap of history.

Who if not the United Nations should come out in favour of liquidating the colonial regime, when, according to its Charter, it is the business of the U.N. to affirm faith in human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human individual, in the equality of rights among nations large and small. But how can friendly relations among the nations be developed on the basis of equality and self-determination of nations, which is the aim of the U.N., while at the same time tolerating a situation in which, as a result of the aggressive policy of powers who enjoy military and economic superiority, many peoples in Asia and Africa are able to win the right of shaping their own destinies only at the cost of untold suffering and sacrifices, only by means of an armed struggle against their oppressors. How is it possible to "achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging

respect for human rights and for the fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion"—you will probably have noticed that I am quoting Article 1, Para. 3, of the principles and purposes of the U.N. Charter—while at the same time closing our eyes to such a shameful aspect of the world of today as the colonial regime represents.

Is it not time we launch a final offensive against colonialism similar to that which, a century or a century and a half ago, the civilised world launched against slave-trading and slave-owning, which they buried, thereby providing broad scope not only for political, but also for economic development of society.

The Soviet Government holds that the time has come to raise the question of the complete and final liquidation of the colonial regime in all its forms and manifestations in order to put an end to this shameful, barbarous and savage survival.

When preparing this speech I knew that not all the participants of the General Assembly would welcome the proposals of the Soviet Union, because side by side with representatives of the free and independent states we have here also representatives of the colonial powers. You could hardly expect them to welcome our freedom-loving proposals!

Adhering strictly to the principle that the U.N. is a centre for co-ordinating the actions of the nations in achieving the common aims proclaimed in its Charter, the Soviet Government submits for the consideration of the present session of the General Assembly a draft Declaration, containing the following solemn demands:

1. All colonies, trust and other non-self-governing territories should immediately be granted independence and freedom in building their own national states according to the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples. The colonial regime, colonial administration in all

its forms should be abolished completely so as to enable the peoples of these territories to settle their own destinies and forms of state administration.

2. All colonialism's strongholds as represented by possessions and leased areas on foreign territories should be liquidated.

3. The governments of all countries are called upon, in their inter-state relations, to strictly and punctiliously observe the provisions of the U.N. Charter and the present Declaration concerning equality and respect of the sovereign rights and territorial integrity of all states without exception, to allow no manifestations of colonialism whatsoever, no exclusive rights or privileges for any one state to the detriment of another.

Convinced that the complete liquidation of the colonial regime will be a noble act of true humanism, a tremendous step forward on the road of civilisation and progress, we ardently appeal to all governments represented in the U.N. to support the provisions contained in this Declaration.

In the draft Declaration framed by the Soviet Government which is hereby submitted for your consideration, we have elaborated in detail the views by which we were guided in bringing this question before the General Assembly. We ask for this draft Declaration to be circulated as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly.

Within the limits of my participation in the general debate I should like to make the following points.

Steps taken by the U.N. to abolish the colonial regime for good and all would create favourable conditions for localising and extinguishing the present hotbeds of war where an armed struggle is now going on between the colonialists and the peoples who are fighting for their independence, and also would considerably reduce the chances of new military conflicts breaking out between the states in these areas of the world. The peoples of those countries which are now suffering the humilia-

tions born of foreign domination would be given a clear and near prospect of peaceful liberation from the foreign yoke, while the states that are clinging to their colonial possessions would be answerable to the U.N., to world public opinion, for the fulfilment of the provisions of the proposed Declaration. Needless to say, such a prospect stands a chance of materialising only in the event that the colonial powers will not try to evade carrying out the U.N. decisions.

No one, moreover, should forget what great changes the abolition of the colonial regime would involve in the lives of the peoples of the enslaved countries. This would not only be a triumph of elementary human justice and international law, which it is the duty of the U.N. to strive for in deeds and not in words, but would bring the benefits of modern science, engineering, culture and social progress to the peoples who have fallen behind as a result of centuries of oppression.

The tremendous significance which the abolition of the colonial regime would have for world economy can hardly be overestimated. It is common knowledge that the economy of the colonies and the trust territories is now subordinated to the selfish interests of the foreign monopolies, while the industrialisation of these countries is artificially retarded. Imagine the position changing and these countries and territories becoming independent, receiving the opportunity of making extensive use of their rich natural resources, carrying out industrialisation, and giving their population a better standard of living. This would increase the capacity of the world market to a tremendous degree, and definitely have a beneficial effect not only on the economic development of the countries of the East, but also on the economy of the industrially developed countries of the West.

An important factor in helping to overcome the age-old backwardness of the countries that are winning independence is economic and technical assistance both through

the U.N. and on a bilateral basis. This, of course, will require considerable financial resources. Where are these to come from without burdening the population of the industrially developed countries? Once again from this rostrum I draw your attention to such a source as disarmament. By assigning a mere tenth of the sums the Great Powers are now spending on military needs, assistance to the less developed countries could be increased by as much as ten thousand million dollars a year. The overall construction of one of the world's greatest power systems in the vicinity of Inga (the Congo), estimated at five thousand million dollars, would turn a vast area in Africa into a flourishing land.

We would also point out, apropos, that it is the moral duty of those who had colonies in the past to restore to these newly-free peoples at least part of the wealth they had extracted from them by cruelly exploiting the population and plundering the country's natural resources.

It may be said—it is all very well for the Soviet Union to demand the abolition of the colonial regime, seeing that the Soviet Union has no colonies. Indeed, we have no colonies, nor do we have capital in any other countries. But there was a time when many of the nationalities inhabiting our country experienced the oppressive yoke of tsarism and the landlord-bourgeois system. The former outlying regions of the Russian Empire had practically the same status as the colonies. They were cruelly oppressed by the autocracy and capitalism. Regarded by the autocracy as a source of gain, the peoples of Central Asia and Transcaucasia and other nationalities inhabiting the Russian Empire received complete freedom after the October Revolution and rapidly advanced their economy and culture and improved the standard of life.

Take, for instance, the Soviet republics of Central Asia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Turkmenia, Tajikistan—all the sister republics of Central Asia, once backward colonies of tsarist Russia, have now become ad-

vanced, industrially developed socialist republics. From 1913 to 1960 the industrial output in these republics increased over sixty times. Kazakhstan, once such a backward country, is now producing as much manufactured goods per head of the population as Italy is, while the per capita output of electric power there is more than in Italy and equal to that of Japan.

Before the Revolution only 7,000,000 kwh of electric power were generated on the territory of Central Asia and Kazakhstan—300 times less than in the whole Russian Empire, whereas now the annual output of electric power amounts to 19,000 million kwh, which is nine times as much as the whole of Russia produced before the Revolution.

The peoples of the Soviet Union are engaged in peaceful constructive labour aimed at the fulfilment of the targets of the Seven-Year Plan for the development of the economy of the U.S.S.R. in 1959-65. With the fulfilment of this plan overall industrial output in the U.S.S.R. will be almost doubled during the seven years. More than twice as much electric power will be generated in the country at large, and almost three times as much in Central Asia.

The Central-Asian republics are already producing today 800 kwh of electric power per capita annually, which is considerably higher, say, than in any of the Latin American republics. The Soviet republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan are producing several times more electric power than such neighbouring countries as Turkey, which is producing 95 kwh per head of the population, Iran 36 kwh, and Pakistan 11 kwh.

Tremendous advance has also been made in the economy and culture of the other, relatively small, nationalities of the Soviet Union incorporated in the Autonomous Republics. Thus, the industrial output in the Yakut Autonomous Republic from 1913 to 1959 increased 53 times, in the Komi Autonomous Republic 109 times, in the Tatar

Autonomous Republic 147 times, and in the Bashkir Autonomous Republic 163 times.

In the family of equal socialist republics the former borderlands of pre-revolutionary Russia, whose peoples were dying out through starvation and disease, have become flourishing lands in which, as everywhere else in the Soviet Union, the standard of living has risen. Wages and salaries there are on the same level as in the other republics of the Soviet Union. The workers and other employees, like all the citizens of the U.S.S.R., are entitled to guaranteed pensions, sickness benefits and other social benefits.

Still more striking are the advances in culture made by the national republics of the Soviet Union. As we all know, the peoples of Kazakhstan and the republics of Central Asia were almost all illiterate before the Revolution. There was hardly a person there with a secondary or higher education. The Soviet government gave all the peoples wide access to the sources of education and culture. Kazakhstan and the republics of Central Asia, like all the other republics of the Soviet Union, have eliminated illiteracy and become areas of universal literacy.

Before the Revolution Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia had no institutions of higher learning, and Kirghizia, Tajikistan and Turkmenia not even technical schools of their own. Last year there were 211,000 students in these republics attending institutions of higher learning and 176,000 pupils attending technical schools and other secondary special schools. There is an average of 88 students of higher educational institutions and 73 pupils of technical schools to every ten thousand of the population in these republics, not counting the great number of young people who went to study in outside places, such as Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, Saratov, Novosibirsk, Tomsk and other cultural centres. We would mention that in France there are only 40 students of higher educational institutions per

ten thousand of the population, in Italy 34, and in West Germany 31, that is, only about a third of the number in Soviet Central Asia.

An important factor making for the successful development of the economy and culture in the national republics is the numerical growth of skilled workers and intellectuals.

Allow me to quote some figures from the returns of the last census of the population compared with those for 1926, the year which saw the complete rehabilitation of our economy to its pre-revolutionary level. During that period the number of workers and other employees engaged in the national economy increased six times for the Soviet Union as a whole, and ten times for Central Asia and Kazakhstan.

The figure for skilled workers and specialists shows a still greater increase. Here are the figures for some professions (number of people, thousands):

		1926	1959	increase of 1959 over 1926
Metalworkers	Total U.S.S.R.	993	9,304	9-fold
	Central Asia	29	528	18 "
Chemical workers	Total U.S.S.R.	44	395	9 "
	Central Asia	0.23	16.6	72 "
Engine-drivers	Total U.S.S.R.	121	1,781	15 "
	Central Asia	4	155	39 "
Automobile and tractor drivers and combine operators	Total U.S.S.R.	22	5,684	260 "
	Central Asia	1.2	754	628 "
Engineers, technicians, agronomists	Total U.S.S.R.	267	4,683	18 "
	Central Asia	9.3	349	38 "
Teachers and other educational workers	Total U.S.S.R.	486	3,276	7 "
	Central Asia	18	342	19 "
Doctors and other medical personnel	Total U.S.S.R.	199	1,702	8.5 "
	Central Asia	7	147	21 "
Scientific workers	Total U.S.S.R.	14	316	23 "
	Central Asia	0.36	26.5	74 "

Tremendous economic, cultural and scientific progress, of course, has been made not only in the republics of Central Asia, which were the most backward before the Revolution, but in all the other Soviet republics as well. For example, academies of sciences have been set up in all the Union Republics, as well as a large number of research institutes and institutions of higher education. A skilled working-class personnel has been created during the period of Soviet government in all the republics, and the numbers of the intelligentsia have increased tremendously.

After the Great October Socialist Revolution took place the bourgeoisie all over the world repeatedly prophesied the inevitable downfall of the Soviets, since Russia was a half-literate country with a working class that had no specialists capable of administering the state and running the country's economy. Events confirmed the correctness of Lenin's words to the effect that the Revolution would awaken the initiative of the people, that the Soviet power would advance leaders and organisers from among the masses, that the ordinary worker and peasant, on taking power, would learn to run the state, would master all the achievements of modern science and technology.

The tsarist government pursued, in effect, a colonial policy in the border regions of Russia, a policy that differed little, if at all, from what we now see being pursued in the colonies. The Uzbeks, Kazakhs, Tajiks and other non-Russian nationalities were slightly called "aliens". They were not considered human beings and were mercilessly exploited. National discord, hatred and internecine strife were kindled among these peoples, and the tsarist empire was kept together only by bayonets and oppression. When the peoples of Central Asia and Transcaucasia were granted national freedom and equal rights with the other peoples of Russia they showed what they could do in developing their national economy and culture.

Could our country's development be said to have suffered as a result of the peoples being granted the right to in-

dependence and self-determination? Is there any evidence of discord and enmity among the peoples or disintegration of the state to be seen in our multi-national country? No. There is nothing like it, nor can there be.

Under our Constitution each of the 15 Union Republics has the right to be a member of the Union or to withdraw from it should it choose to do so. The existence of 19 Autonomous Republics, 9 Autonomous Regions and 10 National Areas makes it possible to preserve the national features, and cultural individuality of every people and nationality.

In the Soviet Union all the nationalities have been drawn closer together as never before in a well-knit family. They form a true friendship of nations, which no trials of the Second World War could weaken. Not only the national minorities, but the Russians, Ukrainians and Byelorussians as well—nations who make up the majority of the Soviet Union's population—have gained by these great changes.

We are proud of the fact that the experience of Russia's former outlying regions has proved that it is quite possible for the countries of the East to do away with backwardness, poverty, disease and ignorance and rise to the level of the economically advanced countries in the course of a single generation.

And now allow me to pass to other examples, which illustrate how the colonialists, in actual practice, are carrying out their "civilising mission" in the colonies.

At the time the former colonies received their independence, the annual national income per head of the population, according to official U.N. data, was as follows: in Indonesia it was 25 American dollars, a mere twentieth of what it was in the Netherlands; in Burma it was 36 dollars, in India 57, i.e., less than a tenth of what it was in Britain. The per capita national income in Belgium at the time the Congolese people won independence was thirteen times as much as that of the Congolese. Moreover, in the Congo, as in other colonies, the lion's share of this extremely low income was appropriated by the colonialists.

Let us take such an important index of economic development as the output of electric power. At the time of receiving independence Burma produced 4 kwh per head of the population a year, India only 15 kwh, Pakistan 2, and Egypt about 50, whereas in Britain the per capita output in 1947 was over 1,100 kwh.

The colonialists kept the enslaved peoples in a state of ignorance and darkness. The number of literate people in Indonesia in 1950 did not exceed 15 to 20 per cent. In India, even several years after her winning independence, when steps had been taken to extend the system of public education, the number of literate population did not exceed 16 per cent and in Pakistan 14 per cent. At the time the countries of French Indo-China received their independence, France had 330 students per 100,000 of the population, while Cambodia had 4. In Indonesia in 1948 one doctor had to serve 67,000 people. It is not surprising that as a result of the low standard of living and the lack of proper medical assistance the average span of life in all the former colonies is appallingly low compared with the metropolitan countries. In a number of these former colonies the average life span is 35 years, which is almost half what it is in the countries that kept them in colonial slavery. This is a still surviving legacy of the colonial regime.

If the metropolitan countries had really cared for the interests of the peoples in the colonies, if they had really rendered them the aid they like to talk about instead of engaging in plunder and exploitation, the peoples of the colonies and the metropolitan countries would have developed uniformly and would not have presented such a striking disparity in the advance of their economy, culture and welfare. What community of nations can you call this, when the living standards in the countries of the West and in the colonies are not even comparable. This is no community, but the domination of one nation over another, when the one uses the labour and benefits of the other, exploits and robs it, and pumps out its national wealth into the metro-

politan countries. The peoples in the colonies have only one way out of their poverty and oppression, and that is the liquidation of the colonial regime.

The defenders of the colonial regime try to frighten the peoples of the metropolitan countries by claiming that with the liquidation of the colonial system living standards will inevitably fall among the population of the industrially developed countries. Obviously, these arguments do not hold water.

In the first place, those who make such a claim give themselves away completely by the involuntary admission that the metropolitan countries are continuing to rob the colonies and dependent countries and derive from this fabulous profits. That is a fact, but we also know that the superprofits go chiefly into the pockets of the monopolies and not to the population at large in the metropolitan countries. After all, it's the millionaires and multi-millionaires and not the peoples of the metropolitan countries who are hanging on to the colonial regime.

Secondly, the experience of many countries who have received national independence convincingly shows that with the rapid growth of their national economy the internal market capacity in these countries expands considerably too. They are able to consume incomparably larger amounts of manufactured goods from the developed countries, while at the same time developing their own productive forces enabling them to supply more raw materials, various products and commodities which the economy of the industrially developed countries stands in need of. This is a more progressive and sensible system of relations between countries, leading to a further advance in the welfare of the peoples both in the former less developed colonies and dependent countries, and in the more developed countries.

The whole tenor of life, of economic and political progress, has pronounced its inexorable verdict upon the shameful colonial regime, which has had its day.

Naturally, we can hardly expect our proposals for the liquidation of the colonial regime, proposals which are in the best interests of humanity, to meet with sympathy on the part of those who still cling to the colonial system. I can hear in advance the critical voices of the defenders of the colonial regime. But to those who are accustomed to build their own well-being at the expense of the oppressed peoples of the colonies we say: think, take a good look at what is going on around you. If not today, then soon, very soon, the colonial regime will break down completely, and if you don't get out of the way in time you will be swept away in any case. The life of the doomed colonial regime cannot be prolonged either by conspiracies or even by force of arms. This will only stiffen the people's struggle against this cankered regime and make that struggle more embittered.

The defenders of the colonial regime, however, are dwindling in numbers even within the colonial powers, and in the final analysis the last word will not be theirs. Therefore we appeal to the reason and foresight of the peoples in the Western countries, to their governments and their spokesmen at this high meeting of the United Nations—let us agree on steps towards liquidating the colonial regime and thereby speed up this legitimate historical process, let us do everything to give the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries equal rights and enable them to shape their own destinies.

We welcome the sacred fight which the colonial peoples are waging against the colonialists for their liberation. If the colonial powers do not listen to the voice of reason and pursue their old colonialist policy of dominating the colonies, then the nations who stand for the abolition of the colonial regime should give all and every assistance to those who are fighting for their independence against the colonialists, against colonial slavery. Assistance, moral, material and other, should be rendered to consummate the just and sacred struggle the peoples are waging for their independence.

The Soviet Union, for its part, will continue to render economic assistance to the less developed countries and give that assistance in increasing dimensions. We are sincerely helping the peoples of these countries to create their own independent economy and develop their home industry—the bedrock of real independence and national welfare.

No nations that oppress other nations can be free. Every free nation should help win freedom and independence for those peoples that are still oppressed.

(Freedom and Independence to all the Colonial Peoples, the Problem of General Disarmament Must Be Solved! Speech Made During the General Debates at the Fifteenth Session of the U.N. General Assembly, September 23, 1960 Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union, 1960, Russ. ed., Vol. 2, pp. 298-314.)

VII. THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE— AN IMPORTANT CONDITION FOR THE VICTORY OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

PEACE IS THE REQUISITE FOR PROGRESS IN THE NEWLY-FREE COUNTRIES

The struggle for liberation from colonial dependence is a matter of life and death for the colonial peoples. But those who are accustomed to being colonialists do not want to understand that at all. Moreover, at times it is not understood even by people who consider themselves progressive and free thinking, and who condemn violence. They seem to have become accustomed to a situation in which the imperialists of this or that Western state lord it over a number of countries of Asia, Africa and South America by virtue of being more "developed and highly civilised", as if destined to fulfil a "noble mission", to "bring civilisation and culture" to the peoples of underdeveloped countries. Such explanations are untenable. There are no arguments, nor can there be, to justify the preservation and continuation of the policy of colonialism.

It is sufficient to consider the example of India, which was a colonial country for many years. Did India prior to being subjugated by the colonialists have a low culture? On the contrary, if we compare Indian culture with that of the colonialists, we find that the high culture of India has deeper roots which reach far back into the centuries. This is borne out by the many monuments of India's ancient culture, created by the talented and industrious people of India.

The colonialists, however, did not take into account the right of the people of India to order their lives in accordance with their own interests. As a result of the domination of the foreign colonialists they were condemned to bear the colonial yoke for a long time. India was oppressed and ruthlessly plundered. For a long time the colonialists retarded the development of the Indian economy and culture and condemned the people to poverty and starvation. And today, when people boast that in Britain and in some other Western countries the standard of living is higher than in other countries, we must not forget at whose expense this has been achieved. It became possible at the expense of the millions of people who were sacrificed to attain that high level. How many millions have died and are still dying today in colonial countries so that colonialists may be able to make huge fortunes out of the blood, poverty and suffering of the peoples. It is not civilisation and culture that the colonialists bring to the countries dependent upon them, but oppression, violence, poverty, backwardness and enslavement.

I have already said that even among democratic sections of the public there are people infected with the bacillus of colonialism. Take, for example, some Labourites in Britain. They consider themselves Socialists and should, therefore, be more progressive than Conservatives on questions of colonial policy. But they include individuals who are indistinguishable from Conservatives on questions of colonial policy.

And it was not by chance that during the attack on Egypt in 1956, some Labourites did not oppose that aggression.

Or take the French Socialists. Was not the French Government, which at the time was headed by the Socialist Guy Mollet, an accomplice in the aggressive attack on Egypt, together with Britain and Israel?

It is not surprising, therefore, that even among those who are taking part in the struggle for peace, there are still people who are beset with doubts as to the possibility of combining the peoples' struggle against colonialism with

the peoples' struggle for peace. They regard the existence of colonialism as unjust, but when a situation arises that threatens to deprive certain powers of one colony or another, they are assailed with doubts and vacillations. Some of them find various justifications for the colonialists having to obtain oil from dependent countries for a mere song. In so doing they apparently fail to realise that this means robbing the peoples of those countries.

The imperialists who extract oil and other wealth, practically for nothing, from the colonial and dependent countries, ignore the fact that owing to this, millions upon millions of people—children and adults—perish in those countries. This does not disturb them in the least. They say that the Asian and African peoples have always lived in greater poverty, and fared worse than the population in the Western countries.

Can the peoples of Asia and Africa reconcile themselves to such prospects? They are fighting, and will continue to fight, for their independence, for the right to dispose of their countries' wealth themselves. The peoples of Asia and Africa are waging a determined struggle for the national independence of their countries. The colonialists will not be able to halt this struggle. It began despite the wishes of the colonialists and it will reach a successful conclusion.

It is necessary, therefore, to differentiate here between colonialists who want to rule over other peoples in order to rob them and grow rich at their expense, and deluded people who desire peace and regard colonialism as unjust, but who do not know whether it is possible to combine the struggle for peace with the struggle for the abolition of colonialism.

Nor should it be forgotten that the peoples of the countries which have liberated themselves from the colonial yoke are determined to defend the cause of peace, since only in an atmosphere of peace can they ensure the economic development of their countries, which have won national independence. Among them we have such a great

country as India, whose lofty moral principles are known to the whole world and deserve great respect.

Needless to say, the Soviet Union is playing a great role in the defence of peace. The very existence of such a peaceful and powerful state as our country has an exceptionally beneficial significance for mankind and acts as a powerful deterrent to aggressors. I would like to stress that the existence of such a mighty state as the Soviet Union instils in the hearts of all people, who are longing for peace, the hope of preserving and strengthening world peace.

Colonialists are people with rather low morals. In their public statements they very often appeal to God, and at the same time hold a concealed dagger which they are ready to use against the weak in order to seize their wealth—their oil or other assets. The colonialists are now raving especially against the Soviet Union, trying to discredit it in the eyes of the peoples. Why are they doing this? Because they see that the Soviet Union has won great respect among the peoples, since it bases its policy on high moral principles.

The Soviet state and all the socialist countries desire peace and not war, peaceful co-operation and not enmity. All the more do they oppose the subjugation of one people by another. The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all socialist countries are resolutely opposed to colonialism. The Soviet Union has the proper means available for dealing with colonialists if they do not come to their senses. Colonialists should not be allowed to endanger peace and subjugate small nations with impunity. The voice of the Soviet Union in defence of colonial peoples and its possibilities of exerting influence on the aggressors are bringing the latter to their senses. Sometimes the colonialists are compelled to sing and serenade in order to lull the vigilance of the peoples and to make a verbal show of their peaceful disposition.

(Interview with Indian Journalists. For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism, Moscow, pp. 630-35.)

WORK FOR PEACE AND DISARMAMENT FACILITATES THE STRUGGLE FOR NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE

Disarmament would also bring tremendous advantages to the underdeveloped countries which are beginning to fulfil vast projects of national revival and to the peoples fighting for their liberation from colonial tyranny.

The liberation of peoples from the chains of colonial slavery is a great progressive development. The Soviet Union whole-heartedly supports the sacred, just struggle of the peoples against colonialism. The Soviet attitude is clear and precise. **There must be no people shackled with the chains of colonialism in Asia, Africa, Latin America or any other area of the globe. All peoples must be free!** There is a close interconnection between the struggle for national liberation and the struggle for disarmament and peace. The struggle for general disarmament facilitates the struggle for national independence. The achievements of the national liberation movement, in their turn, promote peace and contribute to the struggle for disarmament.

The colonialists have always established and maintained their rule by force of arms. Naturally, to deprive them of arms would mean pulling out the teeth of the colonialist sharks. It would for ever eliminate the possibility of any colonialist revenge and finally and irrevocably undermine the foundations of their rule in the colonies still existing. I would like to stress once again that the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament speak above all else of the need of destroying modern lethal weapons. As it happens, these weapons are not in the hands of those fighting against colonialism. Disarmament means disarming the war forces, abolishing militarism, ruling out armed interference in the internal affairs of any country, and doing away completely and finally with all forms of colonialism. That is why disarmament would make for a further development of the national liberation movement. Given a durable peace, nothing could hamper the progress of the national

liberation struggle of the peoples or prevent them from winning complete political and economic independence.

Today the underdeveloped countries are spending roughly \$5,000-\$6,000 million a year for military purposes. This is a colossal amount for countries which need every single cent to break free from poverty and backwardness. There can be no doubt that, given peace and deliverance from the burden of military spending, the underdeveloped countries could the sooner develop their economies and gain economic independence.

Disarmament would create proper conditions for a tremendous increase in the scale of assistance to the newly-established national states. If a mere 8-10 per cent of the \$120,000 million spent for military purposes throughout the world were turned to the purpose, it would be possible to end hunger, disease and illiteracy in the distressed areas of the globe within twenty years. A mere fifth of the amount spent for military purposes would be sufficient to build 96 steel plants the size of the Bhilai Works in India, which is to turn out 2,500,000 tons of steel a year, or 17 giants like the Aswan Dam in the U.A.R. This amount would be enough to set up from 30 to 40 power industry centres of world significance, such as powerful industrial combines in the valleys of the Nile, Niger, Congo and Zambesi in Africa, in the Sahara, in the valleys of the great Indus, Ganges and Mekong in Asia, in the foothills of the Andes and on the banks of South American rivers.

Needless to speak of the beneficial effect these measures would have on the development of the young national states, of the powerful spur they would be to their industrialisation and progress. Those countries could within the next 20 to 25 years overcome their economic backwardness to a considerable degree and approach the industrial standards of countries like Britain and France.

(General and Complete Disarmament Is a Guarantee of Peace and Security for All Nations. Speech at the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace, July 10, 1962, Moscow, pp. 40-41.)

There are people who either present the Soviet Union's position on disarmament questions in the wrong light or deliberately distort it. They assert that our calls for disarmament are harmful and even dangerous because such calls, they say, cause damage to the peoples who are fighting for their liberation from colonial oppression and to the peoples who have already gained their political independence, but have not yet fully freed themselves from the domination of foreign monopoly capital. These peoples, they claim, should arm, instead of disarming, so as to be able to combat the danger the imperialists threaten them with.

We have held, and continue to hold, that the peoples who have not yet cast off the shackles of colonialism can achieve their liberation only in struggle, including armed struggle. And those peoples who have already liberated themselves can also uphold their independence only in struggle, only by arming themselves to give a rebuff to the colonialists and imperialists who are armed to the teeth. Moreover, we do not only say this, but also render considerable economic assistance, including assistance in weapons, to states which ask us to support their struggle against the imperialists and colonialists, the struggle for strengthening their independence.

When we call for disarmament and are fighting for it, we bear in mind that all states must disarm, above all, those which possess the most lethal weapons, nuclear weapons. We are convinced that general and complete disarmament would greatly assist the peoples waging a just struggle against the colonialists and imperialists. Is it not clear that one of the main reasons why the imperialists do not agree to disarmament is that then they would not be able to keep other peoples in subjection. Disarmament would benefit not the stranglers of the peoples' freedom, but the peoples themselves, who are waging a just struggle for their liberation.

(For Peace, Labour, Freedom, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness. Prevent War, Safeguard Peace, Russ. ed., p. 32.)