



REAL  
SOCIALISM.  
THEORY  
AND  
PRACTICE

E. Petrenko, V. Popov

# Soviet Foreign Policy: Objectives and Principles



PROGRESS  
PUBLISHERS  
MOSCOW

The authors spell out here the Marxist-Leninist theory of foreign policy and show that when dealing with foreign policy issues Marx, Engels, and Lenin exposed the fundamental difference between the foreign policy objectives of the proletariat and those of the bourgeoisie. The book examines the main goals of socialist foreign policy, the problem of war and peace, and the principles of peaceful coexistence and proletarian internationalism.

The authors discuss in detail the foreign policy activities of the CPSU and Soviet government, which are aimed at safeguarding international peace and promoting cooperation between countries with differing social and economic systems.

F. Petrenko, V. Popov

# **Soviet Foreign Policy: Objectives and Principles**



**PROGRESS  
PUBLISHERS  
MOSCOW**

Translated from the Russian by *Josef Shapiro*

**Ф. Петренко, В. Попов**

**СОВЕТСКАЯ ВНЕШНЯЯ ПОЛИТИКА:  
ЦЕЛИ И ПРИНЦИПЫ**

*На английском языке*

© Издательство «Международные отношения», 1981

English translation of the revised Russian text

© Progress Publishers 1985

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

П  $\frac{0802010100-442}{014(01)-85}$  64-85



## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION. . . . .	7
<i>Chapter 1. THE SOURCES OF SOCIALIST FOREIGN POLICY . . . . .</i>	14
The Social Nature of Foreign Policy as Analysed by Marx and Engels . . . . .	18
The Confrontation of Proletarian and Bourgeois Interests on the World Scene . . . . .	35
<i>Chapter 2. LENIN'S DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW TYPE OF FOREIGN POLICY . . . . .</i>	61
Lenin on Problems of War and Peace . . . . .	63
The Struggle Against Imperialist Aggression . . . . .	88
The Course of Peaceful Co-Existence and Proleta- rian Internationalism . . . . .	120
Unity of Domestic and Foreign Policies . . . . .	136
<i>Chapter 3. THE CPSU'S FOREIGN POLICY TODAY . . . . .</i>	146
The Realities of the New Era . . . . .	146
The Main Objective and Supreme Principle of So- viet Foreign Policy . . . . .	155
Principles of Peaceful Co-Existence . . . . .	190
Internationalist Policy . . . . .	222
The General and the Specific in Domestic and Foreign Policies . . . . .	242

---

<i>Chapter 4. CLASS APPROACH: THE DETERMINING PRINCIPLE OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY . . . . .</i>	248
The Essence of the Class Communist Approach to International Relations . . . . .	250
The Class Positions of Socialist and Bourgeois States . . . . .	254
 <i>Chapter 5. THE PARTY SPIRIT IN GUIDING SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY . . . . .</i>	 266
Basic Features of the Communist Party Spirit . . . . .	266
The Specifics of CPSU Activities in the Sphere of International Relations. . . . .	270
 <i>Chapter 6. SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES . . . . .</i>	 278
The Theoretical Basis of Soviet Foreign Policy . . . . .	278
 CONCLUSION . . . . .	 306

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the international situation has become unprecedentedly tense. The continuing stockpiling of nuclear weapons evoked the concern of people who realise the true danger of an armed conflict which may turn into a catastrophe for the whole world.

In seeking to prevent a nuclear war, the peoples of various countries show great interest in the outcome of the talks on reducing nuclear arms. People want to know the truth about the foreign policies of states and governments, and about their objectives and principles, for they want to side with the forces of peace and progress. By acquainting themselves with foreign policy concepts, and by comparing the theory and practice of parties and governments of opposing social systems people can see their real foreign policy objectives.

This book is an attempt to summarise the ideas and views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on major problems of international development in order to allow the reader to perceive them as a system of

views representing the general theoretical basis of the foreign policy pursued by the socialist countries, and to understand the approach of the latter to present-day international relations. The book expounds the conclusions of the founders of the communist teaching on the essence and nature of foreign policy and its relationship to other spheres of social life, and shows how certain Marxist-Leninist tenets were applied in the past.

The founders of Marxism developed the fundamental problems of war and peace, and having provided the working class and its vanguard, the communist parties, with ideological and political guidelines in their activities on the world scene they introduced the principles of proletarian internationalism into international practice.

The book acquaints the reader with the ideas and conclusions with which Lenin, the leader of the Russian working class and the founder and leader of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Soviet state, enriched Marxist teaching on international relations.

The world has changed unrecognisably since the deaths of Marx, Engels and Lenin. And the fact that the previsions of the founders of Marxism and their theoretical conclusions have all been confirmed by these changes shows in a most convincing way that Marxist doctrine is scientifically-based. Like all true scientific values, the ideas and conceptions of Marx, Engels and Lenin on fundamental international issues are eternally valid, remaining true and relevant today.

The Marxist-Leninist tenets on international relations and foreign policy are the theoretical foundation on which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet state invariably rely. Many books on Soviet history before and after World War II have been published in the West, which describe the role of the USSR in the war, and the country's present-day foreign policy. The majority of such publications, however, are biased against the Soviet Union.

This book acquaints the reader with the stance taken by the CPSU and the Soviet government on major problems of international relations and with the principles and objectives of socialist foreign policy.

The authors make extensive use of Party documents, materials of Party congresses, and statements by Soviet leaders, which reveal specific Soviet foreign policy actions and show the struggle of the Soviet government and the CPSU to preserve world peace.

The basic principles of Soviet foreign policy are dealt with in detail. The authors examine the Communist class approach to international relations as a determining principle, and compare the class stands of the USSR and the leading bourgeois states.

In analysing the international situation and charting its foreign policy, the CPSU proceeds from the fundamental interests of working people, first of all the working class. The book cites concrete examples to show the factors which manifest the class

and socialist essence of Soviet foreign policy and the purposes it serves.

Public figures in the West deny the class character of their policies, preferring to speak of "state" or "national" interests. The factual materials cited in this book will make it possible for the reader to understand who is really responsible for the policies of the United States, Great Britain, France, and other capitalist states, and whose interests these policies meet.

Class interests today are manifested most clearly by political parties uniting the most active and organised representatives of different classes and social groups. In the 19th century, Karl Marx, who had studied the British electoral system and the social composition of the country's Parliament, had already arrived at the conclusion that the most numerous class—the proletariat—was essentially removed from participation in political life. In any, even the most democratic country, the bourgeoisie has never allowed the working class to have major representation in government and local administrative bodies.

Marx indicated that the proletariat can and must organise its own political party on a national scale, because only then would it have the socio-political force with which effectively to fight against "the privileges of the now governing classes and the slavery of the working classes".<sup>1</sup> Such parties were al-

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, p. 51.

ready beginning to be organised in a number of countries during Marx's and Engels' lifetime with their direct participation and guidance.

Lenin developed a teaching on a new type of party and its role as leader and organiser of the working class and all working people in their struggle for complete social and national liberation from the domination of capital and for building socialism. He organised a Russian working-class party, under whose leadership the Great October Socialist Revolution triumphed and the world's first socialist state of workers and peasants was built.

Today, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, have built a developed socialist society. Communist and workers' parties now exist in almost one hundred countries, and their membership is over 70 million. One-third of the world's population reside in the socialist countries ruled by communist and workers' parties.

When they come to power and form a government, bourgeois parties normally try to make out that domestic and foreign policies are the prerogative of parliament, government and the head of state which supposedly stand above narrow party interests and serve the whole nation. Even President Reagan with his violent anti-communism prefers to pose as defender of American national interests and as peacemaker, carefully concealing his links with the arms production business, which financed the Republican Party at the 1980 and 1984 presidential elections.

In the USSR and other socialist countries, the

leading and guiding role of the ruling Communist Party is established in their constitutions. This means that the charting of the more important aspects of domestic and foreign policy, and the determination of practical steps in this sphere are the prerogative of the Communist Party and its supreme bodies. The Party congresses—the supreme forums of Communist parties—determine the strategic aims, directions and tasks of their countries' foreign policy, while their Central Committees and politbureaus take decisions on current policy issues. The CPSU increasingly comes out as a direct subject of international law.

The guidance of Soviet foreign policy by the Communist Party began in the early years of Soviet government. Lenin thought it right for the Politbureau to "discuss from the Party point of view many questions, both minor and important, concerning the 'moves' we should make in reply to the 'moves' of foreign powers. . .".<sup>1</sup> He also voiced the idea of directly subordinating the diplomatic apparatus to the Party Central Committee.

Many Sovietologists question the extent to which the practice of guiding foreign policy in the USSR is compatible with democracy. This book gives the reader an opportunity to see how foreign policy decisions are made in the USSR, and allows him to assess the relationship between the centralist and democratic aspects involved.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, pp. 495-496.



Writers on international problems debate whether it is possible to pursue a scientifically-grounded foreign policy when foreign policy as such deals with a multitude of different factors. Some Western political scientists totally reject the existence of any law-governed factors in international politics, and regard its development as something involving the prevalence of chance factors. Others take a biological, demographic, ethical, psychological, crude materialistic, or other unscientific stance to try to explain international events and it is for this reason that one of the chapters in this book is devoted to these problems. Chapter VI shows how and to what extent the USSR and the Communist Party rely on science in their foreign policy activities. The authors analyse the significance the USSR attaches to the principle of impartiality, a systematic and integral approach, and to specifying the principal factor in a variety of foreign policy tasks and at the same time examine how science and art combine in the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet government on the international scene.

## CHAPTER 1

### THE SOURCES OF SOCIALIST FOREIGN POLICY

Some Western scholars claiming to be experts in international politics often assert that, having put forward the ideas of a socialist remaking of the world, the founders of Marxism had forgotten such an important aspect of social life as international relations. Some people think that Marx and Engels had failed to develop any integral theory of international relations, and for that reason their present-day ideological successors have almost to invent such a theory. Similar assertions can be found, for example, in *Political Science and International Relations* published under the editorship of D. Frei, Professor of Political Sciences at the University of Zürich, and in some other publications.

But is this really so? Indeed, Marx and Engels did not write any books that in a generalised form would expound all their ideas and views on foreign policy and international relations. But their works on philosophy, political economy, and history provide a comprehensive picture of all the principal Marxist tenets on foreign policy and international

relations. This relates both to the fundamental theoretical problems of international politics and to their individual aspects. They have been examined in many major works by the leaders of the proletariat, e.g. in *Capital*, *The German Ideology*, *The Communist Manifesto*, *The Civil War in France*, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, and others, and also in a large number of articles and letters. The theoretical foundations of the international policy of the working class, which were developed for the first time in these works, today also serve as reliable guidelines for socialist countries in their foreign policy activities.

Engels noted that Marx made scientific discoveries in every field he studied. This assertion also fully relates to Engels' own works on the problems of international politics. Working on the basis of the tenets and conclusions of the principal elements in their teaching,—philosophy, political economy and scientific communism,—Marx and Engels developed a theory of foreign policy and international relations on a truly scientific basis for the first time in history.

Marxism has proven that politics, including foreign policy, can only be truly scientific when its conclusions are based primarily on the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism, the only doctrine that correctly reveals the laws of social development and provides the key to an adequate understanding of both past and present-day realities. Lenin later pointed out in this connection that Marxism's political line was "inseparably bound up with

its philosophical principles".<sup>1</sup> The founders of Marxism had shown for the first time the determining role of the basic regularities they had discovered in this sphere of activity, having turned their attention to the need carefully to study their concrete manifestations. A materialistic understanding of history and its laws of development allows one scientifically to grasp the complex processes and specifics involved in international relations.

Marxism revealed the decisive role of materialistic dialectics as a method for studying international life in all its complexity, controversy, and multiformity, and the causative correlation of the events involved. Marx and Engels made a deep analysis of the domestic and foreign policies of some countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and America. The results of their investigation showed that revolutionary materialistic dialectics permits one not only correctly to assess the international situation and its causative factors, but also to foresee the basic tendencies in its development both in the world as a whole and in specific areas.

Marxist philosophy suggested a number of cardinal principles that the working class and its communist parties needed to work out a truly scientific foreign policy. These principles have become the legacy not only of the Communists, but also of all progressive mankind. They involve a class approach towards current events; a strictly realistic, scientifically-based assessment of those events; pursuit of

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, 1982, p. 405.

policies in conformity with the requirements of the objective laws of social development; and resolute repudiation of all manifestations of subjectivism in foreign policy activities.

Marx and Engels proved that the fundamental economic interests of the classes and social strata which hold power lie at the basis of all domestic and foreign policies.

Marxism disclosed the organic relationship between the objectives of the proletariat's class struggle and its interests in international relations, specifically in the struggle for peace. Marx and Engels established the unity of the national and international tasks of the working class and determined the basic principles for its activities and those of its vanguard—the Communist Party—on the international scene. They also determined the methods to be used by a revolutionary workers' party in its approach to foreign policy issues, and proved that domestic and foreign policies are closely interconnected and have a common socio-class foundation. Bourgeois foreign policy is planned largely under the influence of the class struggle, while its internal function is to keep the exploited and oppressed classes in check and suppress any revolutionary movement of the working people.

By linking foreign policy problems inseparably with the whole complex of questions of domestic socio-economic and political development, it became possible to provide an answer to the most intricate international problems.

Marx and Engels disproved the bourgeois views

of their time that the sphere of international politics was allegedly an arena for an unpredictable game and confrontation between various spontaneous forces, an arena where the destinies of peoples depend on the arbitrary actions of individual personalities. They established that international relations are primarily the scene of acute class struggle, and that specific classes, whose interests are to some extent or another expressed by those very personalities, no matter who they are, stand behind the latter.

Marxism showed that international relations should be regarded as a specific, but inseparable part of the entire system of social relations, a part that develops under the influence of the same laws by which social relations as a whole develop. Having revealed the true essence and nature of foreign politics, Marxism put the study and comprehension of international events on a realistic basis for the first time ever.

*The Social Nature of Foreign Policy  
as Analysed by Marx and Engels*

A materialistic understanding of history and the view that the economic interests of the ruling classes determine their domestic and foreign policies help analyse the most complicated problems of foreign relations.

Marx wrote: "For centuries the Prussian state had carefully concealed the fact that the departments of war, internal and foreign affairs . . . depend-

ed on profane *financial* matters."<sup>1</sup> This was the case in the feudal era.

With the advent of capitalism, economic main springs become the motive force of the foreign policy of all the ruling classes to an even greater measure. Whereas the petty bourgeoisie is little affected by the foreign policy pursued by the ruling classes of feudal society, in the depths of which capitalism was conceived, the situation changes drastically with increasing concentration of production. The rich bourgeoisie is far from indifferent which policy the ruling classes pursue both at home, and on the international scene, and want to know what they hope to achieve. Back in 1847, Engels noted in this connection: "The petty bourgeois is interested in the general policy of his country only in so far as he wants to be left in peace; his narrow round of life makes him incapable of surveying the relations of state to state. The bourgeois, who has to deal or to compete with the most distant countries, cannot work his way up without the most direct influence on the foreign policy of his state."<sup>2</sup> The same idea was also time and again emphasised by Marx, who wrote: "This society cannot tolerate that ... foreign trade relations should be determined by considerations of the Court's international

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, 1977, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976 p. 90.

policies instead of by the interests of national production."<sup>1</sup>

Having studied and summarised the vast material that characterises the development of capitalism in Britain, Germany and some other countries, the founders of Marxism established that, as it consolidates its economic might, capital can no longer exist without achieving supremacy in all fields of domestic and foreign policy. Marx and Engels arrived at the conclusion that the bourgeois does everything to make his class dominant, and its interests in legislation, administration, justice, taxation, and foreign policy a decisive factor. The very nature of capitalist development, which seeks to obtain maximum profit, to ensure a continual increase in capital, and to reduce the cost of commodity production, compels capitalists constantly to expand their trade ties and markets, improve communications, and defend their interests in foreign relations. The bourgeoisie is also prompted to do so by competition on the world market.<sup>2</sup>

In the final analysis, the objective course of history and the law-governed factors of capitalist development have inescapably led to the political supremacy of the rich bourgeoisie in all spheres of domestic and foreign policy in the capitalist states.

The principal lever of political power in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 336.

<sup>2</sup> See Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, pp. 80, 90, 91, 524-525.



hands of the bourgeoisie was large scale-industrial production, and it was this lever that made it possible for the latter not only to determine home policy, but also to dictate to other states.

In a number of articles devoted to Britain, then the world's largest industrial power, Marx and Engels sharply criticised the domestic and foreign policies of the British Cabinet. These were policies that expressed the highly selfish interests of the country's bourgeois-aristocratic rulers.

Having come to power, the British bourgeoisie, together with the aristocracy, played a patently counter-revolutionary role in relation to the French bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1848, and also in relation to revolutionary movements in other countries. The bourgeois-aristocratic oligarchy that ruled Britain feared that revolution, were it to occur in Europe, might easily come to the British Isles and arouse the masses, and this was constantly taken into account in the country's foreign policy.

Marx and Engels not only revealed the class roots of this policy, but also waged an incessant struggle against it, for instance by exposing in the press the counter-revolutionary actions committed by the British bourgeoisie in alliance with Russian tsarism and other reactionary forces in Europe in order to struggle the revolutionary movement.

The pamphlets published by the founders of communist ideology helped *awaken* the class consciousness of the working people and democratic forces to the need to fight against the reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the British bourgeoisie.

This was shown in Karl Marx's article "Lord Palmerston" which was written on the basis of a careful study of numerous diplomatic documents, records of debates in the British Parliament, and press reports. The pamphlet described one of the chief representatives of the ruling élite and British Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston, whose foreign policy was subordinated to the interests of the bourgeois-aristocratic system. As portrayed by Marx, Palmerston reflected the most characteristic features of the men ruling Britain in those times, namely unscrupulousness, corruptness, hypocrisy, perfidy, cynicism, and treachery towards their allies, and a desire to gain their ends at any cost. These features were essentially anti-popular, as was British foreign policy, distinguished by constant interference in the internal affairs of other peoples and by the desire to enslave and subjugate weaker states.

In characterising the British statesman, Marx exposed the basic principles of the bourgeois political system as a whole. In a word, Palmerston favoured "constitutionalism", but was actually the initiator and organiser of police repressions and Draconic measures against all progressive trends in Europe and elsewhere. In analysing his foreign policy, which relied on the world's reactionary forces, including monarchist ones in the struggle against revolutionary and national liberation movements, Marx showed in a well-reasoned way that all the actions of such bourgeois figures were aimed solely at keeping the sky over all land and financial magnates absolutely clear.

The same features also characterise the policies of Margaret Thatcher's Conservative government, something that became particularly obvious in the Falklands crisis.

As Britain became a major industrial power, the desire of the British bourgeoisie to retain at all costs its monopoly in foreign trade and the markets and colonies that provided it with raw materials, a cheap work force, and the resultant huge profits, inevitably compelled the government to co-operate with the feudal aristocracy and turn it into bulwark of the world's most reactionary forces. Together with France and Russia, Britain pursued an aggressive foreign policy, enslaving other peoples and cruelly suppressing national liberation movements in China, India, Persia, Afghanistan, Mexico, and other countries.

Marx and Engels irrefutably proved that Britain's colonial wars were aggressive and predatory. In analysing London's policy in the Crimean War, in 1854-1855, the founders of Marxism showed that in the so-called "Eastern question", too, the methods of British diplomacy were distinguished by perfidy. Seeking to consolidate its positions in the Middle East, the British bourgeoisie tried to reach an agreement on the eve of the war with the tsarist government about the partition of Turkey. In his articles "The Documents on the Partition of Turkey", "The Secret Diplomatic Correspondence", "The War Debate in Parliament", and others, Marx arrived at the conclusion that, "if there lurked no war with France behind the partition of Turkey,

and no revolution behind the war with France",<sup>1</sup> the British government would have liked to swallow up Turkey as much as Russia.

The ruling circles of European states, irrespective of whether they had a feudal or capitalist social system, were very frightened by revolutionary and national liberation movements, and this compelled them to unite. Having gained political power and freedom of trade, and fearing an upsurge of the revolutionary struggle of the working-class for its rights, the British bourgeoisie agreed in the mid-1800s to an open union with the aristocracy.

Under the historically established two-party system in Britain, the interests of the aristocracy were for a long time represented by two major, alternately ruling parties, the Tories and the Whigs. Characterising their political image, Marx noted that all their parliamentary activities came down to a situation whereby "on certain solemn occasions irresponsibility becomes transferred from a Whig to a Tory, or from a Tory to a Whig. Ministerial responsibility means there the transformation of place-hunting into the main business of parliamentary parties".<sup>2</sup>

In criticising the foreign policies of the Tories and the Whigs, Marx noted in several of his articles that the struggle between the two parties was

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, 1980, pp. 79-80.

on numerous occasions simply pretence, the cause of which was "the very secret of the alternate Whig and Tory succession in government, each party having a greater interest to maintain the capability of its opponent for secession, than by ruining their mutual political 'honour' to compromise the government of the ruling class altogether".<sup>1</sup> Engels also singled out this characteristic feature in the activities of European governments, a feature that had left its mark on diplomacy, too. He wrote that when Talleyrand found the documents confirming the 1829 Treaty between Russia and France on the partition of Germany he threw them into the fire "in order to spare French and Russian diplomacy the colossal scandal. Diplomats of all countries constitute a secret league as against the exoteric public and will never compromise one another openly."<sup>2</sup>

As the positions of the British bourgeoisie strengthened, the continued existence of the traditionally ruling parties came to depend on how fully their activities could meet the interests of large-scale capital. This resulted in a process whereby they were transformed into the bourgeois Conservative and Liberal parties, alternately replacing each other at the helm. The most typical representative of this compromise between the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy was the "truly British minister" Lord Palmer-

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, 1979, p. 607.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 604.

ston, whose policies, as Marx noted, were a classical manifestation of the interests of the British bourgeoisie, which constantly and irrepressibly strived to expand its influence and consolidate its positions in the world.

By means of an aggressive foreign policy, Britain was simultaneously resolving another important task, that of distracting the attention of the working class from domestic problems and revolutionary struggle.

In exposing the domestic and foreign policies of the ruling classes in capitalist countries, Marx and Engels at the same time criticised the bourgeois political system as a whole, and specifically its anti-popular, anti-democratic character. For example, they described the role of the press as an instrument in the hands of the ruling classes, by means of which the bourgeoisie not only vindicated the aggressive, reactionary foreign policies of their home countries, but also rallied public opinion in support of this course. By blunting the class consciousness of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie sought to deprive it of opportunities to resist.

In 1861, having analysed the activities of the London *Times*, Marx showed the role of the bourgeois press in international politics. Whereas in domestic policy, the newspaper had little influence on public opinion, since it had always sided with reactionary forces against all progressive reforms, the situation was different in foreign policy. In this case, "the aristocracy *acted* for them, the press *thought* for them in their foreign or international

affairs; and both parties, the aristocracy and the press, very soon found out that it would be their mutual interest to combine."<sup>1</sup>

Marx emphasised that throughout the 19th century the major London newspapers had constantly played the role of barristers of British foreign policy and of its bosses from the nobility. This situation developed gradually and several intermediate stages were required for it to become established. Marx pointed out two parallel processes: "The aristocracy, that had monopolised the management of foreign affairs, first shrunk together into an oligarchy, represented by a secret conclave, called the cabinet, and, later on the cabinet was superseded by one single man, Lord Palmerston, who, for the last thirty years, has usurped the absolute power of wielding the national forces of the British Empire, and determining the line of its Foreign Policy."<sup>2</sup>

By virtue of the law of concentration, which in the newspaper business acted even quicker than in paper production, *The Times* gradually became a national newspaper claiming to represent British public opinion in the eyes of other peoples.

As a result, if monopoly over the administration of a state's foreign policy had passed into the hands of the aristocratic oligarchy to be subsequently concentrated in the hands of one person, the monopoly of a nation to consider and judge its own foreign

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, 1984, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

policy, and to represent national public opinion in these affairs had passed from the British press as a whole to just one of its organs, viz. *The Times*.

For its part, *The Times*, whose owners were not devoid of ambitious plans, could not but enter into an alliance with the Empire's powerful rulers, the aristocratic oligarchy, who were actually in charge of all national resources. According to Marx's conclusion, the natural result was that *The Times* became a slave of that oligarchy. In the sphere of foreign policy, *The Times* was completely focussed on fabricating public opinion so that it would correspond to Lord Palmerston's foreign policy.

Other influential organs of the press, which were closely connected with the ruling circles and acted on their instructions, were also subordinated in a similar way. Marx showed that the bourgeois press was fully dependent on the will of its owners, who determined the trend and tone of publications by speculators in public opinion.

In forestalling what will be said below, it is interesting to note the deplorable story of *The Times*, which by irony of fate eventually became a subject for transaction under the social system which it had faithfully served for almost 200 years since 1785. The British press has nicknamed Friday, February 13th, 1981 the "Black Friday" of British journalism: on that day, a deal was formalised in London, whereby *The Times* was sold to the Australian newspaper tycoon Rupert Murdoch, who paid its former owners 12 million pounds sterling. The deal inflicted a painful blow on British national senti-



ments and on the country's prestige, since *The Times* had for many years been regarded as Britain's mouthpiece. Once the newspaper was in the hands of a foreign businessman, it actually lost its significance as a national institution.

The analysis by the founders of Marxism of domestic and international events and the alignment of class forces in the United States during the Civil War (1861-1865) provides substantial material for understanding the class essence of domestic and foreign policy.

In observing the economic development and the social and political struggle in North America, Marx and Engels were the first to indicate the true causes of the American Civil War, to determine its essence, nature, and motive forces, and to predict its outcome.

The conclusion made by Marx and Engels in a number of articles on the American theme was unambiguous: the American Civil War was the result of a struggle between two social systems, viz. the capitalist system, which had by that time become firmly established in the North, and the slave-owning system, which prevailed in the southern states and had become an obstacle to the country's further economic and socio-political development.

In characterising the causes, true objectives, and predatory nature of the expansionist and aggressive US foreign policy during the dominance of the slave-owning system, Marx wrote that US slave-owner interests were the guiding star for both US domestic and foreign policy. The acquisition of

Cuba, whether by purchase or by force, was proclaimed a great task of US national policy.

It was not only Cuba that the US slave-owners wanted to swallow up. During the presidency of James Buchanan, who faithfully served the interests of land speculators, the White House sent and supported continuous pirate expeditions against Central and South American countries. Northern Mexico had already been captured by US aggressors, who were impatiently waiting for the signal to jump at the other Mexican states.

Marx indicated that the spread of slavery, secretly supported by the federal government, was also closely related to this expansionist foreign policy. He wrote: "Armed spreading of slavery abroad was the avowed aim of national policy."<sup>1</sup>

This situation continued until slave-owner interests came into irreconcilable contradiction with the interests of the growing class of capitalists. The very existence of the slave-owning system was subordinate to the objectively operating economic law that required continued expansion of the amount of land belonging to slave-owners. Marx pointed out that "continual expansion of territory and continual spread of slavery beyond its old limits is a law of life for the slave states of the Union."<sup>2</sup>

The interests of the bourgeoisie and the slave-

---

<sup>1</sup> Marx and Engels, *On the United States*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 89.

owners clashed in a decisive battle precisely at this point, for confinement of slavery to its old bounds would have led to the gradual disappearance of the political hegemony that the slave-owning states were implementing via the Senate. By suggesting that all further enlargement of slave-owner territories should be banned by law, the Republicans nipped slave-owner supremacy in the bud.

In their articles on the American Civil War, Marx and Engels showed its revolutionary character against the system of slavery and predicted the inevitable victory of the more progressive capitalist system. In attentively watching the course of hostilities during the American Civil War, they continued to underline the need for resolute revolutionary measures in the struggle against slavery. Marx emphasised the strength of the major industrial areas in the North and Northwest of the United States, the regions which gave the Federalist Army its chief manpower resources, compelled the government to wage a revolutionary war, and inscribed the motto "Destroy Slavery" on its banners.

Among the Lincoln administration's resolute measures, the Emancipation Proclamation (which freed Negro slaves and made them eligible for military service), the 1862 Homestead Law (giving free land to settlers), the purge of the government apparatus and the army of reactionary elements, and the closure of hostile newspapers, were all of major significance. All these measures brought about a fundamental turning-point in the American Civil War. The broad masses of workers, farmers, and

Negroes played a decisive role in the victory over the slave-owners.

Marx revealed the class nature of the bourgeois foreign policy in the attitude towards events in the United States taken by Britain's ruling circles, who sometimes covertly and sometimes overtly supported the slave-owner suppliers of cheap American cotton and grain.

Despite the controversial interests of the two major capitalist powers, the British government was compelled to pursue a foreign policy towards the United States that would not contradict Britain's economic interests. Marx made direct reference to this when he wrote: "In spite of malignant impertinence and nasty rancour, official England will keep the peace with the 'Yankee swindlers' and confine its deep sympathies with the high-minded vendors of human blood in the South to blotting-paper phrases, and isolated smuggling ventures, for a rise in the price of grain is no joke, and any conflict with the Yankees would now add a food famine to the cotton famine."<sup>1</sup>

In his articles on the American Civil War, Marx showed the class nature of the policy of the US leadership and exposed the clandestine intrigues of bourgeois diplomacy and attempts by the ruling classes to eliminate revolutionary-democratic and national liberation movements. He criticised in the press the desire of the ruling British oligarchy to pursue a policy towards the United States that,

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 231.

despite Britain's proclaimed neutrality, would permit the latter covertly to support the mutinous South, and even to try to provide it with military assistance.

Marx exposed the real cause of Britain's provocative actions. His articles influenced British public opinion and the stand taken by the British working class, which came out against this policy. Despite the military psychosis and chauvinistic intoxication then prevalent in Britain and fanned in every possible way by the corrupt Palmerston press, the British proletariat remained loyal to its class internationalist duty.

The cessation of cotton deliveries from the United States due to the blockade of the slave-owners states put Britain's working class in a *highly* disastrous situation, yet, this could not break the staunchness of the British working people, who showed solidarity with the struggle for the liberation of Negroes in the United States.

In appreciating the international character of the actions of the British proletariat in these conditions, Marx wrote: "The English working class has won immortal historical honour for itself by thwarting the repeated attempts of the ruling classes to intervene on behalf of the American slaveholders by its enthusiastic mass meetings, even though the prolongation of the American Civil War subjects a million English workers to the most fearful suffering and privations."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 297.

Marx's all-round analysis of the processes connected with the American Civil War, of its effects on international relations and on the domestic and foreign policies of some countries in the Americas and in Europe today also serves as a brilliant example of a class, scientific approach towards assessing major political developments.

The objective trends in US social development played a decisive role in establishing and consolidating the capitalist system across America. However, the narrow-mindedness of the bourgeois political system did not allow it to break fully with the slaveholding system, and this fact left an imprint on all subsequent US history.

The American Civil War also revealed capitalist contradictions which involved the embryos of future imperialistic controversies. At that time, the rapacious, exploitative and predatory nature of capitalism's domestic and foreign policy already showed itself clearly in the support by the ruling circles of bourgeois Britain and other countries for reactionary slave-owners who waged a stubborn struggle to restore and expand the slaveholding system which brought huge profits to the exploiting classes. The foreign policy of Britain's ruling circles was based precisely on economic interests.

The American Civil War convincingly showed the decisive role of the popular masses in history, in the replacement of one social system by another, and also the influence of the proletariat on the foreign policy of the exploiting classes. The international working class had already emerged on the

historical scene for the first time during the establishment and consolidation of capitalism. International proletarian solidarity with the struggle for the emancipation of American Negroes in the 1860s was a powerful factor in ensuing success in this liberation struggle and in accelerating progress.

Thus, Marx and Engels arrived at the important conclusion that, in a class society, foreign policy, like domestic policy, inevitably has a profound class character. The ruling classes work out and implement a foreign policy line which fully meets their interests and serves their class objectives.

Having shown in the United States and other countries that the supersedence of one social system by a more progressive one is inevitable, Marxism scientifically proved that the advent of an era when the working class would emerge on the historical scene to determine itself not only in domestic, but also in foreign policy, was also inevitable.

*The Confrontation of Proletarian and  
Bourgeois Interests on the World Scene*

The objectives and character of socialist foreign policy are determined on the basis of the principal conclusions of Marxist teaching on the laws of social development. In this case, the starting point is undoubtedly the tenet which has already been stressed above, namely that, in the end, the class struggle is what specifically underlies and determines both the policies of governments and the supersedence of one socio-economic structure by a

more progressive one. In connection with this, Lenin pointed out: "Marxism has provided the guidance, i.e., the theory of the class struggle, for the discovery of the laws governing this seeming maze and chaos."

Both Marxist doctrine and socialist practice in the study of domestic and foreign policies, and in the assessment of developments in the political, economic, ideological and other spheres, are invariably aimed primarily at revealing class interests that are, in the end, determined by the positions of various classes within a given system of the relations of production. History has shown that it is this approach alone which permits the true motives of any foreign policy steps to be revealed, and the socially-conditioned domestic and foreign policies of the ruling classes, and their parties to be laid bare.

By showing the position of the working class within the system of the relations of production, Marx and Engels were able to specify its role as that of the principal force which was to fulfil the historical mission of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. The founders of scientific communism saw in the working class the most progressive class of their time.

According to Lenin, the most important aspect of Marx's teaching was that it revealed the worldwide historical significance of the role of the proletariat. Lenin said that Marx's and Engels' service

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, 1980, p. 57.



to the working class could be briefly described as follows: they taught the working class self-knowledge and self-consciousness to replace dreams with a scientific approach.

The different positions of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the opposition of their class interests conditioned their opposite approach to fundamental problems in all spheres of social life and their contrasting objectives and principles in both domestic and foreign policy.

Having revealed the class essence of bourgeois society, Marx and Engels showed the exploitative nature of its social relations. The aims and principles of capitalists are wholly directed at obtaining maximum profits. Marx and Engels exposed the hypocrisy and falsity of bourgeois society, the reactionary essence of its political system and of the domestic and foreign policies and ideology of the ruling classes.

It was in the proletariat that the founders of Marxism saw the force that could actively oppose the aggressive, predatory, and chauvinistic foreign policy of the exploiting classes, a policy leading to continuous wars and the enslavement of other peoples. They taught the working class not only resolutely to influence the policies of bourgeois governments, but also to determine their own revolutionary course in international affairs. Marx and Engels stressed that this course had to be directed at fully completing progressive bourgeois-democratic reforms and at preparing conditions for a victorious proletarian revolution. It was from these positions, the posi-

tions of a "sixth power", as the leaders of the working class figuratively termed the European revolution, that the former set about assessing any event in international life, thus educating the proletariat in the spirit of internationalism.

Marx and Engels laid the theoretical foundation of the proletariat's international course, the foundation that further served as a starting point for Lenin to develop the principles and methods of socialist foreign policy and of leadership in the practical activities of the Soviet government on the international scene.

The working class—the most progressive and revolutionary class of our time—expresses the fundamental interests of all the peoples. According to Marx and Engels, in emancipating itself from social oppression and exploitation, it can become free only by simultaneously liberating all the working people, i.e. the majority of the world's population.

On the pages of the world's progressive press, Marx and Engels expressed their support for revolutionary movements wherever they developed: in France, Germany, Italy, Hungary, Poland, and elsewhere. They regarded the elimination of slavery in the United States as the vital concern of the European and American working class. They waged an uncompromising struggle against Bonapartism in France and tsarism in Russia, regarding them as the main bulwarks of European reaction and obstacles to revolutionary, democratic and national liberation movements.

Marx and Engels exposed the covert intrigues of

bourgeois diplomacy and of reactionary forces against revolutionary-democratic and national liberation movements. Their regular press publications on all the principal issues of world politics educated, organised, and consolidated the still largely spontaneous working-class movement to make it purposeful and strong.

Speaking of the need for a more or less lengthy historical period for the proletariat to win power and subsequently pursue an adequate domestic and foreign policy, Marx and Engels vigorously opposed left-wing trends in the revolutionary movement, the "heroes" of revolutionary phrase and lovers of political adventure, like some members of the Central Committee of the Communist League, such as August Willich, and Karl Schapper, who sought artificially to "nudge" the proletarian revolution. In rebuffing such views, Marx emphasised at the September 15, 1850 meeting of the Communist League Central Committee: "Whereas we tell the workers that they will possibly have to survive fifteen, twenty, and even fifty years of civil wars and international conflicts, not only in order to change the existing conditions, but also to change themselves and make themselves capable of political rule, you, on the contrary, say that we should gain power momentarily, or go to bed."<sup>1</sup>

The struggle of the leaders of the proletariat against both left- and right-wing opportunism was

---

<sup>1</sup> Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Band 7, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1969, S. 614.

of great significance for all the subsequent activities of communist and workers' parties in developing and implementing domestic and foreign policies corresponding to the true interests of the working class.

Marx and Engels regarded the prospects of the revolutionary-democratic, working-class, and national liberation movements as inseparable from the entire system of international relations that had become established under the influence of the foreign policies of reactionary European states. They resolutely condemned that system, seeing it as an obstacle to peace and progress in Europe, since it was based on a policy of seizures and annexations, inequitable economic, social and political relations between nations and countries, and exploitation and plunder of the peoples of the world. This policy was essentially based on the principles and methods inherent in the diplomacy of the ruling classes, namely on setting nation against nation, intimidation and blackmail, the use of force, flagrant interference in the internal affairs of other states, etc.

Marx and Engels regarded as one of the working class' major tasks the need to expose the objectives, principles and methods of the diplomacy of the ruling classes. Under the undivided rule of capital, when the possibilities of the proletariat were highly limited, Marx appealed to the working class "to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective Governments; to counteract

them, if necessary, by all means in their power. . .".<sup>1</sup>

When in 1850 Austrian Fieldmarshal Haynau, who had crushed the revolutionary movement in Hungary and Italy, with unusual cruelty, came to Britain at the invitation of its ruling classes, the workers of one factory met him with stones, and this was approved by all the British people. In assessing this fact, Marx and Engels noted that if "Palmerston adopted a bourgeois-liberal stand vis-à-vis the reactionaries of Europe, the British people used the presence of Herr Haynau in London for a striking display of *their* foreign policy".<sup>2</sup>

Marx's and Engels' conclusion that a bourgeois foreign policy was to be replaced by a proletarian, socialist foreign policy was of fundamental significance for the revolutionary movement of the working class, and for the enhancement of its political consciousness. Bourgeois ideologists and the bourgeois governments themselves did everything they could to portray the ruling classes' foreign policy as expressing the interests of all the people. Having proven that the working class, which was fighting for its emancipation, defended not only its own interests, but also those of the whole nation, Marx and Engels created important prerequisites for the proletariat to develop and pursue its own

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, 1978, p. 511.

independent foreign policy and for that policy to be supported by broad strata of the working people, and also for the entire system of international relations to be subsequently restructured. They insisted on the need "to vindicate the simple laws of morals and justice, which ought to govern the relations of private individuals, as the rules paramount of the intercourse of nations."<sup>1</sup>

The programme of the proletariat's foreign policy formulated in 1864 in the Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association (First International) was regarded by the founders of Marxism as a component element of the common proletarian cause, the logical and natural continuation of a home policy directed at overthrowing the bourgeoisie. This tenet was expressed in the final part of the Address in Marx's classical formula: "The fight for such a foreign policy forms part of the general struggle for the emancipation of the working classes."<sup>2</sup>

The relationship between domestic and foreign policy has become a particularly acute issue in contemporary ideological struggle. Most representatives of present-day bourgeois social science try to deny the fact that foreign policy is conditioned by domestic policy, and that both are inseparably linked. Many bourgeois scholars, followed by diplomats and political figures, seek to convince the

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 2, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

public that their countries are allegedly pursuing a foreign policy that is essentially "independent" of their domestic policies, and that the former allegedly meets the interests of the whole people.

Marx and Engels proved domestic and foreign policies, both expressing the interests of the ruling class, to be inseparably linked. Their classical formula states: "As with the internal policy, so with foreign policy."<sup>1</sup> And, inasmuch as the proletariat and the bourgeoisie take opposing class stands, it is but natural that their aims in international politics are contradictory.

While addressing Germany's ruling circles in 1848 and exposing their falsehood and hypocrisy, Engels queried: "How can a democratic foreign policy be carried through while democracy at home is stifled?"<sup>2</sup> In our time, bourgeois ideologists seeking to vindicate imperialist neo-colonialist policies based on oppression and exploitation of dependent countries try by all possible means to conceal the fact that these policies are a natural continuation of their domestic policies, a partial continuation of the capitalist system itself. Profuse talk about democracy existing under expansionism in international affairs is, as Marx and Engels showed, complete and impudent falsehood, for a people that oppresses other nations cannot itself be free. Engels

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 128.

<sup>2</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, 1977, p. 167.

said in this connection: "Germany will liberate herself to the extent to which she sets free neighbouring nations."<sup>1</sup>

Hence the democratisation and revolutionary renewal of society's life and the transformation of the capitalist system are all closely interconnected with the struggle of the oppressed nations for national liberation. Conversely, the elimination of national oppression is a major premise for the social emancipation of the peoples of both the oppressed and the oppressing countries. Marxism has always regarded both of these historical tasks in a single historical context.

In many of their works, Marx and Engels thoroughly analysed international events with a view to educating the proletariat politically. They indicated their class character, and determined the alignment of class forces, the stand taken by political parties, and the tasks of the working class in every given country. For instance, in several articles on France's domestic and foreign policy they literally diatribed the regime of Napoleon III, which survived by manouevring between social classes, relying at the same time on the most reactionary circles of the French bourgeoisie.

The most characteristic features of Bonapartism were totally open dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, mass political terror, dominance of the military, corruption, and embezzlement of public property by government officials, as well as the monstrous spec-

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 166.



ulative swindles of the Second Empire, where profiteering had become a fundamental principle. The large-scale adventures undertaken by Louis Napoleon's government were directed at diverting the attention of the working people from his domestic policy, which evoked general discontent and indignation. For fear of the working people, the ruling classes pursued all sorts of adventures abroad simply to avoid revolution in their own country. In this case, the bourgeoisie of various countries used the same technique: they forced their people to shed blood overseas—anything to avert revolt at home!

In examining the reasons why France entered the Russo-Turkish War of 1853-1856, Marx pointed out in 1854: "Bonaparte is of course in good earnest in embarking in the war. He has no alternative left but revolution at home or war abroad."<sup>1</sup> Marx arrived at the conclusion that the growing contradictions between the ruling Bonapartist clique and the majority of the French population created a situation when the sole possibility to delay a revolution in France was for the latter to embark on a European war, and subsequent events fully confirmed this forecast.

Marx and Engels were the first men in history to approach the problem of war and peace scientifically. They formulated several basic tenets and conclusions concerning the essence of war and peace; the

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 33.

social nature of war; the different nature, types, objectives, and methods of war and warfare; the proletariat's attitude towards war; and the need for and ways of struggling for peace. This is just an incomplete list of relevant problems elaborated by Marxism.

The founders of Marxism made a detailed study of the origin and essence of the phenomenon of war, from tribal relations to the era of capitalism. A study of history from the time when society became divided into classes primarily showed that war had taken advanced forms earlier than peace and led Marx and Engels to the discovery of the class nature of wars and to the conclusion that they result from antagonistic socio-economic structures based on the exploitation of man by man. Economic factors play a decisive role in the origin of wars. Marx and Engels attentively studied the causes and consequences of wars, their influence on economic and social development, their correlation with the revolutionary movement, including the workers' and national liberation movements, and their influence on international politics. By studying a vast amount of historical material, Marx and Engels revealed the scientific groundlessness of bourgeois and petty bourgeois concepts on the origin of wars and severely criticised them.

*Marxism determined the proletariat's tasks in the struggle for peace, against militarism, aggressive actions and annexations, and indicated the need for defending a future socialist fatherland, and the inevitable disappearance of wars in communist so-*

ciety. In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels stressed: "In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."<sup>1</sup> Finally, Marxism pointed out *the unity of the two great objectives of the working class: the struggle for peace and for social progress.*

Marx and Engels determined two basic types of wars, viz. unjust wars and just wars. They provided a clear criterion for determining their essence, showing that, in this case, everything depends on what class the war is waged by, and also in whose interests, for what purpose, and by what means.

They classified all aggressive and colonial wars waged by the dominant exploiting classes in their own interests as unjust and reactionary. At the same time, all revolutionary, popular, peasant, and national liberation wars waged in the interests of the oppressed classes and nations with a view to liberating them were viewed by them as just and progressive. Marx and Engels regarded such wars as legitimate and deserving as much support as possible.

Marx and Engels gave special attention to analysing the class nature of wars in the era of capitalism. In criticising the policy of the exploiting classes, which toy with the destinies of nations and shed the blood of millions of innocent people, they mercilessly castigated the "motives" put forward by

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 503.

the ruling classes to vindicate the involvement of a given country in any bloody carnage. Marx and Engels concluded that wars were inalienable features of capitalist development as such.

Marx and Engels spared no effort in opposing the militaristic policies of the capitalists. Both in the press and in their speeches, they exposed the true causes of war, laid bare the adventurous policies of the ruling classes, developed the fundamentals of proletarian tactics and determined the proletariat's stand in each given case. Marx noted: "Of all the dogmas of the bigoted politics of our time, none has caused more harm than the one that says 'In order to have peace, you must prepare for war.' This great truth, whose outstanding feature is that it contains a great lie, is the battle cry that has called all Europe to arms."<sup>1</sup>

Having analysed the international situation in Europe at the end of 1858, Marx and Engels arrived at the conclusion that events could develop in just one of two ways—revolution or war. Marx wrote that "on the horns of this dilemma Europe is tossed at this moment".<sup>2</sup> In exposing the attempts of the ruling classes, primarily of Bonapartist circles, to unleash a "local" conflict in order to prevent a revolutionary upheaval, and in indicating the counter-revolutionary nature of such a war, Marx and Engels forewarned that reactionaries would fail to

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 439.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 128.

“localise” the conflict, which could turn into a revolutionary conflagration all over Europe.

Marx and Engels regarded the Franco-Austrian War, which started in April 1859, as a continuation of the anti-popular policy of the Bonapartist regime. France’s ruling circles strived to achieve several objectives simultaneously. Above all, they sought to consolidate their power by means of a series of victories over an “external foe”; they also sought to win for themselves wide popularity as fighters for the “liberation” of Italy from the Austrian yoke; to expand their territory; and to strengthen their political dominance in Europe.

In criticising this policy, Marx and Engels pointed out that Bonapartism would not really liberate the people of Italy. On the contrary, they said, it would show itself as the bitterest enemy of Italian freedom and independence, bringing the Italians nothing except continued division and the spread of counter-revolutionary regimes. In their articles in the press, they pointed out the counter-revolutionary character of the Bonapartist dictatorship of the rich bourgeoisie and the threat it posed to the revolutionary and national liberation movement not only in Italy, but also in the whole of Europe. They considered the struggle against that dictatorship to be a major task of the revolutionaries.

In a number of articles, Engels analysed the methods of warfare adopted by the Bonapartist regime and indicated that they were in complete conformance with its reactionary policies, its desire to “localise” the war and to prevent it from developing

into a large-scale conflict fraught with dangerous revolutionary consequences. In characterising Austria's policy, its army, and its Commander-in-Chief Gyulay, a henchman of the semi-feudal Hapsburg Empire, Engels noted that "Gyulay's troops displayed the invincible vitality of the people, and he himself the senile idiocy of the monarchy".<sup>1</sup> In his article "The Po and the Rhine", Engels severely criticised the annexationist, aggressive aims of Bonapartism, which claimed the left bank of the Rhine, basing its argument on the so-called theory of natural boundaries, which constantly served to mask and justify the ruling classes' aggressive foreign policy, and which, in our time, too, continues to be used by some people to justify their territorial claims on other countries.

Engels' works on the theory of war and warfare were of major significance in the further struggle of the proletariat and in safeguarding its revolutionary gains. He was the first to apply the only truly scientific method of dialectical and historical materialism in studying the history of wars and in analysing the military strategy and politics of his time. In a well-reasoned manner, he revealed the groundlessness of bourgeois military science and achieved a real revolution in this sphere of knowledge to lay down the foundations of proletarian military strategy and tactics. In his articles for *The New American Encyclopedia* and other works,

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 379.

Engels showed the determining role of the nature of various socio-economic structures, their mode of production, the level of development of the productive forces, and the class structure of society for the entire military organisation. It is precisely these factors which determine the class nature of armies, and the character and type of armed forces, their specifics, armaments, tactics, and recruiting and training systems.

In his works, Engels made a deep analysis of a vast quantity of material on the history of wars, beginning from ancient times and working through to the establishment of capitalism. He critically revised and summarised the greatest achievements of military theoretical thought of all time and substantiated the decisive role of the popular masses and the significance of morale during hostilities, thus revealing the regularities of armed struggle.

Marx and Engels contrasted the idea of revolutionary wars of liberation against the most reactionary forces in Europe to wars imposed on the working people by the ruling exploiting classes. They believed that revolutionary tactics should be directed towards a full realisation of the tasks of bourgeois-democratic revolutions, and a mobilisation of broad masses of the people to this end.

Replacement of the feudal by the capitalist system took place during endless wars and international conflicts. Lenin wrote in this connection: "The bourgeoisie was then the chief class, which was on the upgrade as a result of its participation in those wars; it alone could come out with overwhelming

force against the feudal-absolutist institutions."<sup>1</sup> In different countries, the bourgeoisie was far from equally progressive and revolutionary, and even within the same country its strata were found to differ significantly.

Indicating that the popular movement in the principal war-affected countries was then generally democratic, i.e., bourgeois-democratic in its economic and class essence, Lenin, like Marx, arrived at the conclusion that, in its struggle against the *chief* representatives of dying feudalism, the progressive bourgeoisie's objective historical task at that time was to use international conflicts in the interests of world bourgeois democracy.

As victorious capitalism continued to develop and its inherent contradictions and class antagonism further multiplied, the bourgeoisie, gradually losing its revolutionary spirit, changed from being the chief, advanced class of its time into a degrading, reactionary class. A new, progressive class—the proletariat—was gradually coming to the forefront to supersede the bourgeoisie.

The emergence of the working class into the world arena had for the first time provided a real possibility for waging a successful struggle to establish a stable and universal peace. Noticing this growing possibility, Marx wrote: "Now at last the working classes are bestriding the scene of history no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, 1980, p. 147.



to command peace where their would be masters shout war."<sup>1</sup>

The founders of Marxism considered the working class capable of solving this historically important task and scientifically substantiated the ways of doing so. Having proven that the old exploitative system "with its economical miseries and its political delirium" would inevitably be superseded by a new system in which there would be no exploitation of man by man, no dominance of private ownership, and "whose International rule will be *Peace*, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—*Labour!*"<sup>2</sup> Marxism suggested the need for the working people of all countries to join together as the principal means for waging the struggle for peace.

The principle of proletarian internationalism was initially formulated and comprehensively substantiated in Marx's and Engels' works. Engels noted: "Because the condition of the workers of all countries is the same, because their interests are the same, their enemies the same, they must also fight together, they must oppose the brotherhood of the bourgeoisie of all nations with a brotherhood of the workers of all nations."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The General Council of the First International, 1868-1870, Minutes*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 321.

<sup>2</sup> *The General Council of the First International, 1870-1871, Minutes*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967, p. 328.

<sup>3</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 390.

Proceeding from the fact that the class interests of the proletariat of all countries are the same and do not depend on what nation or state the workers belong to, this providing an objective foundation for planning and pursuing a co-ordinated internationalist policy by the working class, Marxism inferred the unity of purposes and principles in the policy of the world proletariat.

Marx and Engels revealed the tremendous significance of proletarian internationalism in the struggle of the proletariat as a class for its rights and indicated the ways and forms in which proletarian internationalism would further develop. They regarded the international solidarity of the working class as a prime requisite for its emancipation. They also revealed the role and significance of proletarian internationalism as one of the fundamental principles of the proletariat's internationalist policy, and convincingly showed what a strong and effective means proletarian internationalism is in the struggle for peace and against wars of aggression. Marx predicted that precisely "the alliance of the working classes of all countries will ultimately kill war".<sup>1</sup> The anti-war orientation of proletarian internationalist unity helped rally the broad masses of the working people who come out against war around the working class.

Marx and Engels proceeded from the fact that a peaceful policy meets the fundamental interests of

---

<sup>1</sup> *The General Council of the First International, 1870-1871, Minutes*, p. 328.

the working class, of all the working people, and urged that proletarian solidarity be widely used in the defence of peace. Being convinced that the proletariat can and must actively oppose the chauvinist, aggressive policies of the ruling classes, they emphasised the need for the working classes of all countries to adhere to the same revolutionary line in international conflicts. They believed that the principal trend in the proletariat's internationalist policy should essentially help complete bourgeois-democratic transformations in all countries; support by word and deed the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples; and create the necessary conditions for the victory of a proletarian revolution.

In declaring that "the union of the working classes of the different countries must ultimately make international wars impossible",<sup>1</sup> Marx at the same time pointed out that the possibility of safeguarding and consolidating peace greatly depended on the relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Having shown that the growth of armies in Europe was the direct result of the 1848 Revolution, he noted: "Large standing armies... were not kept up for international warfare, but to keep down the working classes. However, as there were not always barricades to bombard, and working men to shoot, there was sometimes a possibility of interna-

---

<sup>1</sup> *The General Council of the First International, 1866-1868, Minutes*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 152.

tional quarrels being fomented to keep the soldiery in trim."<sup>1</sup>

Marx and Engels thereby indicated the principal and primary function of the army under an exploitative system—the function of suppressing the actions of the working people. In approaching this question dialectically, they maintained that the bourgeoisie, in recruiting the army from among workers and peasants and in unleashing wars, would ultimately teach the proletariat how to use arms, and this would eventually turn against the bourgeoisie itself.

The founders of scientific communism revealed the groundlessness of the stand taken by liberals and radicals of every persuasion, who tried to counter the policy of war without the support of the international working class.

In his address to American workers on behalf of the First International, Marx drew attention to the fact that the bourgeoisie strove with all its might to split the ranks of the international proletarian movement. Urging the working class to prevent the US government from unleashing a war against Britain, Marx wrote: "Your turn has now come to stop a war, the clearest result of which would be, for an indefinite period, to hurl back the ascendant movement of the working class on both sides of the Atlantic."<sup>2</sup> They saw an important foreign policy

<sup>1</sup> *The General Council of the First International, 1866-1868*, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> *The General Council of the First International, 1868-1870, Minutes*, p. 319.

function of proletarian internationalism in developing qualitatively new relations between nations and peoples. This aspect of proletarian internationalism was revealed by them long before the emergence of the world's first socialist state and the socialist system.

Thus, Marx and Engels not only showed the working class the powerful and formidable weapon that proletarian internationalism represents in the struggle for social emancipation, but also revealed its major foreign policy functions that were to play a decisive role in future revolutionary battles.

The contribution of the founders of Marxism to the elaboration of the most significant and complex theoretical problems of foreign policy and international relations is very great indeed. They convincingly proved that, in a class society, not only domestic, but foreign policy, too, is of class nature and serves the interests of the ruling classes. Under the capitalist system, where state authority is in the hands of the exploiting classes, foreign policy is planned and pursued in the interests of large-scale capital. As the bourgeoisie changes into a stagnating and parasitic class, this policy becomes increasingly reactionary and is directed at satisfying the bourgeoisie's fundamental interests, at intensifying the exploitation and robbery of the peoples, and at suppressing the struggle of the working people.

Marx and Engels further showed that the foreign policy of the ruling classes affects the actual development of the entire system of international relations. Under capitalism, the foreign policy

aspirations of the bourgeoisie lead to endless wars, to seizure of foreign lands, to enslavement and oppression of other peoples and states, and to struggle between major capitalist predators for a redivision of the world, for obtaining maximum profits. The pursuit of profit, and the capitalists' greedy interests and selfish aims underlying the entire foreign policy of bourgeois states, determine the principles and methods of bourgeois diplomacy.

Scientific and technological progress and the rapid growth of the productive forces under capitalism help continually to improve the weapons used by regular armies. As a result, every new war started by capitalists inflicts ever greater damage on social progress and brings the peoples immeasurable new suffering and death to many millions.

While uncovering the classroots of the domestic and foreign policies of bourgeois states, the founders of Marxism mercilessly exposed the anti-popular aims and methods of the foreign policy activities of the ruling parties and their governments. They taught the proletariat and the working people of all countries to distinguish the true class interests and intentions underlying the foreign policies of bourgeois parties, states, and governments, policies which were allegedly pursued on behalf of and in the interests of the whole nation.

Marx and Engels scientifically predicted that, with the victory of the new social system, bourgeois foreign policy would inevitably be superseded by a socialist foreign policy of the victorious proletariat, a policy whose influence would result in the

establishment of a new type of international relations. In pointing to the working class as the force that could achieve the historically important transition from capitalism to socialism, they urged and taught the workers to resolutely oppose with all available means the reactionary foreign policy of exploiter classes, to master the secrets of international politics and diplomacy and pursue their own independent foreign policy course. Marx and Engels proved a universal and stable peace to be a major objective of the proletariat's class struggle.

The fact that Marx and Engels had provided a scientifically-grounded explanation to show that domestic and foreign policies essentially correlate and interact was of fundamental significance for the theories and practices of communist and workers' parties. The conclusions they made afforded a reliable methodological key to correctly assessing the policy of any party, state, or class, of the entire system of international relations. At the same time, the principle of unity of domestic and foreign policy formulated by Marx and Engels became a guiding principle in the foreign policies of the communist and workers' parties of all countries, permitting them to plan and implement a foreign policy that met the interests of all progressive mankind and enjoyed widespread support.

Marx's and Engels' rich ideological and theoretical legacy, including the elaboration of major problems of foreign policy and international relations, completely disprove the fabrications of some bourgeois scholars that Marx and Engels had no integ-

ral theory on this sphere of human activity. Their contribution to science remains the theoretical foundation on which the CPSU and the international communist and workers' movement and, to some measure, the national liberation movement, too, plan and implement their foreign policies.



## CHAPTER 2

### LENIN'S DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW TYPE OF FOREIGN POLICY

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the founder of Russia's Marxist revolutionary party, was the man who continued the cause begun by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. The implementation of the ideas formulated by Marx and Engels about the working class winning power and the creation of a new socialist society is associated with Lenin's name.

Having mastered Marxist teaching to perfection, Lenin creatively approached the question of how to apply that teaching at the turn of the century. He wrote: "We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life."<sup>1</sup>

In new historical conditions, Lenin comprehensively developed and enriched the theoretical legacy of his great predecessors and actually ushered in a new stage in the development of Marxism. Apply-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, 1977, pp. 211-212.

ing dialectical materialism to analysing the complex and contradictory phenomena of his time, Lenin supplemented Marxist theory with his teaching on imperialism, socialist revolution, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and put forward and developed his ideas and conclusions on a new type of party, the proletariat's class allies in the struggle for democracy and socialism, and the inseparable relationship of social and national liberation.

Lenin and the Communist Party he created for the first time implemented and further developed the ideas of Marx and Engels on international relations. Lenin advanced and substantiated the concept of a socialist foreign policy in international relations in the new historical epoch of imperialism and socialist revolutions.

Yet, it would be incorrect to infer that Lenin had started to deal with the problems of foreign policy and international relations only after the establishment in Russia of a Soviet socialist republic. He had, in fact, accomplished a great deal in this sphere in the years before the 1917 October Revolution.

Long before the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin had charted clear-cut prospects for the Bolshevik Party's foreign policy in a series of works. Even then, his ideas revealed the outlines of the future international policy of the Soviet state and the contours of its future strategy and tactics. For instance, amongst Lenin's works, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *Socialism and War*, *On the*

*Slogan for a United States of Europe*, and *The Foreign Policy of the Russian Revolution*, all help one correctly to understand foreign policy and international relations in the new historical era when capitalism has entered its highest and last, imperialist stage. Lenin's well-known book *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* is especially significant in this respect.

Lenin's works further developed virtually all major aspects of the theory of foreign policy and international relations. One of these aspects is the problem of war and peace, on whose solution the success of the working people's liberation, the destinies of the peoples of the world, and the victory of socialism essentially depend.

#### *Lenin on Problems of War and Peace*

In the new historical era, the question of wars, which under imperialism became worldwide in character, has, as Lenin put it, turned into a cardinal issue in the policies of all countries. That is why communists have to determine their stand on this question and plan the political course of the working-class party not only successfully to counter the aggressive policies of imperialism, but also completely to exclude wars from the life of mankind.

Headed by Lenin, the Bolshevik Party,<sup>1</sup> launched its struggle to prevent World War I long before it

---

<sup>1</sup> The Bolsheviks were staunch and consistent representatives of the revolutionary, Marxist trend in the work-

started, and when it did begin the Party took the only correct, international stand as regards that conflict.

Lenin had already emphasised before the October Revolution of 1917 that *only* the workers' and peasants' state could resolve the most difficult and paramount task of the time, namely the task of securing peace. This was not to be an imperialist peace, however, not a deal between capitalist countries on the division of the spoils they had amassed by robbery, but a truly stable, just and democratic peace.

After the triumph of the socialist revolution in Russia and after its workers, soldiers and peasants had won power, the Bolshevik Party and the young

---

ing-class movement in Russia at the start of the 20th century. At the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) in 1903, elections to the leading bodies gave the majority to Lenin's supporters (the name Bolshevik is derived from the Russian *bolshe*, which means *more*, i. e. the majority held by Lenin's group), while the opportunists (the Mensheviks) remained in the minority (Mensheviks, derived from the Russian *menshe*, which means *less*). As a trend of political thought, Bolshevism took its theoretical base from Marxism-Leninism. This trend was embodied in a new type of proletarian party, the Bolshevik Party created by Lenin. The Party's name changed several times. From 1917 to 1918 it was called the RSDLP (Bolsheviks); from 1918 to 1925, the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks); from 1925 to 1952, the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks); and since 1952, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

Soviet state were faced with the questions of war and peace which were more acute than ever. These questions needed to be resolved, and in his report to the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which took place in late October 1917 immediately after the armed uprising, Lenin stated bluntly that the issue of peace was a sore subject of burning importance. In fact, it was impossible to advance further along the road of historical progress without resolving it, since it concerned the life and death of tens of millions of people.

The Civil War and foreign intervention in Russia again confronted the Bolshevik Party and Lenin with problems of war and peace which were becoming increasingly acute. As a matter of fact, the fate of the revolution and socialism depended on these problems being correctly resolved, and this is what many millions of war-weary people, and all the working people of Russia were waiting for.

Lenin found scientifically-grounded answers to these complicated questions. To begin with, he provided a clear definition of the nature of war and peace in general, as well as of World War I in particular. He found the criterion for determining the nature of war, having proven that despite the fact that wars vary greatly in nature, they may all be assigned to two basic types, one involving just wars and the other—unjust wars.

Lenin revealed the unity of the working class's two great aims, namely peace and social progress,

and indicated realistic ways for withdrawing from the world imperialist carnage.

In the period preceding the October Revolution, when the Communist Party and the country were faced with a series of complex new tasks, Lenin developed the strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state on questions of war and peace, and these still retain their relevance. He formulated and substantiated the foreign policy principles of socialism and determined its principal directions and aims. The consistent implementations of these principles by the Communist Party and the Soviet state still reliably ensures most favourable external conditions for building a new society in the USSR and the socialist countries, and also for developing the world revolutionary movement.

Lenin and the Bolshevik Party he headed found the ways of halting imperialist aggression against the socialist state, preventing new military ventures by capitalism, and establishing peaceful relations with all countries. And even though there was an acute political struggle around these questions at that time within the Party itself, Lenin's proposals were warmly supported by the working class and the broad masses.

It was Lenin who put forward and developed in detail ideas and tenets on the need to use capitalist crises, inter-imperialist contradictions, and the economic interests of the ruling classes of capitalist states for defending and consolidating socialism. A resolute rebuff to imperialist aggression and support for the young Soviet Republic by the world prolet-

ariat coupled with the above-mentioned highly effective means for pursuing a flexible and well thought-out foreign policy played a decisive role in successfully defending the gains of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

In the early days of Soviet power, Lenin, as Head of Government, solemnly proclaimed the following thesis: peace is socialism's ideal, a paramount objective and supreme principle of the foreign policy of a socialist country. This not only determined the peace-loving nature of the new state and the profoundly humanitarian aims and principles of its foreign policy, but also secured the sympathy and support for such a policy on the part of broad sections of the world public, the peoples of capitalist states, and the governments of small, colonial and dependent countries. This support meant a lot, and Lenin, the leader of the young Soviet Republic, worked to ensure broader and more active involvement of the popular masses in the struggle for peace and to consolidate the international solidarity of the working people in that struggle.

There are quite a few researches in the West who try to reduce the victory of the October Revolution, the conclusion by Soviet Russia of peace with Germany, and the fact that the former had rebuffed the foreign interventionists and routed its class enemies in the Civil War as a favourable chance coincidence of circumstances. Indeed, such favourable circumstances did exist, and Lenin noted that they were of considerable significance.

However, the subjective factor, i.e. the revolutionary enthusiasm of the working class and the toiling masses, and their profound class interest in achieving the ideals and principles of socialism, as well as the far-sighted policy of the Russian Communist Party and its leader Lenin, and their selfless struggle in the defence of revolutionary gains, was what played the decisive role in the victory of the revolution and in all the successes of the young Soviet Republic.

Now that more than sixty years have elapsed since the rout of the foreign interventionists and the end of the Civil War, it is becoming especially clear what an important role was played in strengthening not only the domestic, but also the international positions of the young Soviet Republic by the fact that political power in Russia and ownership of the means of production, of all national wealth, including factories, pits, railways, banks, land, etc., were handed over to the people, i.e. to the workers, peasants, and working intelligentsia.

It is no less apparent that a just settlement of the national question, the proclamation by the government of the right to self-determination for the nations inhabiting Russia, the elimination of national inequality, and the creation of a voluntary union of free peoples within one state were some of the major factors which were instrumental in ensuring the successes of the Soviet state's peaceful policy.

To safeguard and strengthen peace and to counter the policy aimed at unleashing new wars, Lenin



thought it necessary to mobilise all the democratic peace forces and to strive for the creation of the broadest possible anti-war coalition that would include very wide sections of the people and representatives of the left, pacifist wing of the bourgeoisie.

In analysing the problems of war and peace, Lenin comprehensively developed Marxist methodological principles that permitted him to give an adequate scientific characteristic of the socially-conditioned nature of the foreign policy of any state, and to determine the origin, character, and class objectives of any war. One of these principles is embodied in a class approach, under which the problem of war and peace is to be considered in intimate connection with the interests and entire policy of the class that holds state power.

Another Marxist principle is in a historical approach to the analysis of the causes of war, taking account of the specific economic, political, and social development of a state not only on the eve of the war, but over many previous decades.

In stressing the intransigent significance of these Marxist principles, Lenin notes the well-known tenet of materialist dialectics which "calls for a many-sided investigation into a given social phenomenon in its development, and for the external and the seeming to be reduced to the fundamental motive forces, to the development of the productive forces and to the class struggle."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 218.

Lenin's approach to the problems of war and peace was invariably of a specific historical, not abstract nature. In every case, Lenin regarded the state of war and peace as a concrete phenomenon determined by the logic of development of given class, social, and national relations. He showed that law-governed factors of social development and social relations, and not chance factors, underlie war and peace. And since the state of war and peace is a manifestation of the essence of actual social relations in every given stage of historical development, it essentially requires concrete sociological analysis, a specific historical approach.

Using a vast amount of historical material as his base, Lenin provided convincing new evidence showing that the Marxist conclusion that both war and peace may be both just and unjust was well-grounded.

In developing Marxist ideas with regard to the new historical epoch, Lenin characterised unjust, imperialist wars as wars waged to seize and enslave other countries and peoples, to suppress the workers', democratic and national liberation movements, to undermine and destroy the socialist state, to redivide the world, to obtain new markets, and to establish spheres of dominance and influence. Such wars stem from the economic and political interests of the exploiting classes and are waged under the guise of false slogans of "defence of the Fatherland" and "defence of state interests". Lenin said that the working class and all progressive forces had to implacably oppose such wars with

all the means at their disposal. In this case, one of the most radical measures would be to overthrow the bourgeois government of their country, to accomplish a revolution, and to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.

At the same time, as Lenin noted, history had time and again witnessed wars which, despite all the calamities and hardships involved, were nonetheless progressive and conducive to social progress, since they destroyed the most reactionary institutions and regimes, and with them the most barbarous despotism.

Marxism had always supported wars involving revolutions against feudalism and serfdom, against capitalist exploitation and national oppression, recognising their legitimacy, progressiveness, and justice. In our time, too, the wars of oppressed countries and peoples against their oppressors would, as Lenin wrote, "be 'just', and 'defensive' wars, *irrespective* of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slaveholding and predatory 'Great Powers'".<sup>1</sup>

Just wars are waged to liberate the working masses from social and national oppression, to defend the people from external aggression, and to safeguard the socialist state from attack from without. Lenin stressed that the proletariat and all progressive forces should support such wars.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 300-301.

World War I began in July 1914 and continued for over four years. Marx, Engels, and Lenin predicted it and forewarned the international working class of the impending menace. Long before the start of hostilities, the Bolshevik Party waged a stubborn struggle against militarism and the policy of war. On Lenin's initiative, the Stuttgart Socialist Congress (1907) included in its resolution on militarism and international conflicts a basic tenet stipulating that, should the imperialists unleash a war, the working class was to use the resultant crisis in the interests of socialist revolution.

World War I brought unprecedentedly great calamities to all mankind, above all to working people, and directly affected 38 countries with a total population of over 1,500 million people. The war seriously aggravated all capitalist contradictions, having put on the agenda the question of how society and the international workers' movement were to develop, and also of the strategy and tactics of the working class and its political parties in the new historical conditions.

The ruling classes of capitalists and landlords and their political parties did everything to conceal the class, aggressive, and predatory character of the war; to hide from the peoples its true causes; and to poison the minds of the broad masses with the heat of chauvinism. It was to this end that the political actions of the ruling parties and the efforts of the bourgeois press were directed. The bourgeoisie of each warring country sought to convince their people that the war was defensive and

aimed at "saving the nations", and they urged everybody "to defend the Fatherland".

In these conditions, socialists and all political parties of the Second International<sup>1</sup> were faced with a very serious task: to help the working people and the working class of all countries to understand the true causes of the war, its character, and objectives and to determine the tasks, strategy and tactics of the working-class movement in the complex international situation then existing.

Despite the resolutions of the Stuttgart, Copenhagen (1910) and Basel (1912) International Socialist Congresses, which determined the proletariat's tactics in case of an imperialist war, the majority of the socialist parties and the Second International leaders betrayed those resolutions and the cause of the working class, came out in support of "their" governments, urging the masses to stop their class struggle while the war was still on

---

<sup>1</sup> The Second International was a working class international organisation established in 1889 with the direct participation of Engels and a view to disseminating Marxist ideas, developing a mass workers' movement, and creating and consolidating the working class' political parties. It ceased to exist during World War I as a result of the splitting, opportunist activities of the social-chauvinists, who betrayed the cause of the proletariat, and of socialism, by rising in defence of the imperialist policies of their countries' bourgeois governments. The Bolshevik Party led by Lenin waged an implacable struggle against opportunism and social-chauvinism. It headed the socialist revolution in Russia and created conditions for reviving the international unity of the working class and for establishing the Third Communist International in 1919.

and to rise in defence of their native countries.

The outcome of this change in the policies of most of the European socialist party leaders, who succumbed to the onslaught of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, was that the working class in many countries proved to be ideologically disarmed, and the betrayal of its interests led to the collapse of the Second International and to a deep crisis in the international socialist movement.

In his works of that period, Lenin exposed the class, social roots of the opportunism and social-chauvinism of the Second International leaders to show that their emergence was linked with the development of capitalism into imperialism.

Scared by the growth of the working-class movement, the bourgeoisie tried to undermine and demoralise it from within; using their massive profits, the bourgeoisie strived to bribe the upper strata of the working class and thus increase its influence over working people. The "working-class aristocracy", which was increasingly moving away from the bulk of the proletariat gradually to side with the capitalists, was increasingly becoming the defender and conductor of their interests among the working people. This was being achieved by creating privileged economic and political conditions for the top stratum of the working class, by providing it with lucrative and soft jobs in ministries, parliaments, newspapers, etc. As a result, the bourgeoisie succeeded in subjecting large masses of the working people to its influence.

In these conditions, only one party—the Russian

Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin—remained loyal to the cause of the working class by taking a principled stand towards the war and by leading all the revolutionary forces in the struggle against it.

The Bolshevik stand towards the imperialist war (World War I) was expounded by Lenin in his famous theses "The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War", in his written manifesto of the CC RSDLP "The War and Russian Social-Democracy", in the resolutions of the Berne Bolshevik Conference, in the brochure *Socialism and War (The Attitude of the RSDLP Towards the War)*, and in other publications. Lenin convincingly showed that in the era of imperialism wars were essentially caused by existing socio-economic conditions; by basing his works on authentic historical facts, he revealed the imperialist essence and causes of World War I.

In subjecting the social-chauvinist ideas and views stated by such well-known social-democrats as Georgi Plekhanov and Karl Kautsky to severe criticism, Lenin exposed their attempts to vindicate the imperialist war by appeals "to defend the Fatherland" and by the need to find and punish the "perpetrator" and "instigator" of World War I, something indicated by Plekhanov in his brochure *On the 1914 War*. This "argumentation" opened the way for vindicating the true perpetrators of the war.

The idea of detecting the "perpetrator" was, in the Bolsheviks' view, so primitive as to be beneath criticism. Lenin saw the roots of Plekhanov's errors

and delusions in the fact that he ignored the class and national objectives and interests of the warring sides. He wrote: "He does not make the slightest attempt to study the economic and diplomatic history of at least the past three decades, which history proves conclusively that the conquest of colonies, the looting of foreign countries, the ousting and ruining of the more successful rivals have been the backbone of the politics of *both* groups of the now belligerent powers."<sup>1</sup>

Attempting to justify his "theory", which urged socialists from all countries to side with "their" capitalists, and seeing this as a display of "genuine internationalism", Kautsky alluded to Marx and Engels, who in every specific case decided the victory of what country, i.e. of what bourgeoisie, would be preferable on the 19th century wars.

Lenin resolutely exposed this stand, qualifying it as the favourite method of the sophists of all times, who cited examples relating to basically different historical conditions. He showed why one could not draw parallels between wars waged in two different eras, and wrote with sarcasm: "Comparing the 'continuation of the politics' of combating feudalism and absolutism—the politics of the bourgeoisie in its struggle for liberty—with the 'continuation of the politics' of a decrepit, *i.e.*, imperialist, bourgeoisie, *i.e.*, of a bourgeoisie which has plundered the entire world, a reactionary bourgeoisie which, in alliance with feudal landlords, attempts

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 218.



to crush the proletariat, means comparing chalk and cheese."<sup>1</sup>

Lenin wrote that deep theoretical analysis and disclosure of the social essence and historical and class causes of World War I were essential correctly to establish the line of the working class's revolutionary party and to lead the masses. In his works Lenin gave a comprehensive analysis of imperialism and showed that World War I had been caused by the non-uniform development of capitalism; by changes in the balance of forces between imperialist states; and by their struggle for markets, spheres of influence, and a redivision of the world. Hence, it was a senseless venture to look for the "perpetrator" of the war, since, as Lenin put it: "The war is not a product of the evil will of rapacious capitalists, although it is undoubtedly being fought *only* in their interests and they alone are being enriched by it. The war is a product of half a century of development of world capitalism and of its billions of threads and connections."<sup>2</sup>

Lenin pointed out the objective nature of the economic laws of capitalist development that led to World War I. At the same time, he believed that the subjective factor was not insignificant, since the governments and bourgeois parties of all countries had been preparing the war for decades, and to which the growth of armaments, the persistent struggle by the leading imperialist powers for mar-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, 1977, p. 67.

kets, and the increased contradictions between them had inescapably led. The war was also inevitably to come about because of dynastic interests in the East European monarchies.

The bourgeoisie of every country sought to obtain for itself not only economic, but political advantages, striving to attain far-reaching goals by waging the war it had unleashed. What were those goals? They were diverse and essentially aimed at seizing foreign lands and subjugating other nations, ruining competitor-countries, and plundering their wealth. Moreover, it was also no less important for them to divert the attention of the working masses of Russia, Germany, Britain, and other countries from domestic political crises; to disunite the workers and make nationalistically-minded fools of them; and to annihilate their vanguard in the course of the war and thereby to weaken the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Lenin emphasised that this was the sole essence, significance, and meaning of the war.

Proceeding from the Marxist understanding of the socio-economic causes of wars in a society divided into antagonistic classes, Lenin revised and creatively applied the well-known tenet of the German 19th-century military theoretician Karl von Clausewitz to the new historical conditions to provide the following classical scientific definitions of war and peace: "War is the continuation, by violent means, of the politics pursued by the ruling classes of the belligerent powers long before the outbreak of war. Peace is a continuation of the *very same* pol-

itics, with a *record* of the changes brought about in the relation of the rival forces by the military operations."<sup>1</sup>

Having determined the imperialist nature of World War I, Lenin charted the relevant strategy and tactics of the Bolshevik Party from scientific, revolutionary positions. In objectively assessing the aftermaths of the war, which brought innumerable calamities and sufferings to all peoples, he pointed out: "The war has brought mankind to the *brink of a precipice*, to the brink of the destruction of civilization, of the brutalisation and destruction of more millions, countless millions, of human beings. The *only* way out is through a proletarian revolution."<sup>2</sup>

Using this conclusion as a basis, Lenin advanced the slogan of transforming the imperialist war into a civil war. He noted that revolution during war is civil war. In determining the tasks of the proletariat in such a revolution, Lenin emphasised: "It is *impossible* to slip out of the imperialist war and achieve a democratic, non-coercive peace without overthrowing the power of capital and transferring state power to *another* class, the proletariat."<sup>3</sup>

Unlike bourgeois parties and the parties of the Second International, which had slipped into the mire of opportunism, Lenin urged the socialists of all countries to strive for the defeat of "their" governments in the imperialist war. To substantiate

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, 1977, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 86-87.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 67.

his stance, he formulated the tenet that, in a reactionary war, a revolutionary class cannot but wish defeat for "its" government, since otherwise it would be impossible to transform an imperialist war into a civil war. In justifying his view, Lenin said that the defeat of a given government's army weakens that government, helps liberate oppressed nations, and makes it easier to wage a civil war against the dominant exploiting classes.

Trotsky,<sup>1</sup> who is known to have pretended to the role of "theoretician" and leader of the revolutionary movement, particularly in military matters, then advanced his counter-slogan: "neither victories, nor defeats". Lenin bitterly criticised Trotsky's stand to show that it was, in fact, support for "one's own" government, played into the hands of social-chauvinists, led to ideological disarmament of the working class, and deprived the latter of the conviction that successful revolutionary actions were both possible and essential.

---

<sup>1</sup> Trotsky [Lev Davidovich Bronstein (1879-1940)], member of the RSDLP since 1897, Menshevik. After the February 1917 Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution returned to Russia from abroad, where he had been an émigré, and joined the Bolshevik Party. In reality, however, he did not side with the Bolshevik views and continued a covert and overt struggle against the Party's Leninist course. After the 1917 October Socialist Revolution in Russia he was People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs and subsequently People's Commissar for the Army and Navy; he was also member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party and member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. Trotsky opposed the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace

In his speech during a discussion of Plekhanov's lecture "On the Attitude of the Socialists to the War" in September 1914, Lenin, in condemning opportunist tactics, emphasised that, he personally had always struggled against conciliatory unprincipled attitudes. Such attitudes, such betrayal of the principles of revolutionary struggle for the cause of the working class, inescapably led to betrayal of its interests, to sliding to the positions of the most reactionary forces and their accomplices. Indeed, the opportunist wave which had emerged from the depths of the European socialist movement inflicted colossal damage on the interests of the proletariat and the working masses to become a serious obstacle to the implementation of their aspirations.

It was no mere chance that at that very time Lenin advanced the need for the working-class movement completely to dissociate itself from opportunism, from the political parties of the Second International, which had betrayed the interests of

---

Treaty with Germany. In 1920-21 he headed the opposition within the Bolshevik Party. Beginning from 1923, Trotsky waged a fierce factional struggle against the Party's general line and Lenin's programme for building socialism, defending the thesis that the victory of socialism in the USSR was impossible. The Communist Party, having exposed Trotskyism as a petty-bourgeois deviation within the Party, crushed its ideology and organisation. In 1927, Trotsky was expelled from the Party, and in 1932 deprived of Soviet citizenship. Abroad, Trotsky, the bitterest enemy of Leninism, continued his struggle against the Soviet state, the Communist Party and the international communist movement.

the proletariat and the principles of the revolutionary movement and taken the road of social-chauvinism. Lenin inferred the essential need for the working class of every country to create a truly revolutionary Marxist party, and to form on that basis a new international organisation of communist parties, the Third International.

At the same time, Lenin resolutely came out against abstract preaching of peace. He emphasised that the only guarantee of peace is an organised, conscious working-class movement.

World War I clearly showed how alien this was to the working class and the peoples of the belligerent countries. Lenin characterised the opposite class approaches of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie to the then principal issue of world politics in the following way: "You must side with one of the two immensely wealthy and immensely powerful groups of imperialist predators—that is how capitalist reality poses the basic issue of present-day foreign policy. That is how this issue is posed by the capitalist class. And that, it goes without saying, is how it is posed by the broad mass of the petty bourgeoisie who have retained their old, capitalist views and prejudices."<sup>1</sup>

However, the working class, which was neither interested in, nor guilty of unleashing and continuing that predatory war, "cannot side *with either* group of imperialist plunderers",<sup>2</sup> Lenin declared.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, 1980, p. 85.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

It was precisely in this that the Leninist Bolshevik stand fundamentally differed from that of the social-chauvinists, and the Bolshevik policy fully met the interests of the working class.

The Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries (SR's)<sup>1</sup> came out against that policy to pursue an anti-democratic, counter-revolutionary course in this highly important foreign policy issue. Time and again, Lenin convincingly proved that capitalist reality bluntly posed the question: either the proletariat would have to submit to the imperialists of one of the two warring groups, or engage in a revolutionary struggle against any kind of imperialism. The situation demanded that the working class and its political parties gave a clear and absolutely unambiguous answer to that question.

Lenin asked whether Russia's working class was capable of countering the reactionary course of imperialist foreign policy, and answered affirmatively. He also confirmed that Russia's working class has allies in that struggle, primarily the oppressed

---

<sup>1</sup> The Socialist Revolutionaries (SR's), a Russian petty-bourgeois party established in 1901. The SR's rejected the leading role of the proletariat in a socialist revolution, pinning all hopes on the peasantry. They regarded individual terrorism as a major means in their struggle against tsarism, and stubbornly opposed Lenin and the Bolshevik Party in all the basic issues of revolutionary strategy and tactics. After the victory of the 1917 October Revolution, the left-wing SR's recognised Soviet power and were even members of the Soviet government; subsequently, however, they embarked on an anti-Soviet struggle. The SR Party collapsed after the Russian Civil War.

classes of Europe, chiefly the proletariat, and the peoples of Asia, especially those from neighbouring countries, oppressed by imperialism. If a revolution were to break out in Russia, the two warring groups of imperialist predators would fail quickly to reconcile and unite against that revolution. Hence, Lenin inferred the rise of favourable international conditions for the victory of a socialist revolution in Russia.

The two antagonistic classes of present-day society pursued two directly opposite foreign policy lines, two different approaches to the question of war and peace. Lenin charted the strategy of the international policy of the working class for many years to come in the following way: "The foreign policy of the capitalists and the petty bourgeoisie is 'alliance' with the imperialists, that is, disgraceful dependence on them. The foreign policy of the proletariat is alliance with the revolutionaries of the advanced countries and with all the oppressed nations against all and any imperialists."<sup>1</sup>

Subsequent events showed the political line of the Bolsheviks to have been correct and their tactics well-grounded. The reactionary and anti-popular nature of tsarist domestic and foreign policies finally led to the overthrow of tsarist autocracy by the 1917 February Revolution. Thus was how Lenin assessed the consequences of these events for a successful struggle for peace: "The Russian revolution of February-March 1917 was the beginning of

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 87.



the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war. This revolution took the first step towards ending the war; but it requires a *second* step, namely, the transfer of state power to the proletariat, to make the end of the war a *certainty*. This will be the beginning of a 'break-through' on a world-wide scale, a break-through in the front of capitalist interests; and only by breaking through *this* front *can* the proletariat save mankind from the horrors of war and endow it with the blessings of peace."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, Russia's working class led by the Bolshevik Party had a clear programme of action in all the stages of the struggle for peace and against the imperialist war.

But, in addition to a programme, the working class needed a suitable form of organisation in order successfully to break through the imperialist front. Lenin believed that the October Revolution, having created the Soviets of Workers' Deputies, had already made this "break-through" of capitalism by the proletariat of Russia imminent.

If one were briefly to characterise the essence of Lenin's elaboration of the problems of war and peace in the period preceding the October Revolution, one should first of all indicate two of his major conclusions. The first was about the inevitability of wars under imperialism.

Lenin scientifically proved that wars, which are concomitant with all socio-economic structures based on exploitation and oppression, including wars

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 67.

waged in the era of capitalism, inevitably become concomitant with imperialism, since they stem from the latter's very nature. In his well-known work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin, in examining the capitalist stage of development which was characteristic of his time and of the principal features of imperialism, showed that the objective economic foundation of aggressive wars would also continue to exist while imperialism itself exists. Lenin pointed out that it was precisely the objective tendencies of capitalism which had brought about the imperialist war. In this case, the role played by finance capital in the struggle for a re-division of the world was one of the most substantial factors. Lenin wrote: "Finance capital is such a great, such a decisive, you might say, force in all economic and in all international relations, that it is capable of subjecting, and actually does subject, to itself even states enjoying the fullest political independence. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

In inferring the inevitability of wars in the era of imperialism, Lenin proceeded from the fact that the capitalist system was then the world's dominant socio-economic system, and that the policy of war and peace was determined by the class that held state power, namely, the rich bourgeoisie, which made the most of the weakness of the working-class and revolutionary movements, and of the absence of organisation among anti-imperialist, anti-war forces.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 259.

Yet, with the appearance of class antagonisms and the worsening of the position of the working class and of all the working people caused by the war, and with greater consciousness, solidarity and organisation of Russia's proletariat under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, conditions gradually ripened for achieving a socialist revolution in Russia.

Lenin's second major conclusion was that only the victory of a socialist revolution would create conditions allowing the international situation to be fundamentally changed and an end to be put not only to the First World War, but also to war in general.

Lenin's contribution to the theory of war and peace and to developing the strategy and tactics of the proletarian party under imperialism, in a situation when an aggressive war unleashed by imperialism was being waged, retains its basic theoretical and methodological significance for the present-day communist and working-class movement. The nature of imperialism has not changed: it continues to retain its aggressive character and to be the source of wars. It is natural, therefore, that the communist and worker's parties made wide use of Lenin's experience for resolving questions of war and peace in the struggle against imperialism's aggressive aspirations, for reducing international tension, and consolidating peace and international security.

*The Struggle against Imperialist  
Aggression*

The victory of Russia's working class, which, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin, took power into its hands, afforded extensive opportunities for implementing socialist ideas in both domestic and foreign policy. For the first time in history, it became possible to raise the socialist principle of peace to the level of inter-state relations, and to proclaim it the supreme principle of the Soviet state's foreign policy.

The appearance of the first socialist republic of workers and peasants was, in effect, the first sign of peace that gave hope to all mankind. Yet, it was far from simple for that sign to strengthen and turn into a powerful international force. The young Soviet Republic was in a hostile capitalist encirclement, which did everything it could to strangle it in its cradle.

At the same time, however, the fierce clash between the world's two powerful imperialist groups continued. The struggle for peace and against imperialist World War I became the main objective and major principle of Soviet foreign policy. All this brought before the Bolsheviks the urgent need for taking a correct political stand in questions of war and peace, a stand upon which the very fate of the Soviet Republic actually depended.

Back in 1915, in answering the question of what the Bolshevik Party would do if a revolution placed it in power when the imperialist war was still on,

Lenin formulated the future programme of action as follows: "...we would propose peace to *all* the belligerents on the condition that freedom is given to the colonies and *all* peoples that are dependent, oppressed and deprived of rights."<sup>1</sup> Later, in directly preparing the Party and Russia's proletariat for "breaking through the world imperialist front", i.e. for a socialist revolution, and in weighing the chances of its victory both from the viewpoint of Russia's domestic and international situation, Lenin determined in September 1917 that those chances were real. He wrote: "...the chances are a hundred to one that the Germans will grant us at least an armistice. And to secure an armistice now would in itself mean to win the *whole world*."<sup>2</sup>

This opportunity was fully used in October 1917 by Russia's working class under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution allowed the Soviet government, after a stubborn struggle, to withdraw the country from the bloody imperialist war.

When Russia's working class took the country's fate into its own hands, Lenin's famous Decree on Peace, adopted at the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, was one of the Soviet government's first practical steps. The Decree explicitly proposed that all the warring nations and their governments instantly begin nego-

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 403-404.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, 1977, p. 25.

tiating a just and democratic peace without annexations or indemnities.

The Decree declared further continuation of the imperialist war a major crime against humanity, and proposed that a peace be signed, the terms of which would be just for all the peoples. The Soviet government abandoned methods of secret diplomacy and declared that all secret treaties signed by the Russian tsarist government were to be unconditionally and instantly repealed and published in full. To make the peace talks successful, all the governments and peoples of the warring countries were to conclude an immediate armistice for at least three months.

In proposing its terms for concluding peace, the Soviet government at the same time declared that it did not regard them as an ultimatum and was prepared to consider any other suggestions. Lenin regarded this as being of extreme importance and substantiated his position in the Report on Peace which he delivered at the Second Congress of Soviets as well as in his concluding remarks on the Report.

The Decree ended with an appeal to the conscious workers of the largest warring states to promote the cause of peace and liberation of the working people and the exploited masses from all kinds of oppression and exploitation by means of all-round, resolute and selfless activities.

In establishing the need for such an appeal to the broad masses, Lenin stated in his Report on Peace: "Our appeal must be addressed both to the

governments and to the peoples. We cannot ignore the governments, for that would delay the possibility of concluding peace, and the people's government dare not do that; but we have no right not to appeal to the peoples, and we must therefore help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace."<sup>1</sup>

The fact that the Soviet Republic had simultaneously appealed to the peoples and governments of bourgeois countries showed the realistic Bolshevik assessment of the class forces upon which the decision of questions of war and peace depended, was a politically far-sighted step. Again, the fact that the Soviet government had proclaimed a new foreign policy and new norms and principles of behaviour on the international scene that did not exclude, but on the contrary, assumed broad participation of the popular masses in resolving major foreign policy issues, including questions of war and peace, was of tremendous significance for all subsequent world history.

With the adoption of the Decree on Peace, the whole world became aware of Lenin's clearly formulated and comprehensively-grounded programme for a struggle for peace and of the Soviet Republic's readiness to do everything to implement that programme. By the Decree on Peace and all its subsequent activities, the Bolshevik Party showed that it was faithful to its aims and principles, and that the yearning for peace and the abolition of

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 252.

wars was inherent in socialism as a new social system, and that "an end of wars, peace among the nations, the cessation of pillaging and violence—such is our ideal. . .".<sup>1</sup>

The Bolsheviks who sided with Lenin had to wage a stubborn struggle to implement Lenin's peace programme and overcome the obstinate resistance of those who opposed it inside and outside the country. The governments of most capitalist nations ignored the Soviet appeal for peace and refused to negotiate an armistice. On top of that, they began to prepare an armed intervention against the Soviet state and to instigate a civil war in Russia.

The Soviet government was compelled first to conclude an armistice and then sign the Brest Treaty with Germany. The terms were exceptionally severe, predatory, and humiliating. Lenin, like no one else, understood that the imperialist demands should be accepted if Soviet power in Russia were to be preserved; he realised that the only way to obtain a respite so needed to establish and consolidate the world's first socialist state was to sign a peace with Germany. His conclusions were based on all-round analysis of the positions of the young Soviet Republic both at home and abroad, on careful account of the existing balance of forces. It was impossible to wage a war against a huge and well-equipped army of a big capitalist power like Germany when Russia was seriously dislocated economically, had no modern army, was threatened by

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 293.



internal counter-revolution, and the new Soviet government was not still being established. This was clear to Lenin from the very start, and his sober and flexible approach permitted him to find the only correct solution.

Inside Russia, an acute political struggle on the question of concluding peace with Germany began against all anti-socialist forces and representatives of the overthrown exploiter classes and their accomplices, viz. the Mensheviks and SR's. The latter reckoned that a continuation of the war would lead to a Bolshevik defeat and to downfall of the Soviet government.

The situation was further aggravated by the fact that there was no unity on the question of concluding peace within the Party itself. Trotsky and the "left communists" headed by Bukharin<sup>1</sup> came out against Lenin and launched an acute political struggle inside the Party. Trotsky advanced the slogan: "Neither peace, nor war." When heading the Soviet delegation at the talks in Brest Litovsk, Trotsky, counter to Lenin's instructions and to the Central Committee's resolution not to protract the talks, wrecked them by declaring to the Germans that Soviet Russia would discontinue the war, sign no peace, and disband her army.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nikolai Bukharin (1888-1938), member of the Bolshevik Party since 1906, took a non-Marxist stand on several major issues. After the 1917 October Revolution he was *Pravda's* editor-in-chief, member of the CC Politbureau, and member of the Comintern Executive Committee. He came out repeatedly against the Party's Leninist poli-

Trotsky's treacherous stand and subsequent actions (his willful telegramme from Brest to Supreme Commander N. V. Krylenko, who subsequently issued an order to demobilise the old army) not only wrecked the talks, but also afforded a pretext for a German offensive along the entire front.

Lenin indicated that whereas Russia's proletariat was so far confronted by the weak and the rotten Romanov Dynasty, and also by the Russian bourgeoisie, which was not subtle enough in the class struggle, the Soviet Republic was now faced by world imperialism, an excellently equipped and splendidly organised giant, and Soviet government was therefore in deadly peril.

In failing to understand the actual situation to reckon with the objective balance of class forces and with the need to retain the great gains of the 1917 October Revolution, the "left communists", by taking refuge in bombastic revolutionary phrase, urged for the need to declare a "revolutionary war" on German imperialism, which, they believed, would instigate and hasten a world revolution.

Lenin had to wage an exceptionally severe struggle inside the Party and its Central Committee

---

cies. In 1918 Bukharin headed the anti-Party group of "left communists", who worked against the signing of the Brest Peace; subsequently, he joined Trotsky's group. From 1928, he headed right-wing opposition in the Party. In 1929 Bukharin was expelled from the CC Politbureau, and in 1937 from the Party ranks for his anti-Party activities.

against such adventurous views, which threatened to cause irreparable damage to the cause of the proletariat. He said: "We must fight against the revolutionary phrase, we have to fight it, we absolutely must fight it, so that at some future time people will not say of us the bitter truth that 'a revolutionary phrase about revolutionary war ruined the revolution'."<sup>1</sup> In further developing the idea, Lenin noted that modern warfare was unthinkable without all-round preparation, and said it would require, first of all, to advance the country's economy, restore the railways (for without them modern warfare would also be an absolutely empty phrase), and promote strict revolutionary discipline and self-discipline everywhere.

In demanding an instant declaration of a "revolutionary war" against German imperialism and in calling "defencism" a foul and nasty thing, the "left communists" showed their total misunderstanding of both the historical realities and the principles of revolutionary strategy. Their theoretical delusions and lack of understanding of the dialectics of the class struggle led them to gross practical mistakes. In exposing the social and class roots of these errors and delusions, Lenin came out against the "left communists" with the following severe and blunt criticism: "In your objective role, you are a tool of imperialist provocation. And your subjective 'mentality' is that of a frenzied petty bourgeois who

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1971, p. 29.

swaggers and blusteres but senses perfectly well that the proletarian is *right*. . .”<sup>1</sup>

He had to explain to their supporters in a patient and well-reasoned manner that if a war were waged by an exploiter class to consolidate its supremacy, it would essentially be a criminal war, and “defencism” in such a war was betrayal of socialism. However, if a war is waged by the proletariat, which had overthrown its own bourgeoisie and was fighting to consolidate socialism, then that war would be legitimate and “holy”.

Having severely, but justly and in a principal manner, rebuked the “left communist stand” Lenin charted the subsequent strategy and tactics of the proletariat in a country encircled by imperialist predators: “We are and have been defencists since October 25, 1917, we champion the defence of the fatherland ever since that day. That is because we have shown *by deeds* that we have broken away from imperialism. . . . And because we are in favour of defending the fatherland we demand a *serious* attitude towards the country’s defence potential and preparedness for war.”<sup>2</sup>

The proletariat which had accomplished a socialist revolution in Russia had to abandon the idea of an instant armed clash with superior enemy forces. Lenin pointed out in this connection: “From the point of view of the defence of the fatherland it would be a crime to enter into an armed conflict

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 330.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid*, p. 64.

with an infinitely superior and well-prepared enemy when we obviously have no army. From the point of view of the defence of the fatherland we have to conclude the most harsh, oppressive, brutal, disgraceful peace—not in order to 'capitulate' to imperialism but in order to learn and prepare to fight against imperialism in a serious and effective manner."<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion was to do everything possible to consolidate Soviet power in order to make secure and defend the socialist fatherland through systematic, daily preparation and strengthening of the country's defences; by enhancing discipline and organisation at all levels of economic and social life; and by providing for an upsurge in economic development.

This was the strategy. What about tactics? According to Lenin, the tactics was to wait, to delay an armed clash, to avoid battle and, in case of acute necessity, to retreat, and all this without heeding to bawlers. By winning time through retreat, the young Soviet Republic would make it easier for its ally, the international proletariat, to come to its assistance. Only such tactics would help strengthen the links between one, temporarily isolated detachment of world socialism and its other detachments. . .

The break-down by Trotsky of the peace talks in Brest and his capitulatory stand resulted in a Ger-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

man offensive along the entire front. Lenin called the week from February 18 to 24, 1918 a bitter, vexing, severe, but necessary and useful lesson. In addressing the people in those critical days through *Pravda*, he wrote: "The entire bourgeoisie in Russia is rejoicing and gloating over the arrival of the Germans . . . bourgeois newspapers . . . are licking their lips with delight at the impending overthrow of Soviet power by the Germans."<sup>1</sup>

At a Central Committee meeting urgently convened in the evening of February 18, 1918 and held amidst an extremely tense situation, Lenin made a proposal to immediately contact the German government and agree to make peace. Following an acute debate, Lenin's proposal was for the first time approved by a majority of seven to six votes.

It was difficult to take the decision because some prominent Bolsheviks wholeheartedly devoted to the cause of the working-class, including Felix Dzerzhinsky, could not reconcile themselves to the need to sign a predatory and humiliating peace treaty, whose terms had become even more severe after Trotsky's treacherous action.

At the February 23, 1918 Central Committee meeting convened in connection with the German imperialists' demand to consider within 48 hours their new, even more severe peace terms, the debate on the treaty became exceptionally acute. Lenin said that, in his opinion, "the policy of revolutionary

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 41.

phrases is at an end. If this policy is continued, he will resign both from the government and from the Central Committee. An army is needed for a revolutionary war, and it does not exist. That means the terms must be accepted."<sup>1</sup>

The "left communists" again opposed Lenin's stand. Trotsky was not only against signing peace with the Germans, but submitted his resignation from the post of People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs in view of his disagreement on the issue with Lenin and the Central Committee.

Yakov Sverdlov, Chairman of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, took a firm, irreconcilable, Marxist stand together with Lenin. An appeal written jointly by Lenin and Sverdlov on behalf of the Organisational Bureau of the Party's Central Committee to all Party members explained the Central Committee's stand on the question of a separate and annexationist peace and stated clearly and unambiguously: "By preserving Soviet power we are rendering the best, the most powerful support to the proletariat of all countries in their incredibly hard struggle against their own bourgeoisie. Today the cause of socialism could suffer no heavier blow than the collapse of Soviet power in Russia."<sup>2</sup>

The majority of delegates at the All-Russia Central Executive Committee meeting (February 24,

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 36, 1971, p. 479.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 61.

1918) of the Party Extraordinary Seventh Congress (March 6-8, 1918), and of the Extraordinary Fourth All-Russia Congress of Soviets (March 14-16, 1918) supported Lenin's policy on the question of war and peace. Despite their stubborn resistance, the "left communists" and Trotsky suffered complete defeat at these congresses both ideologically and organisationally.

The peace treaty with Germany was signed in Brest-Litovsk on March 3, 1918 and ratified on March 15, 1918. The Soviet Republic had withdrawn from World War I to get a respite it so needed further to consolidate Soviet power in Russia. This was a triumph of Lenin's policy of peace. It became largely possible because of his firmness, insistence, and highly principled approach. Not only did Lenin ensure the conclusion of the Brest Treaty, so vitally essential to the young Soviet Republic, but he also upheld the Communist Party's and the Soviet state's truly Marxist strategy and tactics on the international scene.

A realistic and flexible internationalist class approach to the problem of war and peace allowed Lenin to find the only correct option when the country was confronted with a complex international situation abroad and an acute political struggle at home.

Lenin's principled policy of peace not only saved the Soviet Republic and the gains of the Socialist Revolution from inevitable military defeat and destruction, but also ensured the necessary conditions for the success of subsequent socialist con-



struction in the USSR. This, in turn, helped create favourable international conditions for socialist revolutions in a number of countries in Europe, Asia and America; for the success of communist, workers', and national liberation movements; and for the cause of world peace.

Thus, the theoretical elaboration of problems of war and peace begun by the founders of Marxism and continued in the new historical era by Lenin helped to solve them correctly in the concrete historical situation after the 1917 October Revolution in Russia. *The struggle for peace became the supreme principle of Soviet foreign policy*, a major task aimed at achieving human progress, resolving national and international problems facing the working class, and attaining its final objectives.

Lenin appreciated highly the significance of the peaceful respite as a factor that would allow to prepare for the defence of the socialist fatherland and consolidate Soviet power; at the same time, he clearly saw that the country could not avoid a new war, and mentioned this two days after the Brest Treaty had been signed.

Lenin reached this conclusion on the basis of a thorough analysis of the alignment of class forces on the international scene, the general trends in world development, and the overall international situation at the time, and his prevision had proved correct. Having just withdrawn from a war against one imperialist bloc, the young Soviet Republic was instantly made to confront the Anglo-French bloc,

and this, as Georgi Chicherin<sup>1</sup> put it, literally left it short of breath.

A deep understanding of the economic and social nature of capitalism and of its aggressive policies, and also the back-stage intrigues of the ruling circles of imperialist states made Lenin think that, in the given situation, peace was a respite for subsequent warfare. It was becoming increasingly evident that both the Anglo-French and German blocs would not hesitate to commit further aggression. In his report to the Party Extraordinary Seventh Congress, Lenin forewarned the Party and the working class that even after having signed the peace treaty "the Germans are grouping their regular army, making ready their railways, to capture Petrograd at the next jump. And this beast can jump very well. He has proved that. He will jump again. There is not a shadow of doubt about that. That is why we must be prepared, we must not brag, but must be able to take advantage of even a single day of respite, because we can take advantage of

---

<sup>1</sup> Georgi V. Chicherin (1872-1936), Soviet statesman and outstanding diplomat. From 1904 to 1917 he lived abroad as Russian émigré; in 1905 he joined the RSDLP. At first Chicherin supported the Mensheviks; during World War I, he was an internationalist; in late 1917 he took the Bolshevik stand and in 1918 joined the Bolshevik Party. Chicherin was a member of the Soviet delegation to Brest during the second stage of the peace talks with Germany. From 1918 to 1930, he was People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs. He headed the Soviet delegations at international conferences in Genoa and Lausanne.

even one day's respite to evacuate Petrograd . . ."<sup>1</sup>

Subsequent events showed these forecasts to have been very well-grounded. In violation of the Brest Peace Treaty German troops continued to gradually advance deep inside Soviet territory to capture the Ukraine, the Baltic Region, Byelorussia, the Crimea, and several other areas.

A quest for ways to defend the gains of the socialist revolution and to fight the imperialist aggression evoked the need to take advantage of the existing inter-imperialist contradictions. Proceeding from the Marxist tenet on the decisive role of economic interests in the policies of exploiter classes, Lenin, among other things, set the task of using this factor to develop economic ties with capitalist countries on the principle of peaceful co-existence.

During World War I all major powers were compelled to fight on several fronts. The struggle was very fierce, and even poison gases were used on a mass scale. At the same time, domestic issues in every warring country were increasingly aggravated.

Analysing the situation in Germany, Lenin underlined the need to take the following into account: "Hoffmann's<sup>2</sup> behavior is determined first by

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 106-107.

<sup>2</sup> Max Hoffmann (1869-1927), a German general and active figure in Germany's militarist reactionary circles. From September 1916, he was Chief of Staff, but actually the Commander-in-Chief of German forces on the Eastern Front.

the need to smash the Soviet Republic; secondly, by the fact that he has to wage war on a number of fronts, and thirdly, by the fact that the revolution in Germany is maturing, is growing, and Hoffmann knows this. He cannot, as some assert, take Petrograd and Moscow this very minute. But he may do so tomorrow, that is quite possible."<sup>1</sup> It was necessary to use literally every day of respite to prepare for the defence of the Soviet Republic.

But how to stop the further advance of German forces? What could a country with virtually no army undertake? And were there any real means to halt the aggression? Lenin believed there were. He believed that, first of all, the Germans were to be made to realise that they could no longer profit by advancing inside Soviet territory. Secondly, the Soviet government would have to do something to interest them economically in establishing peaceful relations with Soviet Russia, moreover Germany's raw materials were extremely exhausted by the long world war and she was in the grip of a famine. Lenin sent a message to Berlin to A. A. Joffe, head of the Soviet delegation there. This is what he wrote: "If the German traders will accept economic advantages, realising that *nothing* is to be got from us by war, for we shall burn *everything*—then your policy will continue to be successful. We can give the Germans raw materials."<sup>2</sup>

This line was supported by a Soviet government

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 44, 1977, p. 98.

decision, under which local executive bodies were to destroy all material values and food resources in the way of the advancing Germans, and to oppose them by all possible means. At the same time, on Lenin's initiative, all measures were taken to establish mutually advantageous economic relations between the two countries. The Soviet side strived strictly to observe the provisions of the peace treaty with Germany. As a result of this only correct course, and despite numerous violations of the treaty by the Germans, the Soviet Republic was able to achieve its main goal, i.e. to stop the war.

The revolution which flared up in November 1918 in Germany provided the needed premises for abrogating the predatory Brest Treaty. On November 13, 1918 the All-Russia Central Executive Committee stated that the treaty forced by Germany upon Soviet Russia had collapsed under the joint blows of the German and Russian proletarian revolutionaries.

On the whole, however, the international situation after the signing of the Brest Treaty continued to be exceptionally tense. Hardly had the Soviet government succeeded in withdrawing the country from a state of war with German imperialism, when the Anglo-French imperialist bloc, the Entente, dealt a no less terrible blow to Soviet Russia. The Anglo-French intervention and the internal counter-revolution supported by the Entente, who supplied the counter-revolutionaries with arms and all necessary hardware put the young Soviet Republic in a mortally dangerous situation.

In less than a week after the signing of the Brest Treaty, on March 9, 1918, US, British and French troops landed in Murmansk. On April 5, the Japanese Army, and also US and British forces, invaded Soviet Russia from Vladivostok.

Almost simultaneously, the Czechoslovak Expeditionary Corps, instigated from abroad, mutinied in Siberia, and on July 6 first the "left" and then also the right-wing SR's undertook armed action against Soviet power in Moscow and some other cities. By the late summer of 1918, three-quarters of the Russian territory was in the hands of internal counter-revolutionaries and the interventionists. Famine reigned everywhere. The socialist revolution entered a period of most severe trials.

Speaking at the Extraordinary Sixth All-Russia Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1918, Lenin stressed: "We have never been in such a dangerous situation as we are now. The imperialists were busy among themselves, but now one group has been wiped out by the Anglo-French-American group, which considers its main task to be the extermination of world Bolshevism and the strangulation of its main centre, the Russian Soviet Republic."<sup>1</sup>

As for the policies of the other group of nations who suffered defeat in World War I, guided by the class interests common to the bourgeoisie of all countries, they "acted, if not in direct agreement with Anglo-French policy, then hoping to do them a service so that they should be magnanimous to

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, 1974, p. 160.

her. The implication was that we are also fulfilling the duties of executioner against the Bolsheviks, your enemies."<sup>1</sup>

In exposing before the working people of the whole world the class nature of the imperialist war against the young workers' and peasants' state, Lenin and his government did their utmost to organise a rebuff to the intervention and to crush the counter-revolution. The Bolsheviks knew well that only a revolution that can defend itself was worth something. At the same time, the Soviet state proposed peace talks to all the Entente powers.

The Soviet peace proposals met no positive response from the imperialist states. Nevertheless, they played their part in helping to expose before all the peoples of the world the aggressive aims of the imperialists, and to break the economic and political blockade of the Soviet Republic. The Soviet peace proposals deprived bourgeois governments of support by their own people and strengthened the belief of the working people of Soviet Russia in the inevitable victory of their just cause.

The further intensification of inter-imperialist contradictions hampered the creation of a united front against the young Soviet Republic. The Bolshevik Party took advantage of this to defend the gains of the revolution. Lenin emphasised: "The main economic factor in the West is that this imperialist war which has tortured and exhausted mankind has given rise to such complicated, such

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid.

acute, such involved conflicts that again and again, at every step, the question of war and peace, the solution of the question to the advantage of one or other grouping, hangs by a thread."<sup>1</sup>

Aggravated to the extreme inter-imperialist contradictions for some time deprived the principal capitalist powers of the possibility to launch a joint offensive against the young Soviet Republic. Lenin pointed out that, thanks to these contradictions, even the class alliance of the imperialists of all countries was beginning to malfunction, to cease to be the motive force of their policies.

In May 1918, in his foreign policy report to a joint meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet, Lenin clearly defined the principal controversies among the major world powers. The first controversy was the extremely acute struggle between Germany and Britain on the Western Front.

Both sides, exerting all their power in the lengthy war, continued to convince their peoples and their allies that yet another small effort would allegedly suffice to defend the "fatherland" and achieve victory and a "just" peace. However, the more protracted the exhaustive struggle became, the deeper it involved the warring state to make the end even more remote. The fierceness of the battle made it extremely difficult to unite the belligerents' efforts against the young Soviet Republic.

The second controversy, essentially affecting Rus-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 366.



sia's international position, was, in Lenin's words, the rivalry between Japan and the United States. Both countries' economic development, he noted, had over several decades accumulated such a heap of combustible material as to make inevitable a desperate clash between them for supremacy over the Pacific and its shores. Lenin reached the conclusion that it was impossible to prevent the impending acute conflict between Japan and America. In fact, the contradictions between the two were instrumental in delaying the drive of Japanese imperialism against Russia, albeit those contradictions were for a time masked by the Japan-US alliance against Germany.

Indeed, events showed that the troop landings in Vladivostok, with which Japan started its intervention in Soviet Russia, were carried out with constant caution for possible American actions. The latent conflict between the US and Japan could develop at any moment into an open armed conflict.

As was already mentioned above, in May 1918 the Soviet side proposed to Germany that talks should be started on establishing mutually advantageous economic relations and the Germans agreed. This allowed the two countries to establish business contacts to help Soviet Russia prolong its respite in the war. After Germany's capitulation in November 1918, the Western powers enforced severe peace terms on her, which had only made Germany establish even more close economic and political ties with Soviet Russia. These relations were politi-

cally and legally secured by the Rapallo Treaty (1922) and some other important agreements.

Lenin noted that the stand taken by Britain and the Entente towards Germany had played a decisive role in the change in German policy. He said that Germany's defeat in the war and the subsequent Versailles Treaty "[made] her existence impossible. Because of that situation it [was] natural for Germany to be prompted towards an alliance with Russia".<sup>1</sup>

The Soviet government recognised as a paramount foreign policy task the need to establish mutually advantageous trade relations with Britain. The initial stage in the talks between the two countries ended in the middle of 1920. Leonid B. Krasin, head of the Soviet delegation, returned to Moscow after conducting talks with the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, and members of his cabinet. He brought with him the British government's memorandum, in which Britain agreed to resume trade relations with Soviet Russia on the basis of mutual renunciation of hostile actions, Soviet compensation of losses to certain categories of foreign subjects, etc. Lenin insisted that the memorandum be instantly examined at a Politbureau meeting and that the British terms be accepted as a foundation for further talks.

The Soviet government also succeeded in taking advantage of US-Japanese contradictions for es-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, 1982, p. 475.

tablishing peace and developing peaceful co-operation. Hardly had it started talks with the United States on granting it lucrative concessions in the Soviet Far East, as the struggle between Japan and America became more acute. As a result, their onslaught on the young Soviet Republic weakened.

The granting of concessions to foreign powers was a forced, yet expedient measure in the situation facing the young Soviet Republic. Marx said that capitalism was ready to do anything in pursuit of profits. Such is its nature, its very essence, and the economic interests of the bourgeoisie in the above case played into the hands of the young Soviet state.

Naturally, the Soviet government carefully weighed all the pros and cons of trade and economic ties with the capitalist world. It was aware of the predatory aspirations of foreign concessioners, and could not allow the country to fall into capitalist bondage. At the same time, however, the Soviet government took into account that economic co-operation with capitalist states would also afford advantages to socialist Russia and would help rehabilitate its war-dislocated economy.

Lenin stressed: "If we want to trade with foreign countries—and we do want to, because we realise its necessity—our chief interest is in obtaining as quickly as possible, from the capitalist countries, the means of production (locomotives, machinery, and electrical equipment) without which we cannot more or less seriously rehabilitate our industry, or perhaps may even be unable to do so at all, be-

cause the machinery needed by our factories cannot be made available."<sup>1</sup>

Yet, the principal aims pursued in that period by the young Soviet Republic were essentially political. Lenin noted that, economically, the question of concessions was a secondary one, and that its whole essence was in the political interest involved.

In the end, the comprehension of the relationship of economic and political factors and constant account for both one's own and the adversary's interests, allowed the Soviet Republic to find opportunities for containing and neutralising the aggressive schemes of the capitalist powers and for strengthening its international positions. This was also promoted by the existence of contradictions between the Entente's major imperialist powers, on the one hand, and small countries like Poland, Finland, Sweden, other Baltic countries, and Asian states, on the other.

On Lenin's initiative and with his active participation, peace proposals were made to the newly formed bourgeois states in the Baltic, and also to Finland. The treaty with Estonia turned into a dress rehearsal of the subsequent agreement with the Entente, into the first experience in breaking the blockade and the first experiment of peaceful co-existence with bourgeois states.

Contemporaries were amazed at the great attention Lenin gave to all the details of the talks, avoiding unnecessary resistance and making significant

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 480.

concessions for the sake of peace, and simultaneously rejecting all exaggerated solicitations by the opposite side. Lenin watched international developments very carefully and maintained perpetual contact with the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs. In attaching major significance to every Soviet step in the East, Lenin took a daily and keen interest in the course of the talks with Turkey and engaged in long conversations with members of the Afghan extraordinary mission and with representatives of other neighbouring states fighting for their freedom and national independence.

As a result of the enormous work done by the Communist Party and Lenin personally, the Soviet state gradually began to establish normal good-neighbour relations with the governments of smaller and dependent countries. This made it possible to weaken and, in the end, break the economic, political and military blockade of the Soviet Republic.

The use by the Soviet Republic of objective trends in international developments required that it master the art of diplomacy. Georgi Chicherin, who was the first People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, noted, among other things, the pertinence of Lenin's idea, advanced during preparation for the Prince Islands Conference, to appeal to the economic advantage that could be drawn by the Entente itself. In its memorandum, dated February 4, 1919, the Soviet side agreed for the first time to recognise tsarist Russia's foreign debts, leaving open the question of how they would be paid.

Subsequently, in the course of the talks with the

participants in the intervention in Russia, specifically at the Genoa Conference (April 1922), this Lenin's idea, as was to be expected, was instantly picked up and further developed by the ruling circles of the Entente countries. The Soviet delegation proposed that the repayment of tsarist Russia's debts, insisted upon by the Entente, should essentially depend on whether or not its member-countries compensate the Soviet Republic for the damage done by the intervention and grant it credits for rehabilitating the devastated economy.

Important advantages were secured in halting the imperialist aggression against the young Soviet Republic by making best use of the economic interests of the ruling classes of capitalists countries and by taking account of the deep contradictions existing between them.

Lenin regarded it exceedingly important to give all-round consideration to these factors not only for resolving problems of war and peace, but also for working out and implementing a correct socialist foreign policy. In fact, the Soviet state did persistently use them on the international scene in its struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

A Marxist analysis and correct perception of the alignment of class forces inside the country and abroad and a correctly determined strategy and flexible tactics, helped Lenin and the Bolshevik Party to lead the Soviet Republic out of a seemingly hopeless situation; to preserve, defend and consolidate Soviet power; and ultimately to win a decisive victory not only over internal counter-revolutiona-

ries, but over numerous foreign enemies, as well.

The Soviet state's correct Leninist national policy was highly conducive to a successful struggle for halting the intervention and establishing peace. In his memoirs, Chicherin recalled: "National Soviet republics were being established in parallel with the German troop withdrawal. This represented initial implementation of Lenin's nationalities' programme, which also seriously affected our adversaries. In fact, the latter began to doubt whether to support a 'united and indivisible' White Guard Russia or to promote counter-revolutionary movements among her small nationalities. This contradiction in the Entente's policy, especially in France's policy, was fatal to our enemies."<sup>1</sup>

The steadfast implementation of Lenin's policy of peace and socialism, a policy aimed at securing national self-determination, and of the ideas of proletarian internationalism, and the active use to these ends of imperialist contradictions, plus the heroic struggle of the working class, of all the Soviet working people, who relied on the support of the international proletariat, were the factors that led to what Lenin called "a historical miracle", namely to the victory of a weak, enfeebled, and backward Soviet Russia over the world's strongest countries. The defeat of internal counter-revolutionaries and the victory over the interventionists made it possible for the Party and the people to concentrate on peaceful socialist construction.

<sup>1</sup> *Reminiscences about V. I. Lenin*, Vol. 3, Politizdat, Moscow, 1979, p. 482 (in Russian).

Yet, these victories did not ensure the Soviet state against new imperialist threats. The menace stemmed from the very existence of imperialism, which had not abandoned its attempts to regain its lost positions, destroy the new social system in Russia, and to re-establish its undivided world supremacy. Imperialism remained a dangerous source of wars. Lenin and the Communist Party taught the working people never to forget the existence of that threat; they forewarned of possible new armed attacks against the socialist state, stressing the need to be highly vigilant and strengthen the country's defence in every possible way.

In foreseeing the imperialist states' policies, Lenin forewarned: "The deeper and more formidable the communist movement grows, the greater will be the number of new attempts to strangle our Republic."<sup>1</sup>

After the Civil War and foreign intervention were over, the international situation became characterised by a certain balance of power between the two social systems. Yet, this balance was rather precarious and could change at any moment. In order not to let the extreme reactionary forces and "military parties" take the upper hand in the political struggle within the capitalist countries, Lenin repeatedly called for great caution, discretion and self-restraint in pursuing the Soviet state's foreign policy. He believed that the first commandment of Soviet foreign policy was "to be on the

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 466.



alert, to remember that we are surrounded by people, classes, governments who openly express the utmost hatred for us. We must remember that we are always a hair's breadth away from invasion."<sup>1</sup>

Like Marx, Lenin was deeply convinced in the inevitable victory of communism all over the world. Theoretically, this question was absolutely clear to him. At the same time, he had no doubts that the imperialist states would go on trying to destroy the Soviet Republic until the historical controversy between the two opposite social systems had been resolved. The threat was real, for the world capitalist system was a hundred times stronger economically and militarily than the newly emerged socialist state, which still lacked the necessary means for curbing the aggressive schemes of imperialism.

The Communist Party based the struggle for peaceful co-existence on Lenin's conclusion that socialism and peace were inseparable. In substantiating this tenet, Lenin said in a lecture called "War and Revolution", which he delivered in May 1917, that our goal was a socialist system that, having eliminated the division of mankind into classes, having eliminated all exploitation of man by man and of one nation by other nations, would inescapably altogether eliminate the possibility of war. Peace is the socialist ideal, Lenin emphasised, thus revealing simultaneously the principal aim of socialist foreign policy and the humanitarian essence of socialism. Lenin's strategy of peace was thus aimed

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 148.

at creating the most favourable external conditions for the victory of socialism and communism, at excluding wars from the life of mankind.

This guideline provided the only reliable and correct reference point for the entire revolutionary struggle of the international working class. Lenin's tenet that peace would open hundred times greater opportunities for socialist influence showed the proletariat the correct direction for waging its class struggle. The awareness that peace and socialism are interconnected increased the magnetic force of socialist ideas and objectives and won over millions of working people.

In a number of his works, Lenin developed the idea that talks on settling controversial issues by the interested parties peacefully should be the principal way of resolving international disputes in order to exclude war.

In continuing the Marxist tradition, Lenin's strategy in the struggle for peace was of realistic and clearly pronounced class nature, having nothing in common with the bourgeois-pacifist abstract stand on this issue. Lenin was far from discounting the peace movement; on the contrary he attached serious significance to it. He repeatedly stated the need not only strictly to distinguish between the pacifist and the reactionary sections of the exploiter classes, but also to try to isolate the pacifist camp of the international bourgeoisie from the grossly bourgeois, aggressively bourgeois and reactionary-bourgeois camp.

Lenin's concept provided the revolutionary pro-

letariat with a clear programme of action in the struggle for peace in lengthy perspective, for the entire period of peaceful co-existence of the two opposite social systems. From Lenin's time to our day, peace talks and political settlement of complex international issues on the basis of mutually-acceptable agreements have become firmly established means of Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on war and peace, which is being developed by the CPSU in the new historical conditions, is today also a reliable instrument in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, the underlying principle of the USSR's and other socialist countries' peaceful foreign policies.

The founders of scientific communism predicted that with the establishment of socialist states, the safeguarding of peace would be a major principle of their foreign policy. War is alien to the very nature of socialism, since in a socialist society there are no classes interested in it. Socialist society does not need to plunder or seize foreign lands. Nor is it interested in exploiting other peoples, for its viability is essentially dependent on the results of labour. Peace fully meets the fundamental interests of the working class, of all the working people. Only a peaceful situation ensures the success of the building of socialism and communism and the fulfilment of the working class' national and international tasks. So not only is the struggle for peace the objective and major task of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, it is also the supreme principle of their foreign policy.

*The Course of Peaceful Co-existence  
and Proletarian Internationalism*

The theory of war and peace, as Lenin developed, was inseparably connected with other major issues of Soviet foreign policy and Party activities on the international scene.

Marx and Engels, who foresaw that states belonging to two opposite social systems would co-exist in the future, examined their possible relationships. In 1845, Engels wrote that a communist society, in which there would be no class antagonisms and in which the interests of all its members would coincide, would have no reason for starting aggressive wars. Since within it there would be no classes interested in an aggressive war, "how could a communist society conceive the idea of undertaking an aggressive war?—this society which is perfectly well aware that in war it will only lose men and capital. . .".<sup>1</sup>

It thus follows that countries belonging to the new, communist system cannot commit aggression. What about defensive wars when a foreign country attacks? Engels believed that this could happen, and maintained that in such situations the new communist state would have "to train every fit member of society, in addition to his other occupations, in real, not barrack-square handling of arms to the degree necessary for the defence of the country".<sup>2</sup> A de-

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, 1975, p. 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*

fensive war would be waged by countries of the new social system only against aggression.

Based on this direction of Marxist thought Lenin, in his comprehensive analysis of social development in the new stage, suggested that because of the non-uniform economic and political development of countries in the era of imperialism, socialism might initially triumph in just one or several countries, with the rest remaining either bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for a certain period of time. The existence of one or several socialist states alongside capitalist countries would be a historically determined objective necessity. Because countries belonging to the two opposite social systems would have to co-exist for a fairly long period of time, they would have to pursue suitable foreign policy and establish and maintain normal economic, diplomatic and other relations, i.e. institute the principle of peaceful co-existence.

Objective history has fully confirmed Lenin's conclusion that socialism could initially triumph in one country. His prevision that there would be a relatively long period in which socialist and capitalist countries would co-exist also proved correct.

Following the victory of the 1917 October Revolution in Russia, the Communist Party had to elaborate a socialist foreign policy. This it did. Already in initial Soviet government statements, beginning with the Decree on Peace, Lenin and the Bolshevik Party not only created the foundation of socialist foreign policy, but, also charted a programme for Soviet state activities internationally. The principles

of the new foreign policy proclaimed by the Bolsheviks—peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems and proletarian internationalism—fundamentally differed from those of the ruling classes in countries with any of the pre-socialist socio-economic structures.

The emergence into the international arena of the world's first socialist state led to a situation when major contradictions in international politics shifted from the inter-imperialist realm to the realm of relations between countries of the two opposing social systems. Lenin pointed out: "Two camps are now quite consciously facing each other all over the world..."<sup>1</sup> The relations between countries belonging to different social systems became the central issue, the axis around which world politics, resolved and determined the essence of international relations. This initiated a qualitatively new stage in world history, in which ways had to be found to resolve the complex and difficult issue of actually peaceful co-existence between socialist and capitalist countries and preventing war between them. The question was how to combine the fight for peace and peaceful co-existence with the class struggle against world bourgeoisie and with providing support for all progressive and revolutionary forces. Lenin clearly understood that peaceful co-existence between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois countries did not imply the abandonment of the class struggle. On the contrary, this struggle not only would continue in

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 450.

all spheres of economics, politics and ideology; it would also become increasingly acute. Lenin wrote: "We never imagined that with the fighting over and the advent of peace, the capitalist wolf would lie down with the socialist lamb."<sup>1</sup>

Initially, the imperialist countries not only rejected peaceful co-existence and refused to grant diplomatic recognition to the world's first state of workers and peasants, but also did their utmost to crush Soviet power. The world capitalist system was far stronger economically and militarily than the young Soviet state; nevertheless the initial situation was that of a temporary balance of forces, albeit very precarious. It was based on the aid and support received by Soviet power from the international working class, which demanded: "Hands off Soviet Russia!". This vivid display of proletarian internationalism was a major factor in preserving Soviet power. As a result, the Soviet state had managed to survive the clash with imperialism.

The working class was then able to use state power to wage a battle in the international political arena. As socialism consolidated, the socialist state and its foreign policy became a factor in international relations which all capitalist powers had to reckon with. This could be seen from the growing diplomatic recognition of the Soviet state, and from the establishment of normal mutually advantageous economic and other inter-state ties with other countries.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 452.

Despite the many forms which relations between the young Soviet Republic and the capitalist countries assumed socially they continued to develop on a class foundation. As Lenin emphasised, "the *forms* of the struggle may and do constantly change in accordance with varying, relatively specific and temporary causes, but the *substance* of the struggle, its class content, positively *cannot* change while classes exist."<sup>1</sup>

Proclaiming peaceful co-existence the main strategic direction of socialist foreign policy towards the capitalist countries, Lenin proved the possibility and necessity of peaceful forms of such co-existence even though the socialist and capitalist socio-economic systems were diametrically opposed and imperialism was essentially aggressive.

Lenin's principles of peaceful co-existence stemmed from the theory of socialist revolution. It was based on the fact that safeguarding and consolidating peace would ensure the most favourable external conditions for building socialism. The working people of the capitalist countries had a vested interest in this, and the further successes of the world revolutionary movement would also depend on whether or not these conditions were created.

These questions, which were crucial to the destiny of socialism, were worked through at the time the Bolsheviks were waging a determined struggle against Trotsky and the "left communists", who rejected the need for peaceful relations with capital-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 253.



ist countries, favoured "revolutionary war" against imperialism and a "permanent revolution", and considered diplomatic relations as such unnecessary.

An acute struggle against these views was launched in 1918 at the Seventh Party Congress. Bukharin proclaimed to the assembly that "there can be no peaceful co-existence between us, i.e. between the Soviet Republic and international capital", so that "the only possible and necessary prospect is war against international capital...".<sup>1</sup> Similar views were also expressed by Trotsky, who stated that "it was inadmissible for a revolutionary class to make deals with imperialists...".<sup>2</sup> Lenin had stubbornly to fight against these adventurous views and the ultra-revolutionary phrase, both of which could destroy the revolution.

Lenin's policy of peaceful co-existence was the reflection of the strategic policy developed on the basis of an analysis of objective factors and tendencies. It took into account the fundamental interests of both the international working class and of the revolutionary movement as a whole, and the interests of its vanguard, the Soviet Republic. The establishment of new economic relations with capitalist countries followed from those interests and that policy.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Extraordinary Seventh Congress of the R.C.P.(B), March 1918*, Verbatim Report, Moscow, 1962, pp. 29, 35 (in Russian).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

Once it had crushed the Entente's "crusade" and counter-revolution at home, the socialist state proved its viability in a capitalist encirclement. In this connection Lenin noted that the Soviet state had achieved things that seemed to be inconceivable both politically and militarily, and it had to do the same both in trade and the economy. He said: "I know of no reason why a socialistic commonwealth like ours cannot do business indefinitely with capitalistic countries."<sup>1</sup>

He proceeded from the fact that there were objective conditions for developing economic relations with capitalist countries, conditions that would play their role in the process. The leader of the young Soviet Republic pointed out: "There is a force more powerful than the wishes, the will and the decisions of any of the governments of classes that are hostile to us. That force is world general economic relations, which compel them to make contact with us."<sup>2</sup> In his struggle against the opposition, Lenin upheld the need to develop extensive economic ties with bourgeois countries, establish a state monopoly of foreign trade, and grant concessions to foreign companies. He noted that in this case, certain concessions to capitalists would be inevitable, and that would entail compromises and even losses. At the same time, Lenin strongly opposed any interference in the Soviet state's internal affairs by countries with which relations had been established.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, 1971, p. 177.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 155.

Despite the economic blockade of the Soviet Republic by the leading capitalist powers, its economic ties steadily developed as the socialist state grew stronger. The Soviet country expanded its mutually beneficial co-operation with several companies, increasing its foreign trade.

Lenin clearly specified the objectives to be attained by developing economic relations with capitalist states. On the one hand, Soviet participation in the international division of labour contributed to the most rapid development possible of the economy, and played a key role in establishing broad international economic ties. On the other hand, economic co-operation placed peaceful co-existence on a material foundation and helped protect and consolidate peace. In turn, the successes of the Soviet policy of peace created major conditions for the ongoing expansion of economic ties.

In charting the policy of the Party and state for furthering economic co-operation with the West, Lenin, in a report on concessions delivered to the RCP(B) group taking part in the Eighth Congress of Soviets (December 1920), drew the attention of the communist delegates to the need to take advantage of the incontestable interest of major capitalist powers in establishing economic relations with the Soviet state. The capitalists sought to make profits, and at the same time to exploit opportunities provided by the Soviet Republic to step up their business, which had slowed down during World War I.

Proceeding from the Marxist postulate that profit is the decisive factor in determining all capitalist ac-

tions, Lenin posed the objective of attracting foreign capital by holding before it prospects of huge profits.

Economic agreements with capitalist countries were advantageous both to Soviet Russia and to the countries involved. They had a positive effect on all international developments, helping to restore the global economic ties destroyed by the war. Lenin emphasised: "By such concessions we shall show a large number of countries that we are able to develop the world economy on a gigantic scale."<sup>1</sup> The Soviet-initiated establishment of economic relations between countries belonging to the two opposite social systems showed working people and all people in the capitalist countries—not only their masters—that "it is possible to rehabilitate the world economy and improve the world's technology if they enter into regular relations with us".<sup>2</sup> This was of key revolutionary significance and of propaganda as well, and raised the prestige of the Soviet state in the eyes of people everywhere, leading to greater support by broad sections of people in capitalist countries.

The establishment and improvement of basically new economic relations with capitalist countries was a solid foundation for implementing the principle of peaceful co-existence.

A key feature of the development of relations between the USSR and capitalist countries was their gradual transformation from purely economic to po-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 482.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 483.

litical. This manifested itself in a "period of recognition", when diplomatic relations between Soviet Republic and several leading capitalist countries were established. Lenin noted that "international imperialism has proved unable to strangle Soviet Russia, although it is far stronger, and has been obliged for the time being to grant her recognition, or semi-recognition, and to conclude trade agreements with her."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, global economic relations were a decisive factor that compelled the imperialists to finally consent to normal diplomatic ties with Soviet Russia, i.e. embark on the path of peaceful co-existence with it. Speaking at the Party's Eleventh Congress in 1922, Lenin said: "The fact of the matter is that the most urgent, pressing and practical interests that have been sharply revealed in all the capitalist countries during the past few years call for the development, regulation and expansion of trade with Russia. Since such interests exist, we may argue, we may quarrel, we may disagree on specific combinations—it is highly probable that we shall have to disagree—this fundamental economic necessity will, nevertheless, after all is said and done, make a way for itself".<sup>2</sup>

Reality has confirmed the correctness of the policy of the Bolshevik Party and Soviet state, that of establishing and developing mutually advantageous economic relations with capitalist countries. The

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, 1973, p. 453.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 265.

principle of peaceful co-existence, largely based on these relations, also convincingly proved the viability of this policy.

*Proletarian internationalism* was the other basic principle of Soviet foreign policy. Lenin revealed its significance for socialist foreign policy and for the world communist movement, showing that proletarian internationalism and reactionary bourgeois nationalism were totally opposite. He elaborated the relationship between the national and international factors in the working-class policy, and explained the role of proletarian internationalism in creating relations of a new type between peoples who freed themselves from the capitalist yoke.

Like the founders of Marxism, Lenin proceeded from the fact that all the national contingents of the international working class had objectively common fundamental interests and aims, which demand that they closely interact, support each other, and be united. Pointing out that the world proletariat had a common class enemy, Lenin concluded: "Capital is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed."<sup>1</sup>

Even on the eve of the 1917 October Revolution, when determining the tasks of the working class, Lenin pointed to the great significance of proletarian internationalism for a successful revolutionary struggle.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

He posed and elaborated the complex and urgent issue of how international common and national interests must stand in relation to each other in the working-class liberation struggle. Lenin saw it: "To be an internationalist Social-Democrat one must *not* think only of one's own nation, but place *above it* the interests of all nations, their common liberty and equality . . . He must fight against small-nation narrow-mindedness, seclusion and isolation, consider the whole and the general, subordinate the particular to the general interests."<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, he warned that to make proletarian internationalism an operative force, the specific features of the many nations and nationalities and their state (economic, political, and other interests) had to be taken into consideration. He said that one cannot achieve a voluntary union of nations and nationalities momentarily; one has to work towards it with the greatest patience and caution so as not to cause distrust, and so as to let people erase the mistrust left by ages of oppression by landlords and capitalists, by the existence of private property and the animosity over its division and redivision.

Preparing for the Second Comintern Congress in 1920, Lenin expressed in his theses the essence of the great principle of the workers' and communist movement in the following way: ". . .proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 347.

be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a world-wide scale, and, second, that a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital".<sup>1</sup>

The birth of the world's first socialist state signified a qualitatively new stage in the world-wide struggle of the working class. The emergence and consolidation of the Soviet state made a tremendous impact on the proletarian movement and the world revolutionary process as a whole.

However, this had nothing to do with attempts to "instigate" or "export" the revolution elsewhere. In arguing with the "left communists" who demanded the launching of world revolution, Lenin convincingly proved that their policy was alien to Marxism and proletarian internationalism.

Changes in the concrete historical situation also produced changes in the forms of struggle against the bourgeoisie. While previously, the proletariat could not agree either to talks or compromise with one group of imperialists at the expense of another, with the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia this became not only possible, but also expedient. This was exactly what those who wallowed in the "left" phrase, who opposed all talks with imperialist circles, could not understand.

Even today, one may encounter people in the revolutionary movement who sometimes fail to under-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.



stand how Soviet leaders can conduct talks and sign agreements with representatives of capitalist classes which are being challenged by left-wing forces inside their own countries. Those who think this way believe that such talks and agreements can cause damage to their revolutionary movements. In this connection, it would be useful to recall what Lenin said in 1918: "A socialist republic surrounded by imperialist powers could not, from this point of view, conclude any economic treaties, and could not exist at all, without flying to the moon."<sup>1</sup>

Assessing the prospects of revolutionary movements elsewhere from the viewpoint of the working-class internationalist tasks—once the socialist revolution had triumphed in Russia—Lenin wrote in 1915 that the victory of the proletariat in Russia would create exceptionally favourable conditions for revolutions both in Asia and Europe. Indeed, the 1917 October Revolution gave an unprecedented impetus to the world liberation movement, and the internationalist foreign policy of the Russian working class subsequent to its triumph was clearly obvious in many of the actions of the young Soviet state. For example, Soviet support for and assistance to the 1919 revolution in Hungary; the granting of independence by Soviet Russia to the peoples of Finland and Poland; and Soviet support for the national liberation movements in Persia, Turkey, Afghanistan, Mongolia, Korea, China, and other countries were all possible because of the emergence of a so-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 71.

cialist state, whose slogan was peace and freedom from national and social oppression.

Lenin aptly formulated the internationalist tasks of the world's first state of workers and peasants in the following way: "Support of the revolutionary movement of the socialist proletariat in the advanced countries in the first instance. . . Support of the democratic and revolutionary movement in all countries in general, and especially in the colonies and dependent countries."<sup>1</sup>

As the revolutionary movement developed in Europe and Asia, the role and significance of proletarian internationalism continued to grow; at the same time, the tasks of the struggle against deviations from and distortions of proletarian internationalism also increased in scope. Lenin wrote that the struggle against these evils would always be urgent and "ever larger with the mounting exigency of the task of converting the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national dictatorship (i.e. existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole)".<sup>2</sup>

Lenin believed that the highest duty of communists of all countries was to wage an implacable struggle against every deviation from or distortion of proletarian internationalism, both in theory and

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 157, 158.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 148.

practice. He pointed out that in countries where workers' parties were the genuine vanguards of the proletariat, the struggle against opportunist and Philistine-pacifist distortions of internationalism was a primary task.

Headed by Lenin, Communist Party and the Soviet state were guided by proletarian internationalism in all their international activities, and they developed and applied that principle as the concrete conditions demanded.

Some Western scholars claim that proletarian internationalism "contradicts" the principle of peaceful co-existence, and say the two are incompatible when it comes to real politics. But in fact, the two have never contradicted one another. The unity of the two great objectives of the working class—the struggle for peace and the struggle for social progress, as well as the fact that the policy of peace and the revolutionary transformation of society on socialist principles are in the innermost and fundamental interests of the working class and all working people—has been demonstrated by all the domestic and foreign policies of the USSR and other socialist countries.

Leninism does not at all suggest that peaceful co-existence is some kind of social status quo. In fact, peaceful co-existence cannot serve as an argument for rejecting the legitimacy of the world liberation movement, the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. Peaceful co-existence does not mean ideological rapprochement with capitalism either.

Socialist foreign policy has always been both a

class and an internationalist policy. It takes into account the interests of the working people, who are vitally interested in both their own social emancipation and the triumph of socialism and communism, and in reliably guaranteeing peace. Lenin noted that it was for that very reason that the overwhelming majority of the world's population approved the Soviet Republic's policy of peace.

Thus, the principles of peaceful co-existence and proletarian internationalism are organically linked; they supplement each other, expressing the revolutionary class, and endemically peaceful and humanitarian essence of socialist foreign policy. In Soviet foreign policy the principles of proletarian internationalism and peaceful co-existence have always been indivisible, and today as well, the CPSU and the Soviet government are applying them creatively, taking current conditions into consideration.

### *Unity of Domestic and Foreign Policies*

In the new historical era, Lenin further developed the Marxist principle of the unity of domestic and foreign policies. He paid great attention to analysing the relation between the socialist state's internal and external functions, to the dependence of foreign policy on domestic policy, and to their interaction. He showed that domestic and foreign policies were dialectically linked and have common roots. In a class society, both domestic and foreign policies manifest the interests of the ruling classes, and are determined essentially by these interests. So

it is impossible to have a situation where a government pursues one policy in domestic affairs, and an absolutely opposite policy in foreign affairs.

Proceeding from the fact that economic reality ultimately determines the policy of any country, the domestic and foreign policies of a country can be correctly evaluated on the basis of exact knowledge of the economic interests of its dominant classes, the interests that are secured in the country's socio-economic system. This recognition of the determining influence of the economy on a country's policies was clearly expressed by Lenin in his well-known formula: "Politics is a concentrated expression of economics."<sup>1</sup>

The principal content of politics as can be seen from the history of all countries is determined by the economic interests prevalent in a given society. As Lenin emphasised: "Politics [has its] own objective logic, irrespective of what persons or parties plan in advance."<sup>2</sup> At the same time, communists have always recognised the key impact of other factors, primarily of various elements of the superstructure, such as ideology, morality, culture, etc., on politics.

Foreign policy reflects the law-governed feature of internal socio-economic development and, correspondingly, expresses the fundamental interests of the dominant classes vis à vis other countries. This explains why the foreign policy of the bourgeois state is that of protecting and consolidating the capi-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, 1969, p. 379.

talist social system, of making superprofits, and of attaining other selfish objectives of big business. It is primarily for their own economic interests that the bourgeoisie and its governments are ready to unleash wars, to colonialise and oppress other nations and to perfidiously run roughshod over democratic norms and principles of international relations. This is simply the manifestation of the class, exploiting character of imperialism.

Bourgeois scholars, politicians and ideologists have always done all they could to conceal the class character of bourgeois foreign policy. They are still trying to deny that domestic and foreign policies are interrelated and to "prove" that each is independent of the other.

Naturally, one can always find examples of a country's foreign policy actions which seem to contradict (and sometimes do contradict) its domestic policy. However, if one takes the basic policies of a given country in general, and not certain specific examples, the fact that domestic and foreign policies are closely linked and mutually conditioned becomes very apparent. In this connection Lenin wrote: "No idea could be more erroneous or harmful than to separate foreign from home policy . . . Yet the bourgeoisie are doing everything possible and impossible to suggest and promote this idea."<sup>1</sup> In upholding the Marxist viewpoint on this question, Lenin pointed out: "It is fundamentally wrong, un-Marxist and unscientific, to single out 'foreign policy' from poli-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 85.

cy in general, let alone counterpose foreign policy to home policy."<sup>1</sup>

In exposing the class essence of bourgeois foreign policy, Lenin made a particular stab at the underhanded role of the mass media which serve big business in concealing this fact. He said: "Popular deception had become a real art in foreign 'affairs', and our revolution suffers very badly from this deception. The poison of deception is spread far and wide by the millions of copies of bourgeois newspapers."<sup>2</sup> This showed especially clearly in the fact that, from the very first days after the 1917 October Revolution in Russia, the mass media in the capitalist countries did all they could to prevent the truth about the Soviet Republic from reaching their working people by distorting its major foreign policy acts and its struggle for peace and social justice.

There is no need for communists and the working class to conceal the aims they pursue in international politics. Naturally, these aims are also of a class character; however, here the desire is not to obtain superprofits, to oppress, exploit or rob other nations, or to seize foreign lands. Once it has won power, the proletariat is primarily concerned with economic growth, with developing society's productive forces, and with ensuring conditions that will allow people to develop as well-rounded, complete individuals. In fact, the Soviet state's international activities are largely subordinated to these objectives. The class

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, 1974, p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 85.

essence of Soviet foreign policy manifests itself in the fact that it firmly upholds democratic principles in international intercourse, equal international co-operation, full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of other countries, and full support for peoples fighting for their freedom and independence.

Lenin's conclusion that "we are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy"<sup>1</sup> is a major strategic principle in the Party's and country's entire domestic and foreign policies and will be so in the long historical perspective.

Lenin believed that with the founding of the Socialist Republic, the global struggle between capitalism and socialism would shift to the economic sphere. To prove that socialism could successfully develop the productive forces would mean that it win once and for all on an international scale. That was why economic development became of exceptional significance for the young Soviet Republic. Economics emerged as a key issue of politics, and this still holds true.

The fact that Soviet domestic and foreign policies were closely interrelated impelled the USSR to direct its active efforts on the international scene to ensuring suitable conditions so that it could build socialism in peace. But domestic policy has continued to be the determining factor: in everything that it does, the CPSU bases itself on Lenin's conclusion

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 437.



that foreign policy tasks cannot be successfully resolved without a correct domestic policy.

At specific periods in Soviet history, the Communist Party and the Soviet government did not devote equal attention to domestic and foreign policy issues. Objective conditions and the concrete situation changed, and because of that either domestic or foreign policy received priority. Times occurred in which foreign policy questions, owing to objective conditions (e.g. a great deterioration of the international situation, renewed attacks by reactionary forces, war, etc.) either came to the forefront or receded to the background (when global tensions eased, or when war stopped, giving the country a "peaceful respite" and a chance to use it to consolidate Soviet power).

During World War I, which had a tremendous impact on the domestic and international situation of all countries and sharply heightened class contradictions in most of them, foreign policy, as Lenin pointed out in April 1917, was brought "to the forefront by objective circumstances".<sup>1</sup> The major imperialist powers had split into two camps to wage a fierce struggle for a redivision of the world; the fate of the upcoming socialist revolution in Russia thus largely depended on the international situation, on the alignment of world forces. Lenin and the Communist Party believed the moment for starting a revolution should be determined not only on the basis

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 58.

of the internal situation in Russia, but also on the international situation.

After the victory of the 1917 October Revolution, Lenin continued to give very close attention to the international situation; he made the point that, from the outset of the Socialist Revolution, the question of foreign policy and international relations was a key issue, not only because imperialism posed a serious threat to the new system in Russia, but also because the young communists and workers' movements elsewhere needed Soviet internationalist aid, and the complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR depended on the support of the international working class. That was why the question of when revolutions would take place in other countries and to what extent it would be possible to keep imperialism at bay until they had occurred became a major issue of the revolution.

For some time, the young Soviet Republic had to quell the attacks of numerous enemies all by itself. Fate had doomed it to a long period of isolation, and, as Lenin bitterly commented, it lived through agonizing times after the Brest Treaty. In fact, there were no signs that the world proletarian revolution which the Bolsheviks had so anticipated would develop to the full. "In these circumstances we could do nothing but direct our foreign policy efforts to enlightening the working people of Western Europe."<sup>1</sup> Not in the sense of raising their general levels of literacy and culture, of course, but by publishing

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, 1974, p. 151.

the secret treaties which the Russian tsar had concluded with the British and French capitalists to the advantage of Russia's capitalists, the same treaties which the Kerensky<sup>1</sup> and Menshevik Provisional Government had kept secret and inviolable. As a result, many people in France, Britain, Germany and the United States learned some extremely important facts about the reasons for the outbreak and continuation of World War I, and about their own diplomatic history. This helped them to understand what was actually happening.

Lenin said: "The exposure of these treaties was a blow to imperialism. The terms of the peace treaty which we were compelled to conclude proved to be a powerful weapon of propaganda and agitation; we did more with them than any other government or nation has done."<sup>2</sup>

As the international situation improved, Lenin gave more and more attention to domestic policy issues. Apart from numerous documents and statements by his contemporaries, this is also evidenced from Chicherin's memoirs: "In 1921 Lenin was con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Kerensky, Alexander F. (1881-1970), a Social-Revolutionary and violent Social-chauvinist. After the 1917 February Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Russia was appointed Minister of Justice, then War and Navy Minister, and then Minister-Chairman of the Bourgeois Provisional Government and Commander-in-Chief. After the October Socialist Revolution he fought against Soviet power; in 1918, Kerensky fled to the United States, where for a long time he was engaged in anti-Soviet propaganda.

<sup>2</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 152.

siderably less involved personally in foreign policy affairs than before, this was fully replaced by collective discussion; besides he also went less into the details."<sup>1</sup>

But as soon as preparations for major foreign policy events started, namely, the Genoa and Lausanne Conferences, where the first talks were held to try and resolve questions of relations between countries of the two opposing social systems, Lenin again focussed his attention on foreign policy issues. Chicherin wrote: "Although Lenin lived most of the winter of 1921/1922 in the Moscow countryside, he still was keenly interested in issues connected with the Genoa Conference. In this connection, he wrote several memoranda, and the general content of our speeches in Genoa was determined by his notes. It was his idea to link the solution of the question of Russian debts with the question of our counterparts in the talks granting us credits."

In concluding his reminiscences, Chicherin goes on to say: "Preparations for the Lausanne Conference went on in the autumn of 1922. Lenin was active in the discussion and adoption of the programme we defended in Lausanne. That was his last major contribution to our foreign policy."<sup>2</sup>

Lenin's contribution to developing the theory of socialist foreign policy, whose founder he is by right, is vast and invaluable.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Reminiscences About V. I. Lenin*, Vol. 1, p. 484.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 484.

For the first time ever, Lenin combined the theory of scientific communism with the practice of state foreign policy, having thus produced the guiding principles and methods which the CPSU and the Soviet state implement on the international scene.

THE CPSU'S FOREIGN POLICY TODAY

*The Realities of the New Era*

The Great October Socialist Revolution was the major event of the 20th century, initiating a new era, the era of transition from capitalism to socialism.

It is to Lenin's credit that he was the first to have analysed and understood the nature of the epoch, and its principal tendencies and distinctive features. This enabled communists to develop a well-grounded realistic strategy and tactics, and to correctly deal with the urgent tasks facing the liberation movement.

Lenin wrote: "We cannot know how rapidly and how successfully the various historical movements in a given epoch will develop, but we can and do know *which class* stands at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch, etc."<sup>1</sup>

As Lenin, leader of the Russian and world proletariat, pointed out, the fact that the international working class had emerged to the centre of the new

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145.

historical epoch was essentially determined by objective factors of social development. Marxism was the first philosophy to have said that its historical mission was to change the world—to create a new social system. After a comprehensive examination of the course and prospects of the working-class movement and of social development as a whole, Lenin concluded that the new historical epoch which had now begun would essentially result in “the abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order.”<sup>1</sup>

This postulate is the foundation of the definition of the current epoch, as given by the world communist movement. The Declaration of the November 1960 Moscow Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties noted: “Our time, whose main content is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution, is a time of struggle between the two opposing social systems, a time of socialist revolutions and national-liberation revolutions, a time of the breakdown of imperialism, of the abolition of the colonial system, a time of transition of more peoples to the socialist path, of the triumph of socialism and communism on a world-wide scale.”<sup>2</sup> The international working class and the world socialist system, its main offspring, are the fundamental core around which our times revolve.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 392.

<sup>2</sup> *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1963, p. 38.

The October Revolution initiated a new stage in the working-class movement. Under its influence, communist and workers' parties emerged in most capitalist countries and today's most powerful political force was formed, viz., the international communist movement. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, created by Lenin, is by right considered by progressive mankind as its advanced detachment.

The international revolutionary movement and the world socialist system went through several stages before reaching their current level. Both had their specific features and signified one further step forward on humanity's path to socialism and communism.

By breaking the weak link of the imperialist chain, namely tsarist Russia, the Russian working class initiated a new historical epoch. The world was divided into two directly opposing social systems. The contradiction between capitalism and socialism became the fundamental controversy of our time. The nature of the class struggle also changed, i.e., it shifted to the international scene as well. An acute struggle began between the two opposing social systems in all areas of social life: economics, politics, ideology, etc.

By decree of history, the USSR spent almost three decades fighting in splendid isolation against the world capitalist system for its right to exist.

In considering the question of building socialism in the USSR, the Communist Party proceeded from both domestic and international conditions. As Le-



nin convincingly showed, as far as domestic conditions were concerned, there was "all that [was] necessary to build a complete socialist society".<sup>1</sup> As far as international conditions were concerned, it was important to change the alignment of world forces in a way that would exclude the possibility of restoring capitalism in the USSR from outside. To do this the revolutionary movement had to attain further successes, and socialism had to triumph in several countries. Only then would the victory of socialism in the USSR also become complete.

As a result of tremendous economic, organisational and political work by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government, the question "who beats whom", as far as domestic conditions were concerned, was completely and irrevocably decided in favour of socialism by the mid-1930s.<sup>2</sup> The 1936 Constitution of the USSR entrenched this fact legislatively.

In World War II, the USSR and the peoples of the other countries of the anti-Hitler coalition inflicted a crushing defeat on the shock forces of world imperialism—Nazi Germany and militarist Japan. This opened broad new opportunities for the beginning of a successful popular struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, and for the further devel-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 468.

<sup>2</sup> *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and CC Plenary Meetings*, Vol. 5, Politizdat, Moscow, 1971, p. 34 (in Russian).

opment of the communist, working-class, and national liberation movements.

Triumphant socialist revolutions in several European and Asian countries created the foundations of the world socialist system. The further consolidation of this system meant that the increased economic, political and military capability of the socialist countries led to fundamental changes in the international alignment of forces in favour of socialism.

After 50 years of existence, the USSR reached the stage of development that Lenin had called developed socialist society.<sup>1</sup> The 25th CPSU Congress (1976) stated that the Soviet Union had built a developed socialist society, while the 26th CPSU Congress (1981) and the subsequent CC plenary meetings elaborated and elucidated the major aspects of the current stage of development, concretised the ways and methods of the all-round improvement of the developed socialist society and set deadlines for realising Soviet long-range programmes. The Soviet socialist state had become a state of the whole people, a state expressing their interests and will. The resulting new historical community—the Soviet people—is founded on the inviolable alliance of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia; the working class plays the leading role in this alliance, which is also based on the friendship between all Soviet nations and nationalities.

The successes achieved by the Soviet Union in building the new society enabled socialism to devel-

---

<sup>1</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 79.

op further on its own foundation, on the basis of new, socialist principles evolved and instituted during the years of Soviet government. This was, in effect, a natural stage in the establishment of the communist formation. Developed socialist society, as established in the USSR, is the highest achievement of social progress.

Other socialist countries have now also begun building developed socialist societies, and the relevant theoretical aspects have been further creatively elaborated in concert by the fraternal parties.

The ongoing development of the world revolutionary process and of the national liberation struggle, and dealing with the tasks involved in the building of socialism and communism in the USSR and other fraternal countries have posed complex problems demanding theoretical comprehension. The need for scientific analysis and generalisation is dictated by the new historical conditions and the profound changes occurring in the world, by the further growth of the anti-imperialist forces, by the new forms and methods of revolutionary struggle, and by relevant new opportunities.

In response to this great need, communist parties are carefully examining the key issues of the world communist movement, and of international development as a whole. International meetings of communist and workers' parties play a major role in this. The 1957, 1960, and 1969 meetings of fraternal communist and workers' parties were outstanding events in the history of the international communist movement, and in the development of Marxist-

Leninist thought. Also of great importance were several regional meetings and forums, such as the 1975 Conference of Latin American and Caribbean Communist Parties in Havana, the 1976 Berlin Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe, the 1980 Meeting of the European Communist and Workers' Parties in Paris, and some major theoretical forums.

The documents of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties are of great significance in understanding the law-governed course of events of current social development. The Meeting pointed out the decisive role of the world socialist system in the current anti-imperialist struggle and stated: "*Imperialism can neither regain its lost historical initiative, nor reverse world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces.*"<sup>1</sup>

The documents adopted by the Meeting provided distinct reference-points for the theoretical and practical activities of communist and workers' parties in different countries, and served as a foundation for their joint actions.

On the basis of those documents, fraternal parties themselves deal with the tasks facing them, taking into account the specific conditions in which they have to work and make their contribution to Marx-

---

<sup>1</sup> *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969*, Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 13.

ist-Leninist theory, and to the fight for the victory of socialism and communism. This is the dialectics of the general and the particular in the world revolutionary process. In this connection Lenin pointed out: "All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."<sup>1</sup>

The CPSU is making a major contribution to the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory and to the practice of revolutionary change.

The history of the Soviet Union and its foreign policy shows that the Communist Party has struggled without respite for the implementation of Marxist-Leninist ideas. During this period, the Party has accumulated a great deal of experience in the guidance of Soviet foreign policy. This experience is of major significance for further actions by the USSR and other socialist countries on the international scene. From Lenin's Decree on Peace to the present, the Communist Party and the Soviet government have been fighting non-stop for peace, freedom and national independence, for the triumph of socialism and communism; and for peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, looking also for new ways to achieve these objectives.

The documents of CPSU congresses and CC ple-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

nary meetings, the resolutions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, fundamental Soviet acts of legislation, and speeches and statements by Party and government leaders reflect the theory and practice of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government. CPSU congresses elaborate and endorse the Soviet Union's foreign policy as applied to all principal aspects of international politics.

In the world of today, now that the tasks and functions of Soviet foreign policy are more extensive and complicated than ever before, not only the fate of the USSR and other socialist countries, but also of the human race as a whole, depend on whether that policy is correctly directed and effectively implemented. The CC CPSU Report to the 25th Party Congress pointed out that today the situation in virtually every spot on the globe is taken into account when Soviet foreign policy is charted. Given this, the June (1983) CC CPSU Plenary Meeting singled out the great importance of ongoing elaboration of key questions of foreign policy and international relations, particularly questions of war and peace.

The results of the scientific elaboration of foreign policy issues and the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist foreign policy are embodied in the foreign policies of the USSR and its friends and allies, specifically in their step to uphold peace, in their fight for disarmament, in their efforts to develop economic relations with capitalist countries, and in their support of national liberation movements. In determining their concrete foreign policies, the CPSU

and the ruling parties of other socialist countries always take as their starting point these principles, which they creatively apply, develop, expand, and revise as demanded by every given historical stage, and each given international situation.

*The Main Objective and Supreme  
Principle of Soviet Foreign Policy*

On the day it made its appearances the Soviet state inscribed the word "Peace" on its banner and made the struggle for peace the objective and highest principle of its foreign policy. When the new communist social system has triumphed worldwide and a classless society established, peace, the dream of the greatest minds throughout the ages, will be the natural situation. Whereas in today's world conditions are emerging for creating a stable foundation for peaceful relations between countries belonging to the two opposing social systems, peace can only be guaranteed through the ultimate triumph of communism everywhere.

Like the other socialist countries, the USSR does not need war because it will bring death and suffering to the working people, and because the building of the new social system requires that the material and spiritual forces of society be concentrated on solving tasks that are possible only when there is peace, i. e. the building of the material and technical base that will provide the abundance of material values and distribution according to people's needs. Another reason why the USSR and the other social-

ist countries do not need war is that two further key objectives of communism—the moulding of just and harmonious relations between people, and the bringing up of a complete and fully rounded individual—can only be attained when there is peace. The aspiration for peace and the striving for the victory of socialism and communism objectively coincide. In fact, the fight for peace and for social progress, the working class' two supreme objectives, as Marx pointed out, show their unity in this.

The commitment of Soviet Communists and all Soviet people to peace also stems from their profound conviction that the transition from capitalism to communism is an objectively determined historical process. This is why they are profoundly optimistic about and sincerely believe in the victory of the new social system.

In the USSR, like in other socialist countries, there are no classes who have a vested interest in war, in expansion, or in attaining their objectives by military means. So it should come as no surprise that their foreign policies are characterised primarily by a peaceful approach to other nations.

But can peace be achieved, given the present conditions of acute struggle between the two opposing social systems? And are there options and possibilities for attaining universal and stable peace?

In 1956, the 20th CPSU Congress replied affirmatively and inferred that war is no longer fatally inevitable, and can and must be prevented. In the new historical epoch, imperialism is still aggressive and still a dangerous source of war, specifically lo-



cal wars; but today it has fewer possibilities, and people can prevent the imperialists from starting a new world war.

Events since the 20th Party Congress have shown that the CPSU's conclusion was correct. The imperialists have not been able to start a new world war because the alignment of forces on the international scene has fundamentally changed in favour of peace and socialism; because the socialist countries have become stronger and more united; and because the peace movement had become more and more active, especially in the capitalist countries themselves.

As was noted at the 22nd CPSU Congress, the fact that a new world war has been averted, that the peoples of the USSR and the other countries have been able to enjoy a peaceful life may be regarded as a chief result of the activities of the CPSU and its Central Committee aimed at strengthening the USSR's defence capability and pursuing the Leninist foreign policy, as a result of the efforts made by the fraternal parties of the socialist countries and of the vigorous activity of the world's peace forces.

The socialist world system is becoming an increasingly reliable shield against imperialist military ventures not only for the people of the socialist countries, but also for the human race as a whole. The growing strength of the USSR and other socialist countries is an important guarantee of world peace. Things are moving in a way that even before socialism ultimately triumphs all over the world, i.e., when capitalist countries still exist in some parts of the

globe, it will really be possible to prevent an outbreak of world war.

It has not been easy to keep peace. Since World War II, the forces of militarism and reaction have time and again imperiled world peace. They continued their attempts to aggravate the international situation and bring the world to the brink of nuclear war. Today, US imperialism is the main threat to peace. In fact, it is preparing the most horrendous crime against humanity—a thermonuclear conflict.

The CPSU Programme adopted by the 22nd Party Congress includes major points on war and peace. It emphasises that the issue of war and peace is the central problem of our time. All efforts by people everywhere should be directed to keep the imperialists in check, not to let them press the deadly nuclear button. The CPSU Programme declared that the main task today is to prevent a thermonuclear war, and that "to abolish war and establish everlasting peace on earth is a historical mission of communism".

The Party Programme also indicates the basic way of ensuring a solid and lasting peace—through universal and complete disarmament under strict international control. It points out that war cannot and should not be a means of settling international disputes, and that if the imperialists nonetheless do unleash a world war, they will themselves be among its victims.

Guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory of just and unjust wars, the CPSU Programme declared

that the Party, and the Soviet people as a whole will oppose all kinds of aggressive wars, including wars between capitalist countries, local wars, and wars against national liberation movements. At the same time, the Programme stated firmly and unequivocally that communists and all Soviet people regard it their duty to support the struggle of oppressed peoples, and their just wars of liberation against imperialism.

Given the danger of aggressive wars, posed by world imperialism which is the class enemy of the Soviet system, the CPSU Programme declares that the defence of the socialist homeland and the further strengthening of the USSR's defences are the sacred duty of the Party and the entire Soviet people, and a key function of the socialist state. It also states that the USSR considers that the need ensuring jointly with other socialist countries the reliable defence and security of the socialist world system is its internationalist duty.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in June 1969 in Moscow was a major event in the history of the communist movement. Its Appeal in Defence of Peace to the world and other documents continued the strong anti-war tradition of the communist movement. The Appeal outlined the common position of seventy-five fraternal parties on world peace, the fundamental question of our time. It called on very broad sections of democratic and peace forces to unite in the fight to prevent a global thermonuclear holocaust.

The CPSU delegation outlined the Soviet com-

munists' stand on the most urgent issues of our time, primarily those of war and peace. It declared that the imperialist powers' adventurous policies, coupled with the fact that they have amassed huge quantities of weapons of mass destruction, make imperialism a perpetual threat to world peace. For this reason the struggle against imperialism is at the same time a struggle to free the human race from the threat of a world nuclear war. In this connection, a major task of communist and workers' parties is to head the popular movement for a lasting peace.

Collective measures against aggression have become an effective way of countering the threat of an imperialist-inspired world war. American imperialism has already experienced this during its aggression in Vietnam (1964-1973). The victory of the Vietnamese people, supported by the USSR and other socialist countries and by the world communist movement, clearly showed that when communist parties act in the same direction and mobilise the people in a determined struggle, imperialist aggression inescapably fails.

In making its views public, the CPSU took into consideration that extremely aggressive circles often influence the foreign policies of the leading imperialist powers, and that their intrigues and provocations have to be exposed and their aggressive schemes firmly thwarted.

At the same time, it also has to be remembered that there is a more moderate capitalist wing, whose representatives have a more sober assessment of the

alignment of world forces and are prepared to seek mutually acceptable solutions of key issues, even though in terms of their class and ideology they are opposed to socialism.

At the meeting in Moscow, some concrete measures were suggested that would end the arms race, establish collective security systems in specific areas of the globe, lead to the dissolution of existing military-political groups, and eventually result in universal and complete disarmament. According to the CPSU, the fact of forcing the imperialists to call a halt to the arms race would undermine the positions of those who would instigate a new world war, would lead to the rechannelling of huge amounts of money into social needs, and consolidate world peace.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow noted that, in our current epoch, three principal forces are waging an implacable struggle against imperialism, which has always been the major obstacle to social progress. These are the socialist world system; the working class of the capitalist countries, i.e. the class around which all their progressive elements revolve; and the national liberation movement. At the same time, the Meeting pointed out that the socialist world system was the decisive factor in the anti-imperialist struggle against nuclear war.

Special attention was given to the fact that the enemies of socialism are still trying to undermine the socialist system in order to restore their own supremacy. In this connection, the Meeting em-

phasised that barring the way to these attempts is an inherent function of the socialist state, which relies on the support of broad masses of the people led by the working class and its communist vanguard. The Meeting proclaimed the following postulate of basic political importance: "The defence of socialism is an internationalist duty of Communists."<sup>1</sup>

The CPSU has been able to achieve good results because it takes into consideration the objectively existing alignment of class forces in the world, so that it can consistently pursue a policy of peaceful co-existence and a foreign policy containing initiatives to ease international tensions. In the early 1970s, this enabled the Soviet Union to conclude several important agreements with the United States and West European countries that helped reinforce security and co-operation.

The 24th CPSU Congress (March-April 1971) came forth with a concrete programme of struggle for peace and international co-operation, for freedom and national independence. Its objective was a turn in international relations, relying on the growing strength, unity and activity of world socialism, and on its growing unity with progressive and peace forces; a turn from the Cold War to peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, and a turn to detente and

---

<sup>1</sup> *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties*, Moscow, 1969, p. 23.

to normal mutually beneficial co-operation in various fields of human endeavour.

Conditions that helped lead to an easing of international tensions were created thanks to the important efforts by the Party and the Soviet people to strengthen the country's economic and defence capability. These conditions led to changes in the alignment of world forces. By the early 1970s, the USSR and the USA had reached an approximate parity in nuclear missiles, a parity that was officially admitted by Richard Nixon, then President of the United States. Leaders of Western countries who saw the situation realistically understood that in this circumstance, given the tremendous destructive force of modern weapons, it would be dangerous to try and resolve key international issues by force or threats to use it.

As the Western press put it, an agonising reassessment of values had begun, leading to a more sober approach to relations with the USSR and other socialist countries. This direction was also largely encouraged by the failures and defeats that imperialism, primarily US imperialism, had suffered on the battlefields of Indochina, and by the successes of the national liberation movement, which speeded up the disintegration of the colonial system. The Suez (1956) and the Caribbean (1962) crises revealed the utter futility of imperialist attempts to halt the inexorable trend of events by force, or to slow down the movement towards social progress and peace.

Several objective and subjective factors were in-

strumental in gradually creating the conditions conducive to changes which could result in detente and reinforce world peace. These changes were particularly noticeable in Europe. The leading West European countries, first France, and then West Germany, reacted positively to Soviet proposals on the development of bilateral co-operation, and by doing so, demonstrated political realism and began to revise their policies towards the USSR and the other socialist countries. The 1970 USSR-West German accord led to a major shift in relations between the two countries. The question of West Berlin's status was resolved, and this also greatly helped to ease tensions in Central Europe.

In the early 1970s, there were improvements in Soviet-American relations. During their summit talks in Moscow, Washington, Vladivostok, and Helsinki, understanding was reached on several vital international and bilateral issues. The results of these talks found reflection in a series of Soviet-American treaties, agreements, and other documents, such as the Basic Principles of Relations Between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America, the nuclear war prevention agreement, and several SALT documents. All these helped create a sound political and legal foundation for the further development of Soviet-American relations on principles of peaceful co-existence, to some extent reduced the danger of world nuclear war, and helped create a more favourable international situation.

The improvement in East-West relations result-



ed in a significantly better situation in Europe, and in subsequent conditions leading to the Soviet-initiated 1975 Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Its participants collectively confirmed the inviolability of the European frontiers and elaborated a code of principles according to which international relations should proceed in accordance with the requirements of peaceful co-existence. This created extremely favourable conditions for maintaining and consolidating peace in Europe.

It was generally admitted that the international atmosphere had begun to change for the better, and was gradually melting the ice of the past Cold War years. This created a favourable climate for the renewal of economic, scientific, technological, and cultural co-operation between countries of the two opposing social systems. Detente became an important policy issue for the CPSU and the Soviet government in their ongoing efforts to further expand peaceful international ties.

In accordance with the Peace Programme adopted by the 24th CPSU Congress, the struggle to end the arms race and for disarmament also became a major foreign policy issue for the CPSU and the Soviet government.

The Peace Programme stipulated the need to make renunciation of force and the threat of force in settling disputes the standard practice of international relations. At the insistence of the USSR, this principle was made a basic postulate of its agreements with many countries, as well as of the

Final Act of the Helsinki Conference. In 1976, the Soviet Union also proposed an international treaty on the non-use of force. The draft document stated that in resolving disputes, future participants, including the nuclear powers, must commit themselves to refrain from using any kind of weapons, including nuclear. The conclusion of a treaty of this kind, in addition to the already existing Non-Proliferation Treaty which has already been signed by over one hundred countries, would do a great deal to alleviate the threat to world peace.

The peace initiatives of the USSR and other socialist countries also did a great deal to stimulate the mass peace movement. This could be seen from important events like the World Peace Congress in Moscow (October 1973), the Brussels Assembly of Public Forces for Security and Co-operation in Europe (June 1972 and April 1975), and the World Congress of Women in Berlin (October 1975).

The Peace Programme adopted by the 24th CPSU Congress (1971) was given its logical continuation by the Programme for Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress (February-March 1976). Summing up the results that had come from the implementation of Soviet foreign policy programme, the 25th Party Congress pointed out that the Communist Party and the Soviet government had done everything they could to ensure that the USSR and other socialist countries could continue their efforts to

build socialism in peace, and to ensure the peace and security of people everywhere. And even though world peace was yet by no means guaranteed, the fact that the international climate was improving showed a stable peace was a very realistic perspective.

The 25th CPSU Congress noted that the entire course of world development and the changes in the balance of forces between the two opposing social systems, which were the result largely of the increasing strength and international prestige of the USSR and the entire socialist community, as well as of the successes of the international workers' and national liberation movements, have led to new realities. Some sections of the ruling circles in capitalist countries found themselves forced to reckon with them, as could be seen from the success of detente. Yet, detente did not come by itself: it took a great deal of effort to make the leaders of capitalist countries understand that their policy of brinkmanship had to change in the direction of talks on controversial issues, and that confrontation had to yield to peaceful co-operation.

The 25th CPSU Congress advanced constructive new measures to protect and consolidate peace, to extend international co-operation, and to ensure the freedom and independence of nations. It stressed the need for supplementing political with military detente, and put forward several concrete proposals, whose implementation could have helped safeguard and strengthen peace, and further extend international detente.

However, events since the 25th Congress showed that the reactionaries, the military-industrial complex and the militarist elements in the imperialist countries have not yielded. In fact, they initiated a wholesale counter offensive against the policy of detente in an attempt to undermine the consolidation of peace and discredit peaceful co-existence. They hoped to retard socio-economic development in the USSR and other socialist countries by forcing them to expend a goodly portion of their resources on their defences. They also hoped to upset the existing balance of forces and regain military supremacy over the socialist countries, as well as make huge profits from the arms race into the bargain. The 26th CPSU Congress subsequently noted that that period was characterised by "an intensive struggle of two lines in world affairs: the line of bridling the arms race, strengthening peace and detente, and defending the sovereign rights and freedom of nations, on the one hand, and, on the other, the line of disrupting detente, escalating the arms race, of threats and interference in other countries' affairs, and of suppressing the liberation struggle".<sup>1</sup>

The arms race that imperialism initiated has confronted the world with the alternative: either peace and peaceful co-existence, or the universal catastrophe of a destructive thermonuclear war.

The USSR is doing everything it can to prevent

---

<sup>1</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, p. 6.

a return to the Cold War, to foil attempts to disrupt detente, and to preserve detente as the prevailing tendency in world development.

The Soviet Union has always forcefully stated that the historical contradiction between socialism and capitalism has to be resolved through peaceful competition, and not on the battlefield. To make this possible, the USSR took steps that would help substantially reduce and eventually eliminate the threat of nuclear war. This would create conditions for resolving many of the important issues confronting the world, and all Soviet initiatives after the 25th CPSU Congress followed in this direction.

On June 29-30, 1976 the Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Europe was held in Berlin. The discussion centred around the vital objectives in the struggle for peace, security, co-operation, and social progress in Europe, and greatly contributed to mobilising Europe's peace forces in attaining them.

The Berlin Meeting pointed out that the struggle for peace was inseparably connected with the struggle for social progress. It emphasised that the main revolutionary forces of our time, along with democratic elements, can prevent world war.

The Meeting took place at a time when peaceful co-existence had become the prevailing direction in international affairs. However, since that time, the enemies of detente became more active; in some capitalist countries, the arms race continued without a lull; hotbeds of war continued to exist.

For that reason, the socialist countries intensified their struggle to end the arms race, to deepen détente, and to create conditions that would ensure that peace would prevail.

In 1976, the Warsaw Treaty countries proposed that all the signatories to the Helsinki Final Act commit themselves not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. The West's initial reply was that this could increase the danger of a conventional war. Subsequently, the socialist countries proposed that all the parties to the Final Act pledge not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons, i.e. that they conclude a non-aggression pact. But the West rejected this initiative as well. In fact, this is not the only instance when the NATO countries shunned, under some pretext or other, making mutual commitments on security guarantees and concrete steps in disarmament.

As in the past, the propaganda clamour over the "Soviet threat" still serves as an excuse for the "free world" to arm itself. The purpose of such campaigns is obviously to justify the continuing arms race, and to compel the taxpayer to loosen his purse strings for the military-industrial corporations, which are the ones that profit from the manufacture of weapons. It should come as no surprise that in their chase after profits the militarists are ready to disregard the fate of millions of people.

Official US figures show that American military spending rates are going up and up. In 1978-1980, the increase was over 13 per cent, and in 1981, when President Reagan was inaugurated, a whop-

ping 19 per cent. In 1983, military spending reached \$216.5 billion, and Washington plans to push the 1985 figure up to \$312 billion. Military expenditures in other NATO countries are also going up steadily.

As for the USSR, contrary to the false claims by bourgeois propaganda, its defence spending in recent years has remained virtually unchanged. Defence appropriations in the 1984 Soviet State Budget were 17.05 billion roubles, or 4.66 per cent of the total budget spending.

The Soviet Union is a peaceful country. Its foreign policy is determined by the nature of Soviet society, whose highest objective, as proclaimed by the 1977 Constitution of the USSR, is to ensure that the Soviet people are provided with a constantly better and more rewarding life. There is no objective that the Soviet state might seek to achieve through war. And there are no countries against whom the USSR has territorial or other claims that could lead to an armed conflict.

In the USSR, the propaganda of war is prohibited by law. The chapter of the Constitution of the USSR on the aims and principles of Soviet foreign policy proclaims that the USSR steadfastly pursues a Leninist policy of peace and stands for strengthening the security of nations and broad international co-operation.

Making the significant improvement of the international situation in the 1970s possible were the active and many-sided activities of the USSR and other socialist countries on the international scene;

these activities were founded on the ongoing growth of the economic and defensive strength of real socialism. As a result of the persistent struggle for peace and detente, increasingly favourable conditions were created that would contribute to resolving international disputes and conflicts in a just and peaceful way. Peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems was reinforced, and began to bear fruit in both the economic and political spheres. The Cold War was obviously subsiding.

But as the 1970s ended and 1980s approached, the international situation became sharply worse. There were many reasons for this, the main one being the mounting political adventurism of the most aggressive imperialist circles, especially those in the United States.

This adventurism, this readiness to risk the human race and its vital interests for their own selfish ends, was the reaction of the extreme right-wing forces of capitalism to the changes which had taken place on the international scene in favour of socialism and social progress.

In May 1978, the NATO countries, after a great deal of pressure from the Carter administration, decided that there would be an automatic increase in their military spending up to the end of this century. Subsequently NATO decided that the USA should manufacture and deploy medium-range nuclear missiles in some West European countries. At about the same time the United States announced a new programme to greatly increase American's



armaments in an attempt to upset the existing East-West balance of forces in its favour.

World reaction, and primarily US imperialism, deliberately began to aggravate and cloud the international situation to try and retard any further positive changes. In an attempt to revive the Cold War, the former US President, Jimmy Carter, and his administration launched a loud campaign to "defend human rights" in the USSR and other socialist countries. Under the pressure from the US military-industrial complex, the White House and Congress torpedoed ratification of the Soviet-American SALT-2 Treaty.

Following this, the enemies of detente used Afghanistan as the pretext for undermining it, when in reality the USSR had assisted Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan government to help the country defend its national sovereignty, freedom and independence against outside armed aggression. The US government breached previous contracts and banned grain deliveries to the USSR, as well as breaking off scientific and cultural ties with it. Why these and other similar actions were taken was obvious. The new wave of anti-Sovietism and anti-communism seen in recent years in the West has become a means of whipping up the arms race and of waging struggle not only against the USSR, the other socialist countries, and the communist movement in general, but also against all forces calling for peace and social progress.

The US administration policy changes could only be regarded as a badly-considered attempt to

use the events in Afghanistan to block international efforts to reduce the danger of war, to consolidate peace, and to curb the arms race—in other words to block what the human race has a vested interest in. The one-sided American measures are serious policy miscalculations, and will boomerang on their architects if not today, then tomorrow.

The Soviet leadership was aware that there would be tides and ebbs in the policy of detente. So, it not only continued efforts to consolidate and develop what had already been achieved, but also intensified them. In the midst of a complex international situation, the Soviet government did not yield to provocations, and was firm and principled in its approach to safeguarding international peace and security.

The Soviet policy of detente and co-operation with all countries was made explicitly clear in the resolutions of the 26th CPSU Congress (February-March 1981). The Congress proposed several important foreign policy initiatives to preserve and strengthen peace. It advanced a broad programme of measures for strengthening confidence among all states, and presented a series of proposals on disarmament and international co-operation. On behalf of Soviet communists and all Soviet people, the Party Congress declared: "*To safeguard peace—no task is more important now on the international plane for our Party, for our people and, for that matter, for all the peoples of the world.*"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 40.

The Soviet Union proposed to all countries that to counterbalance the aggressive policy of reaction, they should work to make the 1980s a decade of renewed success for detente, a decade in which detente would again become the prevailing tendency in world development; a decade in which political detente would be supplemented by military detente. The USSR said it was confident that objective possibilities and socio-political forces did exist which could prevent a new Cold War, could ensure peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems, and prevent a world nuclear conflict.

The 26th CPSU Congress also suggested ways these issues could be dealt with: through talks, especially Soviet-US talks, based on strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security.

At the same time as the CPSU and the Soviet government displayed extensive foreign policy initiatives, they expressed their readiness to examine other proposals as well, and to co-operate with all democratic forces in the search of acceptable forms and ways of joint action in the fight for peace.

Large numbers of people around the world responded favourably to this display of Soviet good will. The futility and danger of a continued arms race and of fomenting international tensions are becoming evident today to more and more people, including leading figures in different political movements.

The existing strategic balance between the two opposing social systems meets the fundamental interests of all people, and is effective in containing

the aggressive aspirations of imperialism. All attempts by imperialism to change this balance in its favour are doomed to failure.

The 26th CPSU Congress underscored the vital significance of the fraternal solidarity and concerted actions by the socialist countries for safeguarding world peace and securing international security. It said that the socialist countries would have to further deepen their co-operation in all fields.

The socialist community plays a key role in the anti-imperialist struggle; it is, in fact, the bastion and guarantor of world peace. The USSR and the other fraternal socialist countries can stand up for themselves and crushingly rebuff any aggression, no matter where it comes from.

In its relations with the capitalist countries, the USSR proceeds from the premise that they should be governed by peaceful co-existence, equality, respect and mutual advantage, and be chiefly aimed at securing world peace and international security, and the right to live—the main right of every individual. *“Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace—that is the clue to the future.”*<sup>1</sup> This is the position of the Communist Party and the Soviet state confirmed by the 26th Congress of the CPSU.

The USSR is doing all it can to implement the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 40.

Peace Programme for the 1980s elaborated by the 26th CPSU Congress. The Programme provides for the reduction world-wide of nuclear and conventional weapons, and the number of land, air, and naval forces. It also provides for measures that would improve the situation in Europe, in the Middle East, and the Far East.

Both political and military steps have been proposed to maintain world peace and prevent nuclear war. In keeping with the Helsinki Final Act, steps were taken to strengthen confidence-building measures in the military sphere on the soil of European countries, including the western areas of the USSR. This first of all implied that all countries concerned should be informed in advance of exercises by ground forces, and that observers from other countries should be invited. The 26th CPSU Congress declared that the USSR had made the proposal substantially to extend the zone where such measures would be applicable. The USSR is prepared to *apply them to the entire European part of the USSR, provided the Western states, too, extend the confidence zone accordingly.*

The Congress also declared that *the Soviet Union would be prepared to hold concrete negotiations on confidence-building measures in the Far East with all interested countries.*

Here the Congress expressed the belief that such confidence-building measures would contribute to progress on disarmament.

On the Persian Gulf area, the USSR said it was prepared to discuss a settlement as an independent

issue. At the same time, it declared that the *USSR did not object to discussing questions related to Afghanistan in connection with security problems involving the Gulf*. In this case, however, only the international aspects of the Afghan problem could be on the agenda, not Afghan domestic affairs.

Limitation and reduction of strategic armaments has become a key issue. The USSR confirmed that it was *prepared immediately to resume talks with the United States, preserving all the positive results achieved so far*, but if both sides accepted the principle of equality and equal security. The USSR would not consent to any agreement giving unilateral advantages to the USA. The Soviet Union also proposed that all the other nuclear powers should join such negotiations at the appropriate time.

The USSR again proclaimed that it was prepared to hold talks on limiting any kind of armaments. The 26th CPSU Congress declared that *the USSR was prepared to reach an agreement on limiting the deployment of the new submarines—the Ohio-type by the USA, and ones by the USSR. It could also agree to banning modernisation of existing and development of new ballistic missiles for these submarines*.

The 26th CPSU Congress also advanced proposals on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe to break out of the current vicious circle when any action by one side instantly results in counter measures by the other.

To do this, the USSR proposed that *agreement be reached right now on a moratorium on the deployment of new medium-range nuclear missiles both by NATO and the USSR, i.e. to freeze both quantitatively and qualitatively their existing levels, including, naturally, US forward-based nuclear missiles in the area.*

This moratorium could enter into force immediately after talks start and remain in force until a permanent treaty is concluded on limiting or, even better, reducing such nuclear missiles in Europe. The USSR proposed that during this period all preparations for deploying additional missiles, including the US land-based Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, be halted.

Taking into consideration how important it is that people everywhere realise the deadly results that a nuclear war would bring, the Soviet side proposed the establishment of *an authoritative international committee, which would show the vital necessity of preventing a nuclear catastrophe.* This initiative has led to the creation of an international committee of scientists from many countries which is doing a great deal to explain to people the possible consequences of a nuclear catastrophe.

A sensible solution of the issues vexing the world is possible; but it demands a far-sighted approach, political will, courage, authority, and influence. This is why the USSR called for *a special session of the UN Security Council with the participation of top leaders of its member-states in order to seek*

*ways of improving the international situation and preventing war. If they so wish, leaders of other countries could also attend this session.*

Current international issues were discussed at the November (1982) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU. The Meeting noted that the process of detente, which began in the 1970s, was not an accident, although some bourgeois public figures might say so. In fact, detente is not a dead issue, and the future belongs to it.

The world cannot permanently accept the arms race and wars. The difficulties and tensions featuring the current international situation can and must be overcome through talks and agreements.

The CPSU has always opposed turning the ideological controversy into confrontation between countries and peoples, into deciding who is right or wrong by force of arms. The fact that social systems are different cannot justify aggressive policies. From the very beginning the USSR has always sought frank and honest co-operation on the basis of equality with all countries. This can be seen in the relations that are developing between the USSR and many countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and America.

In furthering the ideas of the 26th CPSU Congress, the June (1983) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU confirmed that Soviet foreign policy had not changed on the principal issue of our time, the issue of war and peace. The Meeting noted that in recent years the struggle between the two world social systems has intensified to an unprece-



dented degree. Yet any attempt to settle the historical dispute between them by way of military confrontation would be perilous for humankind. The way their relations develop in the future, i.e. in fact, the problem of preserving peace on earth, is and will remain in the foreseeable future a key problem of Soviet foreign policy.

The world situation continues to be extremely tense. Staking on military power and achieving military supremacy, the US ruling circles have made another dangerous step towards a nuclear catastrophe. In late 1983, they began deploying medium-range missiles in Western Europe targeted on the USSR and its allies. As a result, the situation in Europe and the entire world has become even more aggravated. The stationing of new US missiles with nuclear warheads in West Germany, Britain and Italy has made it impossible to continue the talks on limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, the talks which the US administration tried to use as a cover for attaining military superiority through a new spiral in the arms race.

In refusing to reckon with the will of the peoples of Europe and the peace-loving public of all countries, the United States has violated the existing military balance to create an additional nuclear threat to the USSR and its allies. The danger of a nuclear conflict has sharply increased. Since these missiles have been stationed as first-strike weapons, the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty member-countries were compelled to take counter-measures, about which they had warned before-

hand. Thanks to these measures, the nuclear balance is now being restored. This is what the Soviet Defence Minister said in his interview to a TASS correspondent.<sup>1</sup> This time, however, the balance would be at a higher level.

The Soviet leadership has repeatedly warned that a nuclear attack against the USSR and its allies would lead to an inevitable retaliatory strike at the territories of countries where the missiles have been deployed.

Unlike the imperialist states, the Soviet Union does not seek military superiority. As was stressed at the February (1984) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU: "We do not need military superiority, we do not intend to impose our will on others. Yet we will not allow anyone to disrupt the military balance which has been achieved." The Meeting fully confirmed the continuity of the Party line in home and foreign policy, in the struggle for peace.

The immutability of the Soviet stand on all of the major foreign policy issues has always been its characteristic feature. Its foreign policy invariably centres around the struggle for peace, improving international relations, thwarting the danger of a new world war, and developing co-operation and mutual understanding among nations. This was pointed out again at the April (1984) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU, which noted that "the

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Pravda*, May 21, 1984.

CPSU and the Soviet government are making enormous efforts to prevent a nuclear war, to preserve and strengthen peace on earth. We are pursuing a consistent and initiative policy to slacken tensions in world politics, reliably to curb the arms race and ensure the country's security."<sup>1</sup>

These tasks are even more urgent because the ruling circles of the imperialist states, primarily in the United States, continue to mount international tensions and pursue a militaristic course, which poses a serious threat to peace. This course is designed to secure for the United States a dominant position in various parts of the globe without taking into consideration the interests of other peoples.

To achieve this aim, the USA is boosting its military strength to an unprecedented level by producing all types of weapons—conventional, nuclear, chemical and bacteriological—on a scale never seen before, US imperialism is also trying to extend the arms race to outer space. It is creating new springboards, many thousands of kilometers from the United States, for direct armed intervention against other countries that reject Washington's diktat. The result has been a situation when by the mid-1980s global tensions—in Europe, Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Central America—have heightened to a dangerous level.

Other NATO countries, primarily Great Britain, West Germany, France, and Italy, are becoming

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, April 11, 1984.

increasingly enmeshed in the USA's war plans. As well, there are feverish efforts under way to revive Japanese militarism and link it to US imperialism's military-political machine. Even if some people still harboured illusions that US policy might possibly change for the better, events of recent years have utterly dispelled them. Moreover, contrary to President Reagan's high-sounding words that he is dedicated to peace and national self-determination and sovereignty, all countries have come seriously to doubt whether Washington now possesses the brakes to stop it from crossing the boundary that could prove fatal to the entire world, the boundary at which every sane human being must grind to a halt.

The criminal attempts by US imperialism to play with the fate of the world, and its pathological hatred of socialism and the international communist, workers' and national liberation movements, have led to a situation where the nuclear-missile race is threatening the life of humankind, not only because the wild policies of US imperialism may result in catastrophe, but also because technical miscalculation might do so as well.

To illustrate this, there were 151 false nuclear alerts and over 3,700 mistaken signals of a less serious nature recorded as of 1983 in the United States. According to the Western press, in the past 30 years there have been over 100 incidents involving US nuclear weapons all over the world, which might have led to a nuclear explosion. Some of the nuclear bombs and missiles lost in the accidents

have not yet been recovered.<sup>1</sup> In the view of Gene Robert La Rocque, a leading American expert in military and political affairs, the world could well expect very serious nuclear incidents in the near future.

The CPSU believes that international security can be consolidated and world peace safeguarded through curbing the nuclear arms race, reducing the numbers of nuclear-missiles, eliminating foreign military bases, creating nuclear-free zones, taking and strengthening confidence-building measures, and deepening East-West understanding. The world is not doomed to destruction, and the arms race can and must be ended. To do this, the USSR has in recent years presented a series of key foreign policy initiatives on limiting and reducing nuclear weapons, both strategic and medium-range missiles in Europe. The USSR proceeded from the interests of strengthening not only its own security, but also the security of socialist and other countries.

Given below are just some of the main Soviet proposals made in the 1980s on the fundamental issues of limiting the arms race and improving international relations:

(a) to declare the first use of nuclear weapons by any state a grave crime against humanity;

(b) to turn Europe into a nuclear-free zone, free of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons,

---

<sup>1</sup> See *S.Sh.A.: ekonomika, politika, ideologia*, No. 7, 1982, pp. 59-62.

with initially reducing to a substantial degree the number of medium-range nuclear weapons;

(c) to resume talks on strategic nuclear weapons;

(d) to conclude a Treaty on the Prohibition of the Deployment of Weapons of Any Kind in Outer Space;

(e) to create a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe;

(f) to turn the Mediterranean Sea into a zone of stable peace and co-operation;

(g) to further elaborate the principles of relations with the developing countries of Asia and Africa;

(h) to consider ways for settling the Middle-East crisis and convening relevant conference;

(i) to consolidate peace in Asia and to spread confidence-building measures to that continent;

(j) to reduce military activity in the Indian and Pacific Oceans;

(k) to declare unilaterally a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in the European part of the USSR, with the subsequent reduction of a certain number of Soviet medium-range missiles, provided there is no new aggravation of the international situation.

In the wake of these constructive ideas, which were welcomed by peace supporters everywhere, the USSR advanced new far-reaching proposals and initiatives. In 1982, it unilaterally committed itself not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. None of the Western nuclear powers followed suit. In addition, they claimed that the USSR's pledge was sheer prop-

aganda, and that the USSR allegedly reserves the right to use conventional weapons, in which, they claim, it has superiority.

Following that the USSR and its Warsaw Treaty allies proposed in their Political Declaration adopted in Prague on January 5, 1983, that agreement be concluded with NATO on mutual renunciation of the use of all weapons, both nuclear and conventional, i.e. an agreement on the non-use of force. But NATO turned down this proposal as well.

The Warsaw Treaty member-states have taken yet another step. On May 7, 1984, they made a formal proposal for concluding a treaty on the non-use of force in international relations, which was handed to the ambassadors of the NATO countries in Budapest.

The Warsaw Treaty countries proposed to NATO to start consultations on a multilateral basis, meaning that the participants in such consultations could be the signatories to both military-political alliances and also all other interested European states.

In advancing this proposal, the socialist countries proceeded from the premise that in the present-day complex international situation fraught with the danger of a nuclear catastrophe urgent effective measures are needed for lessening distrust and tension among the member-nations of the two military-political alliances, and for consolidating international peace and security. The Warsaw Treaty peace initiative is aimed precisely at this. In making their proposal, the Warsaw Treaty Countries expressed the hope that the governments of the NATO member-states

would examine their initiative constructively and give a positive response.

These constructive proposals and initiatives presented by the USSR and its Warsaw Treaty allies envisage both specific steps on limiting armaments and measures to ensure universal and complete disarmament, including the total prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons.

It was the USSR, not the Western countries, who proposed the most basic of all possible solutions to this problem, i.e. universal and complete disarmament under effective international control. This proposal still holds, although the West has not yet replied.

People around the world are quite familiar with the entire complex of Soviet proposals to curb and reduce nuclear weapons in Europe, which unlike American proposals, envisage a genuine "zero" option that would not allow either of the sides to gain military superiority. If the countries concerned stick to the principle of equality and equal security, there is always room for agreement with the Soviet Union. But the point is that the United States and its NATO allies do not want an agreement, because they still hope to attain military superiority over the USSR and its socialist allies so they can dictate to them at will. But this idea is impracticable. The Soviet Union and its friends will never allow any tipping of the balance of forces; nor will they allow anyone to attain military superiority over them.

The Soviet Union's proposals to prevent the militarisation of outer space and many other of its initia-



tives are also aimed at safeguarding and consolidating peace so that the world will not perish in the flames of a nuclear war. It is not accidental that these proposals of the USSR and other socialist countries meet with increasing support in the UN, where the overwhelming majority of countries have voted in favour of them. Universal support for the fight for peace can also be seen from scope of the anti-missile, anti-war movement around the world. According to public opinion polls taken in October 1983, 75 per cent of all West Germans and Britains opposed deployment of US cruise and Pershing-2 missiles in their countries; in this way, they showed they were against their countries being turned into hostages of the Pentagon's nuclear strategy. And in the United States itself, the peace movement is also growing. This is certainly indicative of the fact that the peace policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state meets the deepest aspirations of all people everywhere.

Today, conscious actions by masses of people are becoming more decisive than ever before. Through determined action the people of the world can prevent nuclear war and safeguard peace, thus ensuring that life on earth will continue.

In the world of today, it is no longer enough simply to want peace and be pacific oneself. Peace has to be fought for. This conclusion made by the CPSU is a call for action against nuclear war, an appeal to fighters for peace everywhere. The Soviet people, along with the people of the socialist countries and all peace forces around the world believe that peace will triumph over war. This profound optimism is

based on the objective laws of social development, which convince people that "reason nevertheless prevails in world history".<sup>1</sup>

### *Principles of Peaceful Co-existence*

What makes Soviet foreign policy so viable and influential is the fact that it is founded basically on the principles of peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems.

From the initial years of Soviet government to the present, these principles have always been the foundation of inter-state relations between socialist and capitalist countries; at the same time, they were a form of class struggle between the two opposing social systems, of historic competition between socialism and capitalism.

Despite all the difficulties, peaceful co-existence is gradually being accepted as the political and legal basis of international relations. An important stage in this process was the Helsinki Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, where the principles of peaceful co-existence gained extensive international recognition, and were proclaimed in the Final Act.

As a totality of norms of inter-state relations, Lenin's principles of peaceful co-existence between states with different social systems were legislatively

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 249.

proclaimed in Article 29 of the 1977 Constitution of the USSR, which reads:

"The USSR's relations with other states are based on observance of the following principles: sovereign equality; mutual renunciation of the use or threat of force; inviolability of frontiers; territorial integrity of states; peaceful settlement of disputes; non-intervention in internal affairs; respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; the equal rights of peoples and their right to decide their own destiny; cooperation among states; and fulfilment in good faith of obligations arising from the generally recognised principles and rules of international law, and from the international treaties signed by the USSR."

These principles have been implemented in the USSR's bilateral and multilateral relations. At the same time, however, the ruling circles of certain imperialist powers, especially the United States, still try to use blackmail and brute force against countries whose policies they do not like.

Today, the health or otherwise of international situation rests largely on Soviet and American policies. The state of relations between the two countries, as well as the great need to quickly settle urgent international issues, make an active dialogue at all levels increasingly imperative. The USSR is prepared for dialogue; now the United States will have to show that it is as well.

But the US administration continues to demand preliminary concessions and changes in Soviet foreign policy. In response, the November (1982) CC CPSU Plenary Meeting stated that the USSR has

nothing to change, since it was not the Soviet government which had imposed sanctions against the United States. Neither did it renounce the treaties and agreements signed with the USA.

The USSR has always pursued a principled and constructive policy in its relations with the USA, and it is through no fault of the USSR that all the positive results achieved in Soviet-American relations in the 1970s have been overturned.

In the early 1980s, US ruling circles began a political, ideological and economic offensive against socialism. Military preparations by the United States and NATO have reached unprecedented heights. The deployment of US medium-range missiles in Europe has been started. Combined with huge US military spending (\$232 billion in 1983), this has led to a new spiral in the arms race, and to a far greater danger of war.

Once it adopted a policy of intensifying its military build-up and heading towards a confrontation with the socialist and newly free countries, Washington began openly to disregard the international agreements it made itself party to in the 1970s.

As part of his policy of heightening tensions, President Reagan has advanced a number of doctrines of nuclear warfare, and has tried to prove that a nuclear war can be won.

Those who think as Mr. Reagan does have been given a convincing reply by scientists. An appeal by the Second Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and the reply to that appeal by the December 1982 National Conference

of Soviet Physicians in Moscow stated that a missile war today would inevitably turn into a global calamity. Having studied the possible consequences of the use of nuclear weapons, physicians have said with full responsibility that nobody would win such a war, since the entire world would be a victim.

Physicians presented new facts on the results of a thorough examination of A-bomb victims in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Those bombings took place almost forty years ago, but their toll continues to rise: radiation has produced a generation with serious genetic disturbances in Japan. One can well imagine the consequences of a nuclear war today, given that, in early 1983, there were nearly a million bombs similar to that which destroyed Hiroshima stockpiled around the world.

The doctors warned that modern medicine would be unable to help millions of the victims of a nuclear war. A nuclear war would be a great tragedy, which could destroy not only human civilisation, but also all life on earth. The participants in the conference declared that those who claim that this would not be so, those who count on the fact that mankind could survive nuclear war, are sowing deceit, either out of incompetence or irresponsibility.

In endorsing the Declaration on the Prevention of a Nuclear Catastrophe adopted by the 36th Session of the UN General Assembly in 1981, and which declared the first use of nuclear weapons a grave crime against humanity, the physicians stated: *nuclear war must be outlawed, and nuclear weapons destroyed before they destroy the world!*

Scientists and political and public figures everywhere have also generally criticized the doctrine of a "limited" or "local" nuclear war that one can frequently hear from NATO representatives. Today, it is increasingly clear that the very logic of a modern nuclear conflict will inescapably topple all the calculations of Western strategists on the possibility that such a conflict can be confined.

The Soviet position was clearly stated in party and government documents on the 60th Anniversary of the USSR. They stated that one can frequently hear arguments from US government officials about the possibility of a "limited", "protracted" and other kinds of nuclear war, arguments designed not only to ease people's fears, but also to acclimatize them to the idea that nuclear war is acceptable. But it is impossible not to see that, no matter how and where a nuclear conflict would erupt, it would inevitably become uncontrollable and result in a universal holocaust.

The Soviet stand on this question is perfectly clear: no nuclear war should be allowed, neither small nor big, neither limited nor total. The most important thing now is to stop the instigators of a new war. The vital interests of all peoples demand this.

The aggressive foreign policy of the US ruling circles—that of undermining peaceful co-existence, preparing for a new world war, accelerating the nuclear arms race, and increasing military confrontation—has been strongly condemned by millions of people who desire peace. American steps against

the USSR and other socialist and newly liberated countries in the economic realm are equally the target of severe criticism.

In response to attempts by policy-makers of the major imperialist power, the United States, to upset the current balance of forces in their favour, the November (1982) CC CPSU Plenary Meeting declared that in talks with the United States and other Western countries, the Soviet Union has always emphasized the search for a basis equally acceptable to all sides. This concerns the solution of the most complex issues, principally those involved in curbing the arms race, both nuclear and conventional. On the other hand, the Meeting pointed out that no one should expect unilateral Soviet disarmament, as the USSR is not that naïve. At the same time the Soviet Union does not demand that the West unilaterally disarm. It only wants equality, it wants the interests of both sides taken into account, it wants honest agreement, and is prepared for all this.

The USSR and the fraternal socialist countries base their relations with countries of other social systems on the understanding that peaceful co-existence is an objective necessity, largely determined by economic, political, and social factors, and by the necessity of resolving urgent issues in the interests of the entire human race.

Among the economic factors are the deepening of the international division of labour and the resulting constant expansion of economic ties between all countries. The fact that countries are not equal-

ly rich in raw materials and manpower, and have different natural and climatic conditions, also objectively leads to the development of economic ties, and increased trade.

The need to expand relations in science and technology is dictated by the requirements of scientific and technological progress. The development of tourism, sports, cultural and other ties is also instrumental in consolidating the objective foundation of the policy of peaceful co-existence.

There can be no normal economic, scientific, technological, and cultural ties without proper political relations. No wonder Lenin determined politics as the concentrated manifestation of economics. For this reason, the establishment and development of broad political ties between countries with different social systems has become quite a natural factor in international life. This is seen in the USSR's relations with many countries, principally Finland, Austria, and India. These relations feature stability, mutually advantageous equitable co-operation, mutual respect, trust, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The USSR has permanent contacts with those countries, including top level contacts, during which a wide range of problems of mutual interest are discussed, treaties and agreements covering a broad spectrum of questions are signed.

The change in the balance of world forces in favour of socialism has helped consolidate the policy of peaceful co-existence. And the threat of a world thermonuclear war has left the ruling classes of the



imperialist powers with no plausible alternative. In this connection the February (1984) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU pointed out: "Great Lenin bequeathed to us the principle of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems. We are invariably loyal to this principle. Nowadays, in the age of nuclear weapons and super-accurate missiles, the peoples need it as never before. Regrettably, some leaders of capitalist countries, to all appearance, do not clearly realise, or do not wish to realise this."

Finally, there are many global problems that will only be solved when all countries attend to them together. These include environmental conservation; exploration of the World Ocean; space research; the rational use and protection of natural resources; and problems relating to population, food, health, etc.

The Political Declaration of the Warsaw Treaty Member-States adopted in Prague on January 5, 1983 proclaims: "At the end of the 20th century, mankind has come to face acute global problems of socio-economic, demographic, and ecological nature. The present-day level of the productive forces, science and technology in the world provides the necessary material and intellectual resources in order to undertake the practical solution of these immense problems. Yet, the reactionary forces pursuing a policy aimed at keeping whole continents backward, at alienating and opposing some states to others hamper the development of such international co-operation."

Within the ruling circles of the imperialist powers, different trends have always contended. This reflects the deepest contradiction of the capitalist system which is becoming particularly acute at turning points of history, when imperialism experiences setbacks because of the revolutionary processes occurring in the world, and as a consequence of the general crisis of capitalism. It happened when Russia began its transition from capitalism to socialism, when socialism had fully triumphed in the USSR; and during the emergence and consolidation of the world socialist system. The back-and-forth internal struggle within the ruling elite of the capitalist countries can also be seen today, when capitalism has forever lost its historical initiative, when the balance of forces has changed in favour of socialism, and when the advance of the human race is no longer determined by capitalism, but by the world socialist system and all contemporary revolutionary forces.

Certain groups within the ruling elite of the imperialist powers have to some degree recognized these fundamental characteristics of our era; that is why they pursue a more realistic foreign policy.

At the same time, the further development of peaceful co-operation between countries of the two opposing social systems is being retarded by counter-actions from the most aggressive right-wing forces of the bourgeois political parties and by the military-industrial complex. This is particularly so in the United States, where right-wing reactionary

circles are able to put a great deal of pressure on the official policies of the NATO governments.

The all-pervasive anti-Sovietism and anti-communism of the foreign policies of some Western countries is simply the manifestation of a class position, of the capitalist class's fear of losing its privileges. Blinded by class hatred, those who take this position indiscriminately reject everything the USSR and other socialist countries propose to preserve and consolidate peaceful co-existence. This position which reactionary imperialist forces uphold is a prime cause of international tension.

There can be no doubt that sooner or later, reality will compel the ruling classes of the capitalist countries to recognise that today there is no basis for relations between states with different socio-political systems other than peaceful co-existence.

But many Western politicians and statesmen who have been hardened to thinking in the Cold War mould and to discussing issues from a position of strength, cannot break out of this pattern. Until recently, a search has gone on for an "alternative course" which would allow the West to regain world supremacy once it achieves military superiority over the socialist countries and retards their onward march. This was in fact an attempt to legalise military-political confrontation as a "regulator" of international developments.

Throwing all camouflage aside, the Reagan administration has publicly proclaimed a "crusade" against communism, started preparations for a nuclear-missile war and intensified pressure on the

socialist countries to heighten confrontation to the limits.

Suffice it to recall the tragic incident of the South Korean Boeing 747, which flagrantly violated Soviet air space in September 1983. The flight was used for intelligence-gathering, and was planned long in advance in Washington. The Reagan administration capitalized on resultant provocative clamour to put flagrant pressure on the USSR and impose new "sanctions" against it, as well as to whip up tension that would give it the green light to intensify the arms race. Because of irresponsible actions by the USA and refusal by the White House to provide the necessary security guarantees, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, who headed the USSR delegation, could not attend the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly.

A similar situation had developed by the summer of 1984 in connection with preparations for the 23rd Olympic Games in Los Angeles, where an anti-Soviet, anti-socialist campaign of threats and slander was unleashed with direct support by US authorities. This was unprecedented in the history of the Olympic movement and made it impossible for a number of socialist and developing countries to take part in the Games. The White House planned to use the Olympiad for shameless political propaganda, but suffered yet another defeat and exposed itself in the eyes of the broad world public.

Attempts by aggressive forces to revive the Cold War could be extremely dangerous to peace and progress, as they create the threat of nuclear war.

This makes it impossible to take advantage of the favourable opportunities for attacking issues common to all, and hampers the development of international co-operation and the solution of the many problems in the relations between socialist and capitalist countries.

By refusing to pursue a policy of peaceful co-existence, the capitalist countries have also worsened the situation in the developing countries, which have no interest in seeing the international situation becoming cloudier, or in curtailing mutually advantageous economic relations.

The aggressive hopes of the ruling classes of the United States and other NATO countries are worsening the situation in the capitalist countries themselves. The US militarist policy is accompanied by a steep rise in military spendings, and this greatly aggravates all the economic and social contradictions of capitalism. But this policy has no future.

Confrontation with socialism, the arms race, and aggressive wars will never bring capitalism the results it desires. Ultimately, the policy of blocking the normal development of relations between the socialist and capitalist countries will backfire on the capitalist system itself, and sharply heighten its own inner contradictions.

In a world divided into socio-political systems, no social status quo is possible. This can be increasingly seen from the collapse of the fascist regimes in Portugal and Nicaragua, and of the military dictatorships in Greece and Bolivia; from the success-

ful completion of the long liberation struggle of the peoples of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea; and from the victories of the national liberation movements in Angola and Ethiopia. The struggle against apartheid in South Africa and Namibia, and against the vicious dictatorships in Central and South America, the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine against the Israeli invaders, and the liberation struggle of the other peoples of the world, are all certain to go on till complete victory is achieved, no matter what foreign policy is chosen by the ruling imperialist circles. It is also evident that normalisation of relations between states of the two opposing systems on the basis of peaceful co-existence can lead neither to a "freeze" in national liberation movements nor to a cessation of the class struggle, nor to the abandonment of the struggle for democracy and social liberation. Given that objective conditions for class and national liberation struggle exist, the communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries are against the export of either revolution or counter-revolution.

To distort the true picture and conceal the real causes of mass discontent with the existing political system attempts are being made to shift responsibility onto the shoulders of the socialist countries for the aggravation of the political situation in certain countries, for the intensified class and social battles of the working people, and for national liberation struggle. The current volatile social situations in various corners of the capitalist world are the result of militarist policies.

The capitalist countries' mounting economic difficulties are also largely a result of the militarist policies of the US and its NATO allies. Three major economic recessions hit the West one after another in the 1970s and early 1980s. Unproductive spending by certain countries of tremendous national wealth on an unrestrained arms race led their economies into crisis. The drop in industrial production, inflation, rising unemployment, the worsening of the economic position of huge numbers of the working people, the aggravation of all social contradictions, the crisis of the monetary and financial system, and the energy, raw materials, ecological crises, and many other issues are all part of one big web.

In the United States, the accession to office of the Reagan administration, the most reactionary US administration since the end of World War II, representing the extreme right-wing, adventurous and aggressive sector of the US monopoly bourgeoisie and financial oligarchy, was marked by a policy of increased confrontation with socialist countries, aimed at suppressing national liberation movements and at the unprecedentedly large and rapid militarisation of the United States. This policy and its closely linked economic programme, which the American media christened "Reaganomics" resulted in a major industrial recession and a decline in living standards of broad sections of America's working people. The economic crisis in the United States produced a socio-economic recession in the entire capitalist world. Western Europe,

Japan, and other capitalist states were also hit by the most serious economic crisis since the 1930s.

According to official statistics, US industrial output in 1982 alone decreased by 8.2 per cent. By 1983, the load of American production facilities decreased to 67.8 per cent. The Federal budget deficit in 1983 was \$195 billion and, by some estimates, should in the very near future exceed \$200 billion. The US debt in 1984 amounted to \$1500 billion.

Unemployment has reached record heights. According to official statistics, there were 9.5 million people out of work in 1981, and 12 million in 1982-1983 or 11 per cent of the total labour force. But according to trade union estimates the total number of unemployed, including those working part-time or temporarily, and those who have not registered because they have given up hope of ever finding work, was really about 20 million. This is the highest unemployment level since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Now, if one were to take into consideration that 32 million Americans (14 per cent of the total population) live below the official poverty line, the picture is even more depressing.

The tragic implications of unemployment in the USA are highlighted by figures produced by the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations of the University of Michigan. For every per cent of newly unemployed there are 4,673 patients in psychiatric hospitals, 5,832 new prison inmates, and 33,836 deaths, and no demagogic talk about



“human rights”, “freedom” and “democracy”, which bright boys in Washington love to use to conceal the flaws in the American socio-economic system, can hide these facts from the public.

The climate of universal fear and insecurity created by mass unemployment makes it easier for big business to get workers to agree to wage freezes, shorter paid vacations and the scrapping of cost of living allowances. Mass unemployment and the huge reserve labour force allows the monopolies to attack other key rights of the working class as well, compelling some groups of workers to engage in class collaboration. In return, the workers are promised “profit-sharing” schemes, a say in “management”, through “quality of work” programmes, and are also guaranteed that they will be informed well in advance if the company decides to close down the enterprise.

The results of the Reagan administration's anti-labour policy are well-known. Average real wages in the United States in 1982 were 15 per cent lower than in 1978—an unprecedented drop for the USA. Many people can no longer afford the high rents. According to *The New York Times*, in early 1983 2.5 million Americans were homeless. Constantly rising prices are increasingly affecting the working people. Between 1979 and 1981, inflation ran into a two-digit figure; it is, in fact, the main factor in reducing real wages, as well as a way American corporations can reap super-profits even at a time when business activity drops off.

The exploitation of the work force is growing at a rapid rate. Federal social spending cuts have further undermined American working people's living standards. According to 1982 statistics, these cuts amounted to \$40 billion, and affected key areas like housing, medical care, education, unemployment insurance, welfare, professional training, school lunches, municipal services, etc.

Meanwhile, the Reagan administration plans to spend an average \$500 billion annually on military needs by the mid-1980s—five times more than in 1978. In 1981-1983 the Pentagon was allocated \$640 billion, whereas from 1984 to 1988 it will get, according to the US General Accounting Office, over \$2,000 billion.

The tax burden, which the US government is increasingly shifting to the working people, is growing. According to R. Egger, Director of the Internal Revenue Service, American business pocketed \$87 billion in 1981 alone through tax breaks not counting the even greater amounts they have been swindling through legal loopholes. And new US tax laws significantly reduce corporation taxes and taxes on the rich.

More and more Americans are beginning to understand that cuts in social spendings and increases in arms expenditures are related; as a result, the anti-war movement is growing.

Under pressure from their members, even the conservative ALF-CIO leaders, who almost always back the policies of the US ruling circles all the way, are beginning to criticise the government's

economic policy. The ALF-CIO Executive Committee favours ratifying the SALT-2 Treaty, notwithstanding the anti-Soviet position of its President Joseph Lane Kirkland, who supports the Administration's policy of accelerating the arms race.

The results of special opinion polls in the United States show that more and more Americans strongly favour the idea of a freeze on Soviet and American nuclear weapons and oppose American intervention in El Salvador and Nicaragua.

Contrary to the genuine interests of the United States itself and the other NATO members, the Reagan administration took great pains to sharply aggravate the international situation and worsen American relations with the USSR and other socialist countries. The White House initiated a real economic war: in addition to the long list of items previously banned for export to the socialist countries, Washington imposed restrictions on the sale of many industrial products and raw materials under the pretext that they may have military value. The Reagan administration unilaterally broke off air communications between the two countries, and has significantly cut Soviet-American business, scientific, and cultural contacts. By 1983, the policy of "sanctions" and economic embargoes against the USSR, which were initiated by former President Jimmy Carter, had reduced trade between the two countries to the 1976 level.

The Reagan administration's attempts to torpedo the East-West gas pipeline deal, the biggest in the history of East-West economic relations, under

which gas would flow from Western Siberia to Europe in exchange for pipes, caused discontent around the world. Hoping to deal a blow to the Soviet economy and simultaneously to undermine the competitiveness of its allies, the United States put flagrant pressure on its West European NATO partners to try and explode the "deal of the century".

The outcome of this is well known. American foreign policy suffered a major defeat. The Reagan administration was forced to lift the ban on the deliveries of gas equipment to the USSR by American subsidiaries abroad and by foreign companies manufacturing equipment on US licenses. The gas pipeline went into operation ahead of schedule, after having been built in record time.

The Austrian newspaper *Arbeiter-Zeitung* made the very apt comment that bitter disappointment awaits those who dream of bringing the Soviet Union to its knees economically. In the United States itself, *The Christian Science Monitor* justly noted that exports to the socialist world are a source of major deals and thousands of jobs for Western Europe at a time when unemployment is extremely high. The US Secretary of Commerce, Malcolm Baldrige, calculated that American business lost \$2.2 billion as a result of these sanctions. This was not the only loss either. The American sanctions did far more political and moral damage to the United States itself. Attempts by the Reagan administration to impose new trade restrictions against the USSR were not taken very kindly by the USA's

West European allies. Even London, which usually obediently follows Washington's policies, remained deaf to US appeals. According to *The Times*, top figures in the Tory Cabinet stoutly opposed any steps which might lead to a trade war with Moscow.

On top of that, the 12th Meeting to the Soviet-British Inter-Governmental Commission in the Fields of Applied Science, Technology, Trade and Economic Relations (Moscow, May 21-23, 1984) noted that in 1983 the bilateral commodity turnover increased by 16-18 per cent. During the Meeting a five-year general co-operation agreement was signed between Soviet foreign trade organisations and British representatives.<sup>1</sup>

Not only West European countries, but also many people in the American business community are looking for business in the USSR and other socialist countries. In November 1982, the seventh session of the US-USSR Trade and Economic Council in Moscow drew over 250 representatives of American business, including such leading companies like Occidental Petroleum, PepsiCo Inc., Dresser Industries, Armco Steel Corp., Allis Chalmers Mfg. Co., Food Machinery Corp., Dow Chemical Company, and dozens of medium-size and small companies that play an important role in the American economy.

At official sessions and informal meetings, Soviet

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Pravda*, May 24, 1984.

trade representatives and American business people discussed the future of Soviet-American commercial and economic relations, possibilities for co-operation, and new contracts.

William Verity, Council Co-Chairman and Chairman of the Board of the Armco Steel Corporation, said when assessing the present prospects and future of Soviet-American economic relations, that the Council was a result of detente, when the years of the Cold War had been placed behind us and Soviet-American trade began to grow. He said that this reflected the obvious fact that the two great powers were objectively interested in economic ties, that the vast Soviet market was of great interest to Americans, as was the American market for the Soviet Union. The only result of trade sanctions imposed by the United States, he said, was that many Soviet orders slipped from the hands of American business to other Western countries, and that American companies were also hit hard by the fact that their not carrying out their commitments had created the impression that they were unreliable. It is going to take years, he said, to restore their reputation. Verity expressed the hope that now, despite the difficulties, things will again start moving forward. We should not forget, he said, that trade is not only profitable, it is also a bridge to more constructive and friendlier relations between nations.

Many American business people echo this view. This convincingly shows that normalisation of Soviet-American relations, especially economic rela-

tions, peaceful co-existence and detente are in the interests of the people of both countries, and there are no other reasonable alternatives. Besides, many Americans, the business community included, have a vested interest in this.

Armand Hammer, Chairman of the Board of the Occidental Petroleum Company, who has done business with the USSR since 1921, and many other American businessmen, have made this point time and again. According to a 1983 public opinion poll conducted jointly by Louis Harris and *Business Week*, both of which speak for US business circles, most of the 1,200 executives of major American corporations favour expanding trade with the USSR on a mutually advantageous basis and condemn the Reagan administration's discriminatory measures. Sixty-eight per cent of those questioned said that development of trade with the USSR was the best way to consolidate peace. Two-thirds believed that if the Reagan administration continued to interfere in Soviet-American trade, this would lead to greater confrontation between the two countries. Many American business people evidently do not agree with Reagan's trade and economic policy, which seeks to make trade an instrument of political pressure.

Speaking at the April (1985) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU, Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: "Everybody knows of our willingness to improve relations with the United States as well to our mutual advantage, with no attempt to intringe the legitimate rights and interests

of each other. No confrontation between our two countries is absolutely inevitable. If we analyse the positive and the negative experience accumulated in the history of Soviet-American relations, both distant and recent, we must say that the most reasonable thing to do is to look for ways to rectify relations, to build a bridge of cooperation, and do that from both sides."<sup>1</sup>

Normal and mutually advantageous relations on an equitable basis are in the basic interests of the people of both socialist and capitalist countries, particularly at a time when the West has been hit very hard by another economic crisis. In 1982, the industrial production in the developed capitalist countries was lower than in the previous year. Exports dropped by over 5 per cent. In West Germany, industry operated at only 77 per cent of capacity, and industrial production fell by 1-2 per cent. British, French and Japanese industry was in a state of stagnation.

To overcome the crisis, the West European countries are planning to eliminate entire sectors of industry. For example, the EEC Commission has demanded that by 1985 all its member-countries cut steel production by a third (i.e. by a total of 33-39 million tons). This means closing down at least twenty big steel plants and the loss of tens of thousands of jobs.

In 1982, production fell considerably in Japan's automobile and ship-building industries, while other

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, April 24, 1985.



industries, such as non-ferrous metallurgy, petroleum refining, pulp and paper, and chemical engineering showed no growth at all.

Inflation in the capitalist countries hit record heights. In the early seventies, inflation rates were more than double those of the previous decade. "Creeping" inflation, which now became uncontrollable, began to turn into "galloping" inflation. A recent official report by the International Monetary Fund stated that inflation has become a global problem, a chronic disease of the entire capitalist world. Indeed, in the past decade (1970-1980), prices in the developed capitalist countries rose by 130 per cent.

In most of the non-socialist world, prices are still rising. Capitalism has proved itself incapable of coping with inflation, which is on a still high level largely because of the militarisation of capitalist economy. Excellent examples are provided by the leading imperialist powers (the United States, Great Britain, West Germany, France, Italy, and Japan), which continually increased their military spending in the 1970. In Italy, Great Britain and Japan, the total jump was almost 200 per cent, and this naturally affected the rate of inflation.

Many developing countries have fallen bondage to the industrially developed capitalist countries. For example, between 1970 and 1980, NATO arms sales to developing countries rose by 400 per cent, resulting in an increase in their national debt and super-inflation.

The unprecedented arms race and the related

growth of inflation led to a huge jump in the US national debt. In May 1984, US Congress compromised with the administration and approved its decision to raise the national debt ceiling to 1,520 billion. According to expert forecasts, in 1985 the debt will have exceeded \$1,500 billion.

The situation elsewhere in the capitalist world is not any better. For example, in 1983, France's national debt amounted to 323 billion francs, West Germany's to 41,5 billion DM, and Italy's exceeded \$ 50 billion.

The Western press believes that if the right-wing policy of unrestrained arms race is not changed, the implications for the whole capitalist system may be very serious. No one can predict the consequences of further militarisation in the economic, political, and social realms.

The unprecedented growth of military spendings and the resultant rise in prices hit the working people hardest, as millions of them in capitalist countries are suffering from the policy of militarisation. Although the Vietnam war cost American taxpayers \$130 billion in all, military spending in the 1980s will funnel nearly \$1.5 billion a day out of the pockets of American working people.

Government controls on the capitalist economy do not help. Anti-inflation measures by bourgeois governments encourage employers to curtail production, and this only increases unemployment. On the other hand, when they try to halt declining production and create jobs, they again cause inflation to rise.

Even when lower inflation rates are achieved, they usually do not last very long. In fact, most of the EEC countries have not been very successful, as average rates of inflation topped 10 per cent.

The problem of unemployment is equally acute. Between 1970 and 1980, unemployment in the developed capitalist countries doubled, reaching 19 million. According to forecasts by experts from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, which brings together most of the industrially developed Western countries, unemployment will reach the 35-million figure by 1985.

The monopolies' drive against working people's rights and living standards is heightening the class struggle. The actions of the big monopoly bourgeoisie are being challenged with growing determination by the working class and all working people, who are to defend their rights and to oppose the arms race and the threat of a new world war. Between 1970 and 1980, the number of workers going out on strike rose by more than a third involving as many as 250 million workers, even according to official figures.

Contradictions among imperialist countries have become increasingly acute. National and transnational monopolies are now waging a real trade war for markets and raw material and energy sources. The three major economic centres of the capitalist world—the United States, Western Europe and Japan—are competing with growing ferocity even in one another's domestic markets.

To defend the interests of its domestic monop-

olies, the United States severely restricted auto imports at the end of 1982. This measure was directed primarily against Japan, which has captured over 20 per cent of the American auto market. At the same time, it was also a blow against West European companies, which are also strongly entrenched in North America. Robert J. Dole, Chairman of the US Senate Finance Committee, stated bluntly that this decision should be seen as a declaration of a "limited war" against Japan and Western Europe.

In contrast with this policy, the USSR and the other socialist countries, for whom the guiding principle is peaceful co-existence, have proposed the development of equitable and mutually advantageous relations to the West. Many Western statesmen and public figures, scientists, businessmen, and trade union officials believe that the West could solve many of its problems—expand production, create thousands of jobs, stabilise the internal socio-political situation, and improve the living standards of the working people—by expanding mutually advantageous trade with the USSR and other socialist countries. According to West German trade unions, over 400,000 people hold down permanent jobs in the Federal Republic thanks to trade and economic co-operation with the USSR. The impact of this could be especially felt in 1983, when according to official figures, there were 2.3 million people out of work in West Germany.

Despite the obstacles put up by aggressive circles, the objective tendency towards further development of world economic ties is gaining strength. Econom-

ic and cultural relations are developing, as can be seen from the growing trade and economic relations between the USSR and the other socialist countries and the capitalist world. For example, despite the cloudy international economic situation, Soviet foreign trade in 1980 was double that of 1976, and reached 119 billion roubles in 1982. Significantly, Soviet commercial and economic links with several capitalist countries are now based primarily on large-scale and long-term contracts. Between 1970 and 1980, Soviet trade with the capitalist world rose by 570 per cent. Despite the opposition of certain forces in the United States, who are trying to slap an embargo on sales of many items to socialist countries, including the USSR, the range of trade items has broadened. The legal foundation of foreign trade has become more solid. The USSR has signed several inter-government agreements and economic, industrial and scientific-and-technological co-operation programmes for 10-15 years and longer with several capitalist countries, among them West Germany, Finland, France, Italy, Britain and Austria.

The relations over the past decades between the USSR and Finland are a telling example of mutually advantageous co-operation between countries with different social systems. These relations are of great significance for both sides. In fact, they show most eloquently that peaceful co-existence is possible and essential, and the only reasonable alternative to the policy of confrontation which might erupt in nuclear war.

Soviet-Finnish relations were initiated by the Decree signed by Lenin recognizing Finland's independence. The 1948 Soviet-Finnish Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance was the political and legal foundation for the further development of broad and comprehensive bilateral ties. This was largely the result of the good will shown by both sides, and, specifically, President Juho Paasikivi's constructive and realistic policy was continued by Urho Kaleva Kekkonen and Mauno Koivisto.

In 1983, when this Treaty marked its 35th anniversary, a protocol introduced well ahead of the expiry date and extending it for a further 20 years was signed in Moscow. As Finnish President Mauno Koivisto pointed out, these long years of fruitful co-operation were the result of the fact that "the Finnish-Soviet relations are a specimen of good-neighbourly relations not subject to changes in the international climate, or to fluctuations in the political situation. Experience has proved that these relations fully meet the fundamental interests of both countries and peoples."<sup>1</sup>

During the post-war decades, the USSR and Finland have established relations of mutual trust, friendship, and fruitful co-operation in many areas. All these are key factors in ensuring security of both Finland and the north-western borders of the USSR, and in consolidating peace both in Northern Europe, and the entire continent, as well.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pravda*, June 7, 1983.

The Soviet Union fully supports the proposal put forward by Finland and Sweden that Northern Europe be declared a nuclear-free zone, and is prepared to take corresponding measures for its own territory. Moreover, the USSR has proposed discussions with interested parties on the question of non-nuclear status for the Baltic Sea area, and in the Baltic states this has been welcomed. Finland, the USSR's northern neighbour, has also approved it. During his visit to Moscow in June 1983, President Mauno Koivisto declared that Finland deeply trusts the USSR's consistent and far-sighted foreign policy.

The extension of bilateral Soviet-Finnish contacts on the government and parliamentary levels, and also on the level of public organisations, help to reinforce understanding and trust.

Soviet-Finnish trade and economic ties are becoming increasingly strong. In 1982, their trade exceeded five billion roubles. That same year, 27 per cent of Finland's exports went to the Soviet Union.

Extensive trade and economic ties between the two countries are developing in accordance with the long-term (up to 1995) co-operation programme, under which between 1981 and 1985 trade will increase to 18-20 billion roubles, compared with 12.8 billion in the preceding five-year period. It is planned to extend the operation of this programme until the year 2000. As well, a protocol on co-operation in agriculture and food production was signed in 1983.

Soviet-Finnish economic relations feature equitable and mutually advantageous co-operation, which, in the words of Stig H. Höstä, Managing Director

of the Confederation of Finnish Industries, has enabled his country to ride the tide of the negative consequences of the world economic situation, which has become a great deal worse in recent years.

Just before the Soviet-Finnish Summit in June 1983, Finnish Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa told a group of Soviet journalists that, despite inflation and unemployment, Finland's economy is on the whole functioning normally, and that co-operation and mutually advantageous trade with the USSR play a positive role in this. Premier Sorsa pointed to the significance of factors like continuity and stability in Soviet-Finnish relations, and underlined the fact that the good prospects, solidity and reliability of bilateral economic ties are ensured by the vast Soviet market open to Finland, and also by the fact that planning can be done for a five-year and longer period. He also noted that the development of bilateral trade naturally also involves problems, but they are always settled. The many years of business carried on by Finnish ship-building company Wärtsilä with the Soviet Union can be taken as an example of trade and economic and scientific and technological co-operation between the two countries. In 1982, Wärtsilä marked fifty years since the first Soviet order. In those five decades it sent nearly 300 different types of ships to the USSR. Today, from 40 to 65 per cent of Wärtsilä's total business involves exports to the Soviet Union.

Thus, good-neighbourly Soviet-Finnish relations vividly show how successful, fruitful, and profitable relations between countries with different social



systems can be. In fact, Soviet-Finnish relations can serve as a prototype of not simply peaceful and correct ties between countries with different socio-political systems, but of friendship, respect, and trust as well.

Of course, there is not unanimous approval in the West for Finland's foreign policy or for the friendly and mutually advantageous relations between it and the USSR. Certain forces in the imperialist world are conducting a campaign of slander against Finland; they loudly deplore its "dependence" on the Soviet Union, for which they have coined a ridiculous term "Finlandisation", which they brandish at other countries to try and stop them from pursuing a policy of peaceful co-existence. This should come as no surprise, since Soviet-Finnish relations show that any capitalist country can pursue an independent policy, a policy totally uninfluenced by aggressive war-mongering groups, and that peaceful co-existence is imperative.

Truth will out. Not only the Soviet people, but people in many other countries as well believe utterly that the Soviet approach to international relations is promising and viable. In one of his speeches, President Koivisto said in 1983: "Unfortunately, the international atmosphere is greatly different from what we are accustomed to in our relations. In this situation, the significance of the practical experience that we have acquired becomes even greater, since it shows that there can be excellent relations and extensive co-operation between two countries that differ both in size and in social system."

There are two distinct tendencies in international politics in the current capitalist world. One is the blatant aggressiveness of ultra-reactionary forces headed by American imperialism. These forces do everything they can to reverse contemporary social development, to find a way out of the crisis situation arising from the heightening of internal and interstate contradictions by escalating the arms race, by raising international tensions, by seeking a confrontation with socialist countries, and by crushing liberation movements. This was again confirmed at the two recent summits of seven leading capitalist countries at Williamsburg (1983) and London (1984) and at the NATO Council Session in Paris (1983) and Washington (1984), where the United States and its allies openly flaunted their commitment to a policy of coercion.

On the other hand, there are people in the capitalist world whose foreign policy approach is based on a realistic consideration of the world situation. They understand the need for and mutual advantage gained by peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, and are taking adequate steps to establish increasingly broad ties.

### *Internationalist Policy*

Whereas peaceful co-existence is the foundation of interstate relations alone—specifically, between countries with different social systems—proletarian internationalism is the foundation of relations between socialist countries, of relations between socialist and

young developing countries, and of relations between fraternal communist and workers' parties. This principle embodies both the ideology and the political objectives of the international working class.

With the emergence of the world socialist system, the concept of proletarian internationalism broadened, its forms became more diverse, and its role in all spheres of social life became immeasurably greater. The fact that proletarian internationalism became qualitatively richer by virtue of socialist international relations gave rise to the concept "socialist internationalism".

The socialist countries base their domestic and foreign policies on the principle of socialist internationalism; this is an objective consequence of their common economic and socio-political systems, class objectives, and ideology. The unity of national and international interests have given birth to close cooperation and fraternal mutual assistance between the socialist countries in all realms of life, foreign policy among them.

Coupled with the achievements of other sectors of the world revolutionary movement, the ongoing consolidation of the socialist countries and their economic, political, military, and other accomplishments have produced great changes in the alignment of the world's class forces. By the end of the 1970s the impact of real socialism on the global events had become so great that imperialist forces had to take this into serious account.

What makes it necessary for the socialist countries to coordinate their actions on the international scene,

and for all anti-imperialist forces work more closely together, is that at every single step they are confronted by a united bloc of imperialist powers. The only way the socialist countries can attain their major foreign policy goals is by acting together on the basis of proletarian, socialist internationalism. This applies to all key issues: curbing the aggressive schemes of the militarist forces in the imperialist countries; ensuring peaceful co-existence; supporting national liberation movements; limiting the arms race; advancing towards universal and complete disarmament, etc.

The 26th CPSU Congress pointed out that the Soviet Union is paying constant attention to strengthening friendship and co-operation with socialist countries. Thanks to joint efforts by the fraternal parties and peoples of socialist countries, history is now witnessing the successful building of a totally new socialist world, and the emergence of inter-state relations of a kind never seen before: truly just, fraternal, and based on genuine equality. Inter-state relations have long since been called international relations; however, it is only today, in the socialist world, that they are in fact becoming international relations which directly involve millions of people. This is one of socialism's gains, and one of its great services to humanity.

As a result of the constant interaction between the fraternal parties that embraces all key questions of socio-economic development, ideology, and global politics, the socialist countries have come to have basic unity of views and profound mutual understanding

and trust. There are constant exchanges of party and government delegations, meetings of Central Committee secretaries on important international and ideological problems and questions of party organisation, and the expansion of inter-party contacts at all levels. The new 1977 Constitution of the USSR proclaimed friendship and co-operation with the socialist countries and mutual assistance as the cornerstone of Soviet foreign policy. The ideas of friendship and co-operation are also reflected in the constitutions of the socialist countries.

When in 1955 the fraternal socialist countries established the military-political Warsaw Treaty Organisation they showed by this act their joint readiness to defend their revolutionary gains. Throughout its existence, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation has proved itself an effective instrument in safeguarding world peace and security, and a solid guarantee against all imperialist schemes.

The CPSU and the Soviet state take as their starting point the fact that the economic competition with capitalism is of decisive significance. Economic co-operation between socialist countries is successfully developing on both bilateral and multilateral levels. Joint efforts by the socialist countries, primarily within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA), founded in 1949, bring each member-state and the socialist community as a whole considerable benefits, and enables them to deal with tasks of great scope which one or two countries alone could not cope with. The success of the 1971 Comprehensive Programme of Socialist

Economic Integration was a major reason why the economic growth rates of the CMEA countries in 1970-1980 were double those of the developed capitalist states.

Imperialist forces in the West are doing all they can to weaken and even split the socialist community. They are making constant attempts to undermine it from within through economic and political action, and by intensifying their ideological subversion. One of the most striking examples was the imperialist offensive against socialist Poland. Western reactionary circles had long nurtured designs of changing the socialist system in Poland, and of cutting it off from the socialist community. For several years, they tried to organise a "fifth column" in that country, giving almost unlimited support to counter-revolutionary organisations like KOS-KOR, lauding the so-called "flying universities" to the skies, and establishing contacts with counter-revolutionaries, whom they supplied with money, printing equipment, and literature.

Capitalizing on the signs of discontent among the Polish working class caused by mistakes and miscalculations in the socio-economic policies of previous Polish leaders, the US administration began directly interfering in Poland's affairs. It used its radio stations "Liberty" and "Free Europe" which broadcast from West Germany to incite counter-revolutionaries in Poland, and began to encourage Solidarnosc, an organisation whose leaders were opposed to socialism and which was established under the guise of a trade union, to challenge popular rule. The US administra-

tion also insisted that the Polish government lift martial law in the country once it had been proclaimed, and broke off trade and economic ties with Poland.

In the difficult days that the Polish people had to face, proletarian, socialist solidarity fulfilled its role. At its 26th Congress the CPSU declared: "The Polish Communists, the Polish working class, and the working people of that country can firmly rely on their friends and allies; we will not abandon fraternal, socialist Poland in its hour of need, we will stand by it."<sup>1</sup> Not only the USSR, but also all the Warsaw Treaty members took a similar stand.

Poland's working class and its party, relying on all-round assistance and support from the USSR and other socialist states, and on the solidarity of all progressive forces abroad, dealt a resolute blow to the aggressive schemes of the imperialists and Polish counter-revolutionaries, preventing events from developing in a direction that the reactionary forces in the West would have liked to see. The result was a setback for these forces.

The aid to Vietnam was another sparkling example of proletarian, socialist internationalism. The war of aggression which American imperialism launched in the 1960s against the Vietnamese people was defiantly challenged by all the country's patriotic forces, who took up arms to fight for their freedom and independence. As a result of a stubborn struggle against the army of the world's mightiest imperialist

---

<sup>1</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 14.

power, armed to the teeth with the most modern weapons, the heroic people of Vietnam emerged victorious. US imperialism was forced to retreat after suffering a major military and political defeat.

The decisive factors in the victory of Vietnam's just cause were the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people under the leadership of its party; the all-round internationalist aid to and support for the just struggle of the Vietnamese by the USSR and other socialist states; and the skilful use by the leadership of Vietnam's patriotic forces of various military, political, and diplomatic forms of struggle.

During the war the USSR and other socialist countries provided Vietnam with internationalist aid, and are continuing to do so now to help the Vietnamese people rebuild their devastated economy and promote their economic and cultural development as their plans of socialist construction envisage.

During Vietnam's struggle against American intervention, working people in the capitalist countries, too, displayed their great internationalist solidarity with the Vietnamese people. The US aggression evoked such an immense and steadily growing wave of protest from the working class, the broad masses of the people, and all progressive and peace forces everywhere, including inside the United States, that the American authorities were eventually forced to confront the reality of it.

General William C. Westmoreland, the former US Commander-in-Chief in Vietnam, had to admit that solidarity with and support for the struggle of the Vietnamese people by the American people them-



selves was an effective factor. Making a trip back to the United States in 1968, at the height of hostilities in Vietnam, he was amazed at the scope of the anti-war movement. As he recalls it, the press was literally saturated with "enemy propaganda", and the war was lost more because of that propaganda than on the battlefield.

But Westmoreland "forgot" that the United States suffered almost half a million killed and wounded in Vietnam. Nevertheless, his admission is vivid testimony of the power and scope of the US anti-Vietnam war movement in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

The internationalist unity of the socialist countries did not develop because they levelled out their interests or reduced their objectives and tasks to the lowest common denominator. The different features of each of their economies and cultures, and of the ways they each took to build a new society, are harmonized within the framework of common strategic targets on the basis of full respect for the sovereign rights and maximum consideration of the specific interests and requirements of each individual country.

The June (1983) CC CPSU Plenary Meeting stated that the strengthening of co-operation and unity among the socialist countries was the paramount task in the international activities of the CPSU and the Soviet government. This has been made necessary by both the international and domestic interests of the USSR and the other socialist countries. The imminent threat of a thermonuclear war compels the socialist community to wage a determined struggle

for preventing a global catastrophe, for preserving civilisation and mankind's right to live. Fulfilling the tasks involved in building and further improving developed socialist society requires increasing co-operation among the socialist countries. This also requires further deepening of socialist economic integration, making this integration more effective, and promoting processes by which the fraternal nations are drawn closer together.

All these are long-term and objective processes. At the same time, their implementation increasingly brings into play the subjective factor, the conscious activity of political parties, classes, and masses of the people. The higher the socialist countries' level of social development, the more they will have in common, and the greater and more profound their mutual understanding and co-operation will be.

Proletarian internationalism also characterises the socialist countries' approach to the national liberation movement. These policies are the polar opposite of the neo-colonialist imperialist policies of the United States and other capitalist countries, which are trying to keep the liberated countries politically and economically dependent.

The developing countries occupy vast areas of three continents; their population is over two billion, i.e. almost half of the world's population. In 1983, there were 127 newly-independent young states. Quite recently, they were backward, oppressed, and ruthlessly exploited fiefdoms of imperialism. Now that they have made a break with their colonial past, they play an increasingly important role in interna-

tional affairs. The newly free countries are the majority in the United Nations, and many are active in the non-aligned movement.

Many Asian, African and Latin American countries feature different levels of political, economic, social, and cultural development, and their internal processes are extremely complex and ambivalent. They have also chosen different paths of economic and social development. But they have a great deal in common, primarily their colonial past, the extreme poverty of the overwhelming majority of the population, and the need to hurdle centuries of backwardness. All of them crucially need to create their own industrial base, to develop agriculture, to free themselves of imperialist coercion in economic and cultural life, and to safeguard and consolidate world peace.

There are specific reasons for the difficult socio-economic situation the liberated countries find themselves in. One is the legacy of their recent colonial past; another is neo-colonialism. Many developing countries have successfully made quite a bit of socio-economic progress after winning independence. However, on the whole, the conditions in most developing countries are still tenuous because of modern imperialism and its impact.

In recent years, a goodly number of Western studies have appeared providing a comprehensive analysis of the problems facing the developing countries, most of which are directly or indirectly following the social commands of monopoly bourgeoisie. Even the reports prepared by the Brandt Commission estab-

lished by the Socialist International, reports whose facts are scrupulously honest and complete, make the point that the liberated countries' difficulties stem essentially from the generally bad situation in the world today.

The world is experiencing one of its most severe economic crises ever. It emerged in the leading capitalist countries, but its results have created havoc in the developing countries, since monopoly capital has done everything possible to shift its difficulties elsewhere.

In his report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in 1983 in Delhi, Fidel Castro, then Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, revealed the mechanism of this neo-colonialist policy.<sup>1</sup> Given the grave economic crisis involving the West's financial, raw materials, and energy problems, national and transnational corporations became more and more attracted to the natural resources of their former colonies out of which they funnelled fabulous wealth and reaped superprofits.

The collapse of the colonial system of imperialism and the developing countries' greater role in world politics compelled the imperialists to change their predatory strategy and tactics. They started to use new, neo-colonial forms and methods of exploitation, but the system which plundered, killed and exploited remained essentially as it was.

<sup>1</sup> See: F. Castro, "The World Economic and Social Crisis. Its Impact on the Underdeveloped Countries, Its Sombre Prospects and the Need to Struggle if We Are to Survive." Report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, Ed. Politica, Habana, 1983.

In the new historical conditions the methods of political domination and armed suppression that were so successful before have been relegated to the background. But imperialism has not ditched them altogether. Evidence of this is the vast network of military bases whose tentacles embrace the earth; the fact that the United States, Britain and France have set up "rapid deployment forces"; and the fact that between 1945 and 1983 215 armed clashes and conflicts have occurred in various spots of the globe through the fault of imperialism, most involving the liberated countries, and nearly every one—either directly or indirectly—the United States or its allies.

In the world of today, imperialism's principal method of domination is a massive economic drive against the liberated countries; its main instrument is the transnational corporations, of which, according to UN statistics, there were 11,000 (plus 82,000 subsidiaries) in 1983. Their tentacles have grasped the entire non-socialist world. Transnational corporations (TNC) control half of the world's trade; 90 per cent of the developing countries' exports pass through their hands. Through their control of the distribution system and of the markets, the TNC increasingly penetrate the developing countries, and often ignore their domestic legislation.

The imperialist methods of economic onslaught and coercion have resulted in the exceptionally severe plight of developing countries. Between 1975 and 1983, their share of world industrial production rose only from 7 to 9 per cent. Over a billion people, i. e.

a quarter of the world's population, live in appalling poverty, primarily in developing countries. Over 500 million people are starving and 40 million die of malnutrition and hunger every year.

The imperialist powers' economic policy towards the developing countries has resulted in a growth in unemployment to 500 million in these countries—over half of the potential labour force.

Things are no better in education and medical care. According to UNESCO figures, 814 million adults, primarily in Asia, Africa and Latin America, are illiterate, and over two-thirds of the world's population, chiefly in the same continents, have no access to medical aid. No wonder child mortality in the developing countries is ten times higher than that in the capitalist countries.

The one-track-mind policies of the imperialist countries, which safeguard the interests of big business, is aimed at further enslaving the peoples of developing countries by turning their territories into sources of raw materials and super-profits, and markets for the industrial products of imperialism. Kuwait's newspaper *Al-Anba* wrote that the lavish talk by developed capitalist countries about establishing a new international economic order is in fact simply an attempt to keep the liberated states in the position of suppliers of raw materials, and to prevent them from developing their own industries.

Imperialist policy deliberately aims to maintain the gap in the economic growth between developed and developing countries. According to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, in 1980

per capita GNP of the developed countries was on the average 40 times higher than that of the developing countries. This enables the former to dictate their conditions to and impose their demands on the latter, and to wiggle out of competition from them. Making the point that economic liberation is the principal condition of genuine national independence, Lenin wrote that some bourgeois newspapers are "talking of *national* liberation. . ., leaving out *economic* liberation. Yet in reality it is the latter that is the chief thing".<sup>1</sup>

Historically, the conditions in which the economies of the former colonies and semi-colonies evolved were such that they found themselves almost fully integrated in the capitalist economic system, and still function in its framework. Although the young countries gained national independence, the fact that most have no highly developed industries means that they are still no more than hewers of wood and drawers of water for the capitalist system, which sets the terms under which their raw materials will be supplied. As well as this, the imperialist monopolies do all they can to prevent economic relations with the developing countries to be put on a new footing.

The developing countries' position is being aggravated by mounting inflation, a steady rise of prices for products imported from the industrial nations, and a sharp decline in prices for raw materials exported by the developing states. In 1980, the price

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, 1973, p. 398.

for one pound of sugar on the world market was 42 US cents, whereas in 1982 as low as 6 US cents; that was a seven-fold decrease. Formerly, 24 tons of sugar were needed to buy a tractor in developed Western countries, today this would require 115 tons, i. e. five times more. In the not too distant past, six tons of jute yarn were sufficient to buy a medium-size lorry, whereas in 1983 this required twenty-six tons. This applies to all kinds of raw materials, with the exception of fuels and rare metals.

All this leads to a sharp worsening of trade terms for Asian, African, and Latin American countries. The situation is paradoxical: the more raw materials they sell, the less they get for them, and they still cannot break away from this vicious circle.

The imperialist practice of granting loans has become a prime method of economically fettering the developing countries.

By early 1983, their debts, including those accruing from commercial credits, exceeded \$700 billion. This has become a serious problem, which not only leaves little opening for economic development, but makes it impossible for the developing countries to maintain even the low level of consumption of recent years. Debts have to be repaid, and the amount of money that the developing countries spent at the end of 1982 to cover the interest alone was \$131 billion. Obviously interest payments cover not only their national incomes, but all newly-received loans. According to *The Economist*, granting loans to economically less developed countries is a very profitable business. Current short-term loans are usually granted



for 3-5 years, with an annual interest rate of 8-15 per cent.

In recent years, Western and Japanese banks have introduced increasingly severe terms. If the recipient fails to fulfil his commitments in repaying just one loan, he is obliged to instantly repay all other loans, even if the repayment date has not yet fallen due.

Latin American countries have the largest foreign debt in the world. In 1984, it topped \$350 billion. Their various payments for 1982-1983 loans alone amounted to \$50 billion. Brazil's foreign debt in 1984 was \$92 billion, Mexico's \$87 billion, Argentina's \$44 billion, and Colombia's \$12 billion.

By the early 1980s, Mexico, for instance, was the world's fourth largest producer of petroleum. Almost all of its oil, however, is turned into foreign bank profits, since the returns from sales are used to pay debts, which nonetheless do not decrease. This is also furthered by Reagan's policy of inflating bank interest rates, a policy that leads to growing payments for loans. Such economic robbery not only drains the Latin American countries, but also allows to exert powerful pressure on their domestic and foreign policies.

The web of debts in which the developing countries are caught up is skilfully knit. By this net, imperialism hopes to solidly hitch the developing countries to their cart so as to prevent their people and governments from choosing non-capitalist development; to prevent them from pursuing an independent foreign policy and from creating their own modern industries; and to prevent them from turn-

ing the popular struggle for national liberation into the struggle for social emancipation.

As part of this strategy, the United States and its allies are provoking the Asian, African and Latin American countries into involving themselves in an unrestrained arms race; they are doing everything they can to foment disputes and provoke conflicts between neighbouring countries, and to instigate regional and local disputes, as can be seen by their forcing of neighbouring countries to be hostile to Nicaragua, by their interference in the internal affairs of El Salvador and Chad, and their occupation of Grenada.

The USSR and the other socialist countries, have countered imperialist policy with a policy of equal co-operation with all interested Asian, African and Latin American countries, to which they have provided and continue to provide assistance in all spheres of social life. This assistance takes the form of economic development aid, by training personnel, developing culture, education, medicine, science, etc., and when necessary, repelling imperialist aggression, as was the case in Angola, Ethiopia and Afghanistan. All of this reflects the genuine internationalism of Soviet foreign policy.

The CPSU proceeds from the fact that the national liberation movement is one of the three main contemporary forces fighting against imperialism, reaction and war, and for peace, democracy, and social progress. Naturally, co-operation between the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries and the developing countries objectively strengthens the anti-im-

perialist front and helps to consolidate all the forces resisting world reaction.

Many liberated countries have chosen the capitalist path of development. But to try and overcome their economic backwardness, they are intent on gaining equal and mutually advantageous relations and on consolidating world peace. The socialist countries understand and support these countries, and co-operate with them on the basis of full respect for their sovereignty and non-interference in their internal affairs. This helps the developing countries consolidate their independence.

The USSR is developing very close relations with countries which have chosen the socialist path of development. This is a natural consequence, for the Soviet Union and the developing countries not only share a common anti-imperialist foreign policy of peace but also common ideals of social development. Lenin foresaw that socialism would actively influence the world liberation movement chiefly by force of example, by its successes in building a new society.

Many young countries, faced with a choice of how they are to develop further, and seeing the tremendous successes that the peoples of the USSR, Cuba, and other socialist countries have achieved within a brief historical period in comparison with the capitalist countries, consciously make their choice in favour of socialism. They see that in the socialist countries industrial production is growing faster than in the developed capitalist countries, and that socialist economies are not plagued by crises. This is convincing proof of the advantages of socialism.

The Soviet Union is very well aware of the difficulties involved in the revolutionary development of countries which have expressed their desire to take the socialist road. Difficulties are inevitable when embarking on so great a task as eliminating backwardness and instituting fundamental social change.

Guided by the principle of proletarian internationalism, the socialist countries always extend solidarity to peoples who have chosen social progress and help them achieve economic growth.

The Programme for the Further Struggle for Peace and International Co-operation, for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress clearly posed the following task: to "work for eliminating discrimination and all artificial barriers in international trade, and all manifestations of inequality, diktat and exploitation in international economic relations".<sup>1</sup> The Soviet Communist Party is firmly striving to do this. The USSR's 1982 trade with the developing countries amounted to 16,900 million roubles—150 per cent higher than in 1975. By the early 1980s, the USSR had helped build 1,700 industrial and other important projects in the developing countries, primarily in the public sector, to help strengthen their economies.

Other socialist countries are also providing a great deal of aid to developing countries. As a result, over

---

<sup>1</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 25th Congress of the CPSU*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1976, p. 32.

4,900 industrial and other projects have either been built or are under construction, and 3,300 of them are already operating.<sup>1</sup>

Co-operation with the USSR is equitable and mutually advantageous. Soviet export deliveries and economic, scientific, and technological assistance to developing countries are provided on a fair basis. Suffice it to say that normally Soviet credits are granted on favourable terms for 10-12 years at a 2-2.5 per cent annual interest.

The developing countries have advanced quite far on their road to social progress, in no small measure thanks to the mutually advantageous co-operation and support that the world socialist system provides. Despite the schemes of imperialism, which is doing everything it can to retard the economic and social progress of the developing countries, by 1983 their overall industrial production was 350 per cent higher than 30 years previously. For the first time, their per capita production growth rates exceeded that of the Western countries. Their share of world trade has also increased somewhat, this being due not only to the rise in oil prices, but also to their more rapid industrialisation.

The socialist community strongly opposes the militarisation of the newly liberated countries and their being squeezed into the arms race. One of the proposals contained in the statement of the June 28,

---

<sup>1</sup> See: A. A. Gromyko, *Foreign Expansion of Capital: Past and Present*, Mysl Publishers, Moscow, 1982, p. 448 (in Russian).

1983 Moscow meeting of the party and government leaders of seven socialist countries was a call to NATO for a mutual reduction in military spending. The funds thus made available could be used to deal with the economic and social problems, including those facing the developing countries.

It was stressed at the February (1984) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU: "One of the fundamentals of the foreign policy of our Party and the Soviet state has been and will remain solidarity with the peoples who have shattered the fetters of colonial dependence and embarked on the path of independent development. Especially, of course, with the peoples who have to repel the attacks of the aggressive forces of imperialism which is creating very dangerous seats of bloody violence and war conflagration in one part of the world after another. Siding with the just cause of the peoples and working for the elimination of such hotbeds is today also an essential and important direction in the struggle for lasting peace on earth. Our Party's principled stand on these issues is clear, pure and noble. And we will unswervingly adhere to it."

*The General and the Specific  
in Domestic and Foreign Policies*

The development of Soviet society has shown the dialectical correlation of all its aspects, the organic unity of socialist domestic and foreign policies. The USSR's successes in its fight for peace and social progress and for making peaceful co-existence the

foundation of international relations directly depend on the achievements of the Soviet people in further building developed socialism, primarily in the economic sphere. The 26th CPSU Congress pointed out that guidance of the economy is the core of all Party and state activities, for it is the economic sphere which provides the foundation for dealing with all social tasks and strengthening the country's defence capability, as well as the foundation for an active foreign policy.

The unity of domestic and foreign policies became of great significance with the emergence and development of the world socialist system. The further international division of labour, greater economic integration and specialisation, foreign policy co-ordination, and the development and consolidation of all-round fraternal ties between the socialist countries have created qualitatively new conditions for co-ordinated domestic and foreign policies.

Domestic policy achievements make it possible not only to solidify the positions of socialism on the international scene, but also to tackle qualitatively new and more complex tasks, to deepen socialist economic integration. In turn, the effective foreign policy of the USSR and other socialist countries has a favourable impact on their domestic policy.

But the inseparable association between domestic and foreign policies does not at all obliterate the specifics of foreign policy.

Domestic policy embraces the realm of relations between classes and political parties, and also between (where applicable) various nationalities

within a country with a specific socio-economic system; foreign policy embraces the realm of relationships between states which may have different socio-economic systems.

The international arena is the stage for relations between sovereign states, relations governed by specific rules and conventions that have evolved over long years of inter-state communication, not established by any one subject of those relations. Besides, it must also be considered that the system of international relations is distinguished by the exceptional fluctuation of its components.

The role of the subjective factor is very prominent in foreign policy since foreign policy is more dependent on the constantly changing international situation than is domestic policy. In domestic relations, certain classes have a monopoly of power; in international relations, where each sovereign state is the subject of power, no single country can dictate its will to another without risking a serious international conflict, or possibly a war. So in international relations, political compromises and alliances between states are a normal practice, reflecting the specific features of a given foreign policy.

Countries not only inevitably come into contact with each other, but are also interested in establishing political, economic, and cultural ties, and in concluding corresponding agreements. Through the implementation of their foreign policy, the socialist countries consciously influence the system of international relations in the spirit of peaceful co-existence.

In working to ease international tensions and to



make peaceful co-existence the basis of the USSR's relations with capitalist countries, the CPSU and the Soviet government are guided by Lenin's instruction that it is necessary to combine the commitments to communist ideals with the ability to make specific compromises. The USSR has signed several important agreements with capitalist countries on mutually advantageous co-operation and on limiting the arms race. Reasonable concessions on both sides had to be made before some of them could be reached. These were necessary and substantiated compromises in politics, but not in ideology, i. e. compromises that benefit peace.

Current international relations are a specific area of social relations involving the interaction of economic, political, and cultural ties between various countries which are often at different stages of historical development and have different socio-economic systems.

There are two key aspects of international relations that determine their specific features: (a) the relative independence of international relations, whose laws are not the same as those governing the internal development of individual countries, and (b) the fact that international relations are basically a function of domestic relations. The emergence of international relations is influenced by the greater international division of labour, which makes it impossible for individual countries to exist normally in isolation and develop their economic mechanisms at the same time.

Naturally, the principal features of the foreign po-

licy pursued by different countries, primarily its class character, do affect international relations. In this regard, Andrei Gromyko, the USSR Foreign Minister, wrote: "The class nature of the CPSU's foreign policy, which represents an inseparable part of the vast and diverse work of the Party in all fields of life, is primarily seen in that this policy is directed at safeguarding the fundamental interests of world socialism, the international working class, and all the exploited and oppressed people on earth, at consolidating for the sake of these interests the world's working people under the banner of proletarian internationalism."<sup>1</sup>

The world today is the stage for an acute struggle between the two opposing social systems; socially different foreign policies intersect and collide, resulting in the contradictory nature of the system of international relations. At the same time, this struggle on the international scene is combined with cooperation and diverse contacts between countries with different social systems. In certain instances, Lenin said, military co-operation with certain capitalist countries may even be possible, a possibility the Soviet government translated into reality during World War II.

In charting the USSR's long-term foreign policy, the CPSU takes into account the existing international situation and the position of various countries

---

<sup>1</sup> A. A. Gromyko, *In the Name of the Triumph of Lenin's Foreign Policy. Selected Speeches and Articles*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1978, p. 456 (in Russian).

on various issues. The protection and consolidation of peace, as well as the maintenance of normal interstate relations largely depend on how correctly international disputes are resolved. Conversely, if a government chooses to ignore the disputes, tries to indefinitely put off a solution, and refuses to find a way out of a complex situation through talks, fatal consequences for the country and the world as a whole could ensue.

A very important aspect of the CPSU's international activity is the guidance of Soviet foreign policy, which is, in turn, a component of the Party's comprehensive endeavour to further improve developed socialism.

## CHAPTER 4

### CLASS APPROACH: THE DETERMINING PRINCIPLE OF SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

In directing the development of all the aspects of life under socialism, the Communist Party relies on knowledge of the laws of building socialism and communism and on Lenin's principles of Party leadership which account for and express these laws. The principles of party leadership as developed by Lenin determine the Party's approach to charting and implementing the general direction of domestic and foreign policies, and to leadership in state and social affairs. In fact, they reflect the nature and objectives of socialist society and the Communist Party, and determine the methods and style of work.

The principles of Party leadership are immutable at each given historical stage of social development. On the other hand, they change, which fact enables the Communist Party to take a creative, flexible approach to its leadership of society at each specific stage of development.

The CPSU applies the general principles of Party leadership to international relations as well. But this has its own specific features, with the result that the determining principles are the class, genuine communist and scientific approach,

Because a socialist state pursues its foreign policy in a world in which there are states with different social and political systems, and because the sphere of international relations is an arena of class struggle, the principle of class approach is paramount in analysing international politics, in determining the alignment of class forces in the world, and in charting the foreign policy of a socialist state in specific conditions.

The principle of genuine communist approach originates from and is organically connected with the principle of class approach. The leading role of the Communist Party within the socialist state, a role proclaimed in the Constitution of the USSR, is, among other things, embodied in Party leadership of the entire system of Soviet foreign policy measures.

The class and genuine communist approach in the CPSU's international activities is combined with a scientific approach. The fundamental interests and ultimate ideals of the working class coincide with the objective course of history and with the interests of the human race as a whole; so in this case, genuine communist approach manifesting the interests of the working class and other sections of the working people coincides with the scientific approach. Today, a prime condition for the success of a socialist foreign policy is the ability of organically combining the principles of class, genuine communist, and scientific approaches in determining and implementing that policy.

By combining Lenin's principles of leadership with

a creative approach to those principles, the CPSU and the Soviet government can effectively pursue their foreign policy and attain their objectives, despite fierce opposition from world reaction.

*The Essence of the Class Communist  
Approach to International Relations*

The trends and principles governing the activity of any political party are determined by the social nature of the class forces on which it is based. It is this social nature that determines the degree to which the party is progressive or reactionary. Those classes and social groups which because of their objective position cannot ensure society's progressive development, but, on the contrary, slow down that development, are correspondingly represented by parties that play a reactionary role in social development.

Political parties always express the interests of definite social classes and groups, although far from every party openly recognises its own class character and reveals the true aims it serves. Bourgeois parties which represent the interests of the ruling exploiter classes usually conceal their real nature behind the guise of "national interests" and "impartiality". At the beginning of the century, Lenin pointed out that bourgeois ideologists scrupulously avoid consideration of political problems from the viewpoint of class struggle. However, unlike them, the working-class party cannot.<sup>1</sup> Lenin showed that in a class society

---

<sup>1</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 326.

there is no such thing as politics in general, no politics that stand above classes. There is bourgeois politics, and there is socialist politics. Their character is determined by the property relations prevalent in society, and depends on what class wields state power.

Lenin gave a correct criterion for understanding the essence of politics of any kind when he wrote: "People always have been the foolish victims of deception and self-deception in politics, and they always will be until they have learnt to seek out the *interests* of some class or other behind all moral, religious, political and social phrases, declarations and promises."<sup>1</sup>

A class approach makes it possible to reveal the socially determined policy of any party, or of any state. Both the theory and policies of Marxist-Leninist parties are inseparably linked with the interests of the working class, the most progressive, revolutionary class of the contemporary epoch, a class whose objective position in relation to the means of production determines its role, i. e. the principal force of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism.

The CPSU does not conceal its class ideology and policy, and consciously makes them serve the proletariat, which is the class expressing the objective trends and prospects of social development.

The class approach to guiding foreign policy postulates two basic requirements in charting and implementing that policy.

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, 1976, p. 28.

First, in analysing the international situation, one has to proceed from the fundamental interests of the working people, primarily from the positions of the working class, and draw adequate conclusions for all activities on the international scene.

Second, one has to make the fullest and most accurate consideration, analysis and assessment possible of the alignment of the principal class forces on the world, regional, and national scales, and also of the activities of classes, social groups, political parties and states at home and abroad.

If a correct, class assessment of the facts of international life is to be made, one must be able to perceive the economic interests underlying the most complex contradictions between various classes and social groups, the interaction of political parties and states, diplomatic actions, and, finally, armed conflicts, and to be able to take those interests into consideration.

Lenin wrote: "When it is not immediately apparent which political or social groups, forces or alignments advocate certain proposals, measures, etc., one should always ask: 'Who stands to gain?'... In politics it is not so important *who* directly advocates particular views. What is important is *who stands to gain* from these views, proposals, measures."<sup>1</sup> This scientific criterion enables the CPSU to make correct decisions in foreign policy and international relations.

In analysing the foreign policies of given countries, the CPSU takes into account the social nature of their socio-economic systems, the class which wields

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 53.



state power, the political orientation of that class, and the class that determines world development at every given historical stage.

After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between labour and capital, and the struggle for social and national liberation, rose to the level of international politics, and are the essence of world politics at the present time. Given the complex conditions of the current struggle between the two opposing systems, a class approach and class analysis enable the CPSU and other fraternal parties to determine the nature of international development, and to make adequate theoretical conclusions and generalisations on the basis of which the socialist countries implement their foreign policies.

It is not only the ruling communist and workers' parties of the socialist countries that are guided by the principle of class approach in their domestic and foreign policies; so are the Marxist-Leninist parties of the capitalist countries fighting for the interests of the working people. Gus Hall, General Secretary, Communist Party USA, wrote in this connection: "We, who are partisans of the working class, can publicly justify our class approach because our class is the class of human progress. Our party simultaneously serves our class and human society as a whole. We place the struggle for democracy into that overall framework. Ours is not a narrow, selfish partisan viewpoint."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *World Marxist Review*, August 1977, Vol. 20, No. 8, p. 25.

*The Class Positions of Socialist  
and Bourgeois States*

An analysis of the many modern bourgeois theories of foreign policy and international relations leads to the conclusion that bourgeois theorists do not usually consider international issues from the viewpoint of the class struggle. In practice, however, they do take a class approach—that reflecting the interests of the ruling classes, primarily those of the monopoly bourgeoisie—to all domestic and foreign policy issues facing bourgeois states and parties. But this approach is being concealed, hushed up and disguised in every way possible; it is masked by discourses about national interests and the supra-class and extra-class policies of the capitalist countries. This is clearly apparent in the domestic and foreign policies of any capitalist country, especially of the United States.

Bourgeois ideologists try to make Americans and other people accept the myth that the United States is a “classless” country. They claim that the United States is a society of “people’s capitalism”, that classes disappeared during the transition to “post-industrial society”, that the working class as such no longer exists, and that the redistribution of wealth and incomes has eliminated the political significance of economic inequality. On top of that, the bourgeois publicist Peter Drucker makes an absolutely amazing claim: as though Marxist socialism was first instituted on American soil!

If we look at the factor of how wealth and in-

comes are in fact "redistributed" in the United States we find that 4 per cent of the American adult population owns property valued at \$1,000 billion—more than the GNP of almost all Western Europe. Also, 0,002 per cent of Americans possess almost half of the assets in American industry, banking, communications, transport and municipal services, and control two-thirds of insurance funds. On the other side of the coin, half American population receive no more than three cents out of every dollar. This is the widely publicised society of "people's capitalism".

The American mass media publicise American tax policy as an instrument that ensures the just redistribution of public wealth. Yet, over the past 30 years, an increasing portion of government tax income has come from individuals, while imposed corporation taxes dropped from 27 cents of each dollar in profit in 1950 to 16 cents in 1970. And the Reagan administration has further reduced corporation taxes.

Inasmuch as economic might in the United States is concentrated in the hands of the few, the latter are the ruling élite which determines the policies of the government. The one per cent of Americans who possess a quarter of all national wealth constitute one-third of the ruling élite; 21 per cent of Americans, the so-called upper middle class, two-thirds of that élite; and the remaining 78 per cent only three per cent of the élite. Those whom the American financial oligarchy admits to this three per cent in fact cut all ties with their class so they can loyally serve big business. Those American politicians from a "lower middle class" background who made it big,

such as Harry Truman (a former jewelry dealer), Hubert Humphrey (a druggist's son), Henri Kissinger (a university professor), Jimmy Carter (a peanut farmer), and Ronald Reagan (a former actor), have always remembered who put them in their high government office. The composition of this three per cent in the ruling élite is always in a state of flux, whereas several generations of Rockefellers, Fords, Morgans, Duponts, Mellons, and many other billionaires and millionaires continue to hold dominant positions in American political and economic life.

Manipulation of elections is one of the ruling class' most common ways of controlling access to power. American corporations set up "political action committees", through which they finance the election to Congress of the candidates they support and require. The role of these committees and of money in the US electoral process is growing rapidly. Whereas in 1974 there were 89 such committees, and corporations donated \$12 million to candidates for campaign expenses, in 1978 there were 1,500 political action committees, and corporate donations rose to \$64 million.

A candidate for US Congress has to finance his own election campaign. It is little wonder then that 85 per cent of US Congressmen come from the big and middle bourgeoisie (entrepreneurs, bankers, big farmers, etc.). The remaining 15 per cent are the so-called professionals (teachers, journalists, etc.). People call the US Senate a "millionaires' club", since every third senator has assets of over a million dollars.

Thus American ruling class represents itself and

defends its interests in the country's legislative and executive bodies.

Since World War II, the top US financial oligarchy has initiated the formation of various business groups like the Business Council, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Economic Development Administration, and the Trilateral Commission, through which they influence political life in both the United States and other capitalist countries. These groups choose people for high government office, and work out recommendations for the administration. The Trilateral Commission, founded in 1973 on the initiative and money of the Rockefellers and Fords, is especially notorious because on it are representatives of the business and political élite of the United States, the leading West European countries, and Japan. The Commission has become international corporate board of the bourgeoisie whose job is to maintain and strengthen imperialist positions in the world. In fact, it put people like Jimmy Carter, Walter Mondale, Cyrus Vance, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and other past and present US officials on the US political map. The US financial oligarchy is the determining political force in charting the nation's strategy, which it implements via its representatives in government, thereby effectively controlling American foreign policy.

Over the past 35 years, three major financial oligarchy groups involving the Morgans, Rockefellers and Fords, were the foundation of the entire mechanism of class control of American foreign policy. These three groups also act on behalf of other East-coast

financial groups based around Wall Street. When Ronald Reagan became US President, these groups were joined by big capital from the West coast. By their dominant positions in US economy, these groups virtually control government foreign policy. They have used their "foundations" to establish and fund an extensive network of research institutions, which develop foreign policy doctrines that meet the interests of US monopolies and financial groups. These foundations are also used to train people for posts in government agencies and to control them.

The Council on Foreign Relations is the most important of the monopoly organisations that influence US policy. It both works out and endorses the basic strategic doctrines of US imperialism developed by other institutions. Control of the implementation in American foreign policy of the doctrines adopted by the Council is exercised by the Council and funded by the above-mentioned "foundations".

The Council on Foreign Relations has developed all the key foreign policy doctrines of US imperialism of the past 30 years, and all had an anti-communist and anti-Soviet thrust. The Council's basic objectives and purposes, officially formulated by the Council itself, already shows that the principal point in elaborating American foreign policy is the need to provide a single class approach, notwithstanding any party disagreements and changes.

Now, what are these purposes and objectives? In the first place, to forecast and chart the problems that may face US foreign policy tomorrow. Second, to exclude the possibility of the kind of inter-party

conflicts which may negatively affect US foreign policy. Third, to ensure continuity of foreign policy irrespective of administration. And, fourth, to ensure the implementation of the Council's ideological tenets and decisions in US politics.

One of the Council's main purposes is to forecast US foreign policy 10-15 years ahead. Accordingly, a programme of foreign policy measures has been elaborated for the United States and its allies.

The US government usually institutes Council policy, although the latter is not an official government body. The Council once felt it was good policy to strengthen NATO and at the end of the 1970s, the NATO leadership, under American pressure, decided to step up the arms race. When in January 1980 the former US President, Jimmy Carter, postponed ratification of SALT-2, it was not simply his idea, but the decision of the US financial oligarchy, the country's real master.

The following examples are indicative of the role and impact of various centres developing foreign policy doctrines on US foreign policy.

In 1968, the Brookings Institution developed a programme for a "settlement" in the Middle East which envisaged that Israeli troops remain at the "cease-fire lines", i.e. on Arab lands seized by the Israelis in 1967. It also recommended that a Mideast peace settlement be delayed, and that separate tasks were possible and necessary. The foreign policies of former US Presidents Nixon and Ford were exactly in line with these recommendations.

In 1976, the Brookings Institution developed a new

programme for an "overall" settlement of the Mideast problem which suggested finding Palestinians with whom an "agreement" could be reached. The Carter administration adopted this programme: it started looking for "trustworthy Palestinians", undermining the positions of the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), and sponsoring separate deals between Egypt and Israel. The result was the Camp David agreements.

The Brookings Institution supplies not only "ideas" but also personnel for the US State Department.

Since World War II, the role of the military-industrial complex has grown immensely in US foreign policy making. In regard to its influence on American executive and legislative bodies, the military-industrial complex has become an autonomous entity within the United States.

The US military-industrial complex controls a whole series of government departments and agencies, including the Energy Resources Council, the Department of Commerce, the Treasury, and the Central Intelligence Agency. Big business and the Pentagon exchange personnel. Every year, thousands of former senior officers and generals are appointed corporate executives, while representatives of the financial oligarchy are sent to the Pentagon. Banker Robert Lovett, General Motors President Charles Wilson, banker Thomas Gates, and Ford Motor Co. President Robert S. MacNamara have all been US Secretaries of Defense, while former Bechtel Corporation Vice-President Caspar W. Weinberger is the present incumbent.



On retirement, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe Alexander Haig was instantly appointed President of United Technologies, a company manufacturing aerospace equipment, whose bosses were convinced that would help boost sales to the Pentagon.

In recent years, the US military-industrial circles have had an increasing number of their spokesman elected to US Congress; the result is that the "hawks" have become a lot louder, and have forced through Congress higher appropriations for military spending. Besides, relying on their close ties with the Pentagon and the arms manufacturers, the "hawks" play a major role in shaping US foreign policy and military-political strategy, and in stimulating anti-Soviet campaigns. Right-wing senators like Henry Jackson, Barry Goldwater, John G. Tower, Strom Thurmond and Sam Nunn were the main initiators in torpedoing several Soviet-American agreements, and in sabotaging ratification of SALT-2 by the Senate. A joint letter by "hawkish" senators to President Jimmy Carter played a rather important role in the administration's decision to adopt a five-year (1979-1984) programme for further militarization.

The US financial oligarchy and the military-industrial complex exercise total sway of American foreign policy.

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) set up in 1945 plays a special role in political and economic expansion. This major Western financial organisation, which is under complete control of the US financial oligarchy, has become a powerful imperialist

instrument for imposing on other countries a policy to suit Washington. US representatives hold key executive posts in the IMF, whose resolutions are primarily designed to meet US interests; in fact, the United States can veto any project. Under the IMF Charter, the member-countries must give the IMF leadership detailed information on their economic status. Financial aid is given only to states which agree to reduce their government expenditures on social needs and abolish import controls. In that case, foreign monopolies get unlimited access to their markets and undermine their national economies, causing inflation, unemployment, and poverty. Such are the results of imperialism's international economic policy.

The class character of US foreign policy manifests itself explicitly in the military adventures which US imperialism has undertaken in various areas of the globe; in US support for anti-popular dictatorships in Chile, Paraguay, South Korea, and El Salvador, and for the racist regime of South Africa, the aggressive Zionist circles in Israel, and reactionary forces in the Middle East. It can also be seen from the subversive actions against the socialist countries, specifically against Cuba and Poland; from US financial and military aid for training terrorist groups in Pakistan for use against Afghanistan and India; and from stepping up the arms race. The imperialist class stand of major Western powers is vividly seen in their approach to limiting the arms race and achieving general and complete disarmament. It is seen in the US position at the Soviet-American talks on limiting

strategic armaments; in the Western countries' negative approach at the Vienna talks on reducing armed forces and armaments in Central Europe; and in the approach to the problem of disarmament as a whole. Imperialism is doing all it can to turn back the wheel of history, to slow down the transition of new states to progressive, socialist development, and to preserve its supremacy and class interests in those countries.

American propaganda loudly proclaims that US foreign policy is based on the principles of "freedom", "justice", "human rights", etc. Horst Schmitt, Chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin exposed this political demagoguery for what it is when he pointed out that it is the capitalist countries who define human rights and human dignity, and the very basic human right to work. There are over 10 million unemployed in the United States plus the fact that racial discrimination is common in hiring and firing.

It is utterly galling that those who only recently wanted to bomb Vietnam into the Stone Age, those who engineered the fascist coup in Chile and openly support racist South Africa, try to pose as champions of human rights.

The "ban on professions" in West Germany and the terrorist policy of Britain's Tory government in Northern Ireland are wanton violations of civil rights and freedoms. The aggressiveness of imperialism displayed itself in American support for Great Britain in its conflict with Argentina over the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, and in open US inter-

vention in El Salvador designed to stifle the aspiration of this small Central American country for freedom. The two faces of American policy are evident in regard to the people of Palestine, in the US aggression in Grenada, and in the establishment of hundreds of military bases thousands of kilometres from American shores. All these examples show that the objectives and principles of the domestic and foreign policies of the socialist and capitalist countries are polar opposites.

The activities of the CPSU and the Soviet government on the international scene are accompanied by the active participation of broad sections of the working people. They feature a genuinely principled class approach and honesty. Lenin pointed out that "honesty in politics is the result of strength; hypocrisy is the result of weakness".<sup>1</sup>

It would be wrong, however, to equate the USSR's class approach to foreign policy with sectarianism, political narrow-mindedness and unawareness of the need to join forces in the fight for peace, detente and social progress.

In the pursuit of its foreign policy the CPSU involves in the struggle for detente and democratic objectives those who are really interested in peaceful co-existence, in fighting against imperialism and war. That is why the USSR supports the non-aligned movement.

The CPSU and the Soviet government do not treat all capitalist countries alike. The Soviet Union

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, 1974, p. 166.

has good-neighbourly, and friendly relations based on mutual advantage with Finland. It has for several years maintained relations covering many areas of interest with France, West Germany, Italy and other capitalist countries. At the same time, the USSR has no relations with extremely reactionary, anti-popular, fascist, dictatorial or racist regimes which pursue aggressive foreign policies, such as South Africa and Israel. The class approach has enabled the USSR to correctly determine its policy towards rulers who, having illegally usurped state power suppress freedom and democracy in their countries, e.g., in Chile, Paraguay, etc. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has normal and mutually advantageous relations with countries where reactionary fascist regimes have been overthrown, such as Spain and Portugal.

## CHAPTER 5

# THE PARTY SPIRIT IN GUIDING SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

### *Basic Features of the Communist Party Spirit*

The class approach of the Soviet Union to international politics manifests itself fully in the policy of the Communist Party. The CPSU, being the vanguard of the working class and all the people and understanding the laws of social development, is the best able of all to elaborate the domestic and foreign policies of the Soviet Union. The practical activities of the CPSU embody the basic Leninist postulate on the leading role of the Communist Party: "No important political or organisational question is decided by any state institution in our republic without the guidance of the Party's Central Committee."<sup>1</sup> This principle is proclaimed in Article 6 of the Constitution of the USSR, which says: "The Communist Party, armed with Marxism-Leninism, determines the general perspectives of the development of society and the course of the home and foreign policy of the USSR, directs the great constructive work of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned, systematic and theoretically substantiated character to their struggle for the victory of communism."

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 47-48.

The genuine communist approach runs through everything the USSR does on the international scene; in this sense those critics of Soviet foreign policy who reproach it for partiality and open sympathies for liberation movements are absolutely right. The USSR does not hide the fact that its policy is imbued with genuine communist spirit. In fact, those who under the guise of an "objective" and "impartial" approach attempt to pursue a class imperialist policy are guilty of concealing their own class approach.

In his analysis of the essence of bourgeois politics, Lenin decried the groundlessness of the claims of those who say that their objectivist approach is not a class position and implies no support of any political party; and that they stand "outside politics", outside the class struggle and act from "non-class" positions. "The non-party principle in bourgeois society is merely a hypocritical, disguised, passive expression of adherence to the party of the well-fed, of the rulers, of the exploiters.

"The non-party idea is a bourgeois idea. The party idea is a socialist idea."<sup>1</sup>

Neutralism has no place in the acute political struggle between opposing classes in bourgeois society. Lenin's demand for a genuine communist approach forces people to make a conscious choice, and in assessing a given event to side openly with a definite class or classes, with definite social groups. Communists take the position of the working class, of all

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, 1965, p. 79.

the working people, while bourgeois parties take a bourgeois position. Of course, the proletarian, communist spirit and the bourgeois partisanship are totally opposite. Underlining the class nature of the Party's political struggle, Lenin wrote: "In a society based upon class divisions, the struggle between the hostile classes is bound, at a certain stage of its development, to become a political struggle. The most purposeful, most comprehensive and specific expression of the political struggle of classes is the struggle of parties."<sup>1</sup>

It is the communist spirit reflecting the very essence of socialist ideology and politics, that imparts a socialist character to the domestic and foreign policies of the CPSU. No wonder, Lenin bent such importance to this principle and urged to strictly see to it that the Party spirit be implemented not in word, but in deed.

To counterbalance bourgeois objectivism, the Marxist-Leninist Party spirit orients to profound analysis of social and class contradictions, to revealing the fundamental class interests upheld by a given political party.

An analysis of the domestic and foreign policies of capitalist countries unmask those political and government figures, scholars and diplomats who try to deceive the people by talking on and on about the "supra-party" nature of their states.

The American mass media, for instance, pretend that the Democratic and Republican parties, which

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 79.



succeed each other at the helm of power in America, not only pursue fundamentally different foreign policies, but will always rise above partisan politics in the interests of the nation. In fact, however, the domestic and foreign policies of both parties, like those of the governments they form, fiercely protect the class interests of US monopoly capital.

Something very similar can also be observed in Great Britain, where the Conservative and Labour parties also periodically replace each other at the helm of power. Despite the fact that the Conservatives do not conceal their affiliation with big capital and Labour declares itself a "workers" party there is no great difference between their home and foreign policies; both actually serve the capitalist class and pursue a policy welcome to the latter. This is evidenced by an analysis of British policy during Conservative and Labour rule. For instance, the home and foreign policy of the Tory Government under Margaret Thatcher, the "iron lady", is wholly directed at supporting the arms race and increasing tensions.

The British Conservative government is obediently echoing the most reactionary aspirations of the American ruling élite. Secure that aid and support would be forthcoming from its senior partner, the British government in 1982 invaded the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands, thousands of miles away from Britain. The Reagan administration ignored its commitments under a joint defence treaty with Argentina and backed its principal NATO ally to the hilt; so now the Tory government is turning the islands

into an important British air and sea base. This is a convincing example of how the imperialist states and their ruling political parties disregard even the most elementary standards of international law when their class interests deem it necessary.

The fundamental qualitative difference between socialist foreign policy and the foreign policy of the capitalist countries is that the first is based on the interests of the working class and all the working people. This is why the USSR is the most determined and consistent advocate of peace, and is doing everything it can to end the arms race so it can channel the money it is now compelled to spend on defence into improving people's living standards. The starting point of the genuine communist approach to foreign policy has always been this basic requirement—everything in the name of man, everything for the welfare of man—a requirement consistently fulfilled through Communist Party guidance of all state activities on the international scene, and of the entire system of foreign policy and foreign trade bodies.

*The Specifics of CPSU Activities in  
the Sphere of International Relations*

Foreign policy is a specific realm of Party leadership. Yet, in this area, too, the CPSU leadership is based on a number of general principles that guide the activity of the ruling Communist Party. These principles are obligatory for all Party organisations operating in various sectors of public life, for all

Party bodies. They have been repeatedly tested in practice, and not only do they largely predetermine the forms, methods and mechanism of Party activities, but also impart them the necessary stability, consistency, and predictability. In this sense, democratic centralism and collective leadership, and Leninist principles in selecting, placing and educating personnel, have basic significance in Party activities relating to Soviet foreign policy.

Foreign policy decisions are made in a very responsible way because the CPSU stands firm on the principles of democratic centralism: all leading Party bodies are elected, from bottom to top; Party bodies are answerable to their Party organisations and to higher bodies; strict Party discipline and subordination of the minority to the majority; and decisions by higher bodies are strictly binding on lower bodies. The people most deserving are promoted to Party leadership and, hence, to leadership of foreign policy, and what they do is under constant Party control.

The principle of unity of democracy and centralism in the CPSU's guidance of Soviet foreign policy is as immutable as that of its guidance of other realms of state and social life. However, guidance of the state's foreign policy is entrusted exclusively to central Party bodies.

The special accent on centralism in Party guidance of Soviet foreign policy is due to the fact that international relations are a complex and fluctuating phenomena: all foreign policy decisions are extremely crucial and entail a great deal of responsibility.

ty, and have to be taken quickly, on the basis of the most accurate assessment of the alignment and balance of political forces and the possible implications of every decision.

Hence the need for making the adoption of responsible Party decisions, the competence of central Party bodies. Supervision by a single centre permits to most effectively guide and co-ordinate the multi-form activities of various government bodies in implementing the Party's general line in foreign policy. That is why Party organisations of government bodies responsible for Soviet foreign policy are directly subordinated to the CC CPSU, and Party organisations of similar bodies in the constituent republics to their respective Communist Party central committees. Local Party bodies supervise these Party organisations only in admittance of new members and in inner-Party work.

Centralised Party leadership of Soviet foreign policy has become established practice. This, however, does not totally relegate democratic principles to a minor role; on the contrary, the Party seeks to use democratic methods to the fullest extent possible in its guidance of Soviet foreign policy. Even in the initial years of the Soviet state during the very difficult period of the 1918 German invasion, and when an acute inner-Party struggle was going on over whether or not to sign the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, Lenin considered it possible and necessary to solicit the opinion of local Party and Soviet organs, and of rank-and-file Communists and Soviet workers.

A genuinely democratic basis for planning Soviet

foreign policy has evolved through detailed discussions on relevant issues at Party congresses and CC plenary meetings. The respective republican, territorial, regional, city, district, and local Party organisations, and the very broad masses of rank-and-file Communists, also do their bit in charting and assessing Soviet foreign policy.

The CC CPSU and its Politbureau constantly inform Party organisations and, through them, all Communists, about their activities in international politics. Also, the CPSU consults regularly with broad sections of its most active members, and reports on its foreign policy activities to Party congresses of democratically elected delegates from all Party organisations of the respective union and autonomous republics, territories and regions. The results of CPSU congresses and CC plenary meetings and their resolutions on foreign policy issues are brought to the attention of Party members, and are widely discussed by all the working people of the USSR.

The CPSU guides Soviet foreign policy on strict principles of collective decision-making. This means that foreign policy decisions at Party congresses, CC plenary meetings, and Politbureau meetings are made exclusively through free, responsible, collective discussion with the opinion of every participant taken into consideration. This makes it possible to acquire the knowledge of experts and to approach any foreign policy issue comprehensively and competently.

Observance of the principle of collective leadership guarantees the Party against one-sided and un-

grounded decisions, and against subjectivism and voluntarism, which are particularly dangerous in international politics, an area affecting the fate of millions.

The 24th, 25th and 26th CPSU congresses, having reaffirmed the Party's firm adherence to the Leninist principle of collective Party leadership, gave new stimuli for its further implementation. The 26th Party Congress specifically emphasised the role of Party congresses and CC plenary meetings in charting the Party's general line. It gave major attention to the Party's and government's activities on the international scene, and to scientifically analysing from class, Party positions the major processes of world development. The same is also characteristic of local Party organisations. At Party election meetings held all over the country prior to and after the 26th CPSU Congress, Communists, as usual, actively discussed the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet government and unanimously approved the political line and practical activities of the CC CPSU and its Politbureau in implementing the Party's Peace Programme.

Important foreign policy issues are regularly discussed at CC CPSU plenary meetings. Between the 25th and 26th Party congresses, the Politbureau held 236 meetings, many of which concentrated on foreign policy issues. The points on the agenda are carefully discussed beforehand in the respective ministries, government agencies, research institutes, and CC CPSU departments. Their spectrum is exceptionally broad, and many of them are increasingly com-

plex. For this reason, the Politbureau, when it feels necessary, will set up special commissions that will comprehensively study and generalise new tendencies and phenomena appearing on the international scene, and also provide counsel on taking proper and timely measures. The fact that information about Politbureau meetings and their decisions appears regularly in the Soviet press shows that all the activities of the Party's highest bodies are made public knowledge. Such information provides a clear view of the very essence of foreign policy issues that are the special concern of the ruling Communist Party.

The CC CPSU Secretariat gives constant attention to Soviet foreign policy. Between the 25th and 26th Party congresses alone, it held 250 meetings, at which virtually all current issues of Party work were discussed. Major attention was given to selecting diplomatic and other international relations personnel, and to organising and controlling the implementation of foreign policy decisions.

A combination of Party and Government leadership is a specific feature of Soviet foreign policy, one practised broader than in any other sector. A flexible amalgamation of the Soviet (government) and Party leadership was considered by Lenin a tremendous source in managing socialist society and the state. In his view "such an amalgamation has been very beneficial in the case of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, where it was brought about at the very beginning".<sup>1</sup> Today, too, this com-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 495.

bination fully proves its value. In Soviet political practice, the combination of Soviet and Party leadership has nothing to do with mechanical concatenation or with identification of Party and Soviet functions.

The CPSU, its Central Committee and its Politbureau are primarily concerned with basic issues, with selecting and assigning personnel, and with controlling the activities of state bodies dealing with international politics. The everyday work of Soviet personnel stationed abroad is supervised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Trade, the State Committee for Economic Ties with Foreign Countries, and other appropriate state bodies.

CPSU leaders directly participate in multilateral and bilateral meetings and talks with leaders of socialist countries, and with presidents, prime-ministers, and many other government, political and public officials from capitalist and developing countries.

Contacts with the leadership of the Socialist International, the CPSU's participation in the 1978 World Conference on Disarmament it sponsored, and CC CPSU contacts with the Socialist International's Study Group on disarmament are of great significance. The CPSU's ties with the socialist and social-democratic parties of Finland, Belgium, Sweden, Japan, Spain, and other countries have been extended. There were 123 delegations of communist, workers', national-democratic, and other parties and organisations from 109 countries at the 26th CPSU Congress.



Thus, the CPSU not only elaborates the general direction of Soviet foreign policy and determines the principal directions of the USSR's activity on the international scene, but is also directly involved in the decision-making on many practical questions.

## CHAPTER 6

# SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

### *The Theoretical Basis of Soviet Foreign Policy*

The class and genuine communist approach taken by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to foreign policy leadership is organically linked to a scientific approach based on Marxist-Leninist theory.

Lenin's works exemplify this approach to the study of socio-political processes and events in international life. Lenin's understanding of the laws of social development allowed him not only to foresee the general outlines of the basic directions that history would proceed, but to precisely determine the class essence and objectives of the policies of individual countries.

The CPSU's scientific approach to international relations involves several components, the most important being historical materialism (the theory of socio-economic structures, laws governing the historical process, principal tendencies of social development, etc.). From this viewpoint, international relations are regarded as a single system with its own objective logic of development and specific laws and features.

The foreign policy of the USSR is based on the economic laws of social development; it takes into

account the state of the global economy as a whole and the economic situations of various social systems and individual countries.

A scientific approach to foreign policy and international relations presupposes knowledge and creative application of the theory of the class struggle of the proletariat and the theory of socialist revolution; of the social and political laws of building socialism and communism; and of the world revolutionary process as a whole. These are the principal components, whose application to international developments is the essence of the Party's and state's scientific approach to foreign policy.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of international relations and socialist foreign policy is thus based on Marxist-Leninist philosophy, political economy, and theory of scientific communism. These components of the general theoretic and methodological foundation make it possible to correctly analyse and deal with any specific policy issue. Without a scientific foundation of this kind, a correct approach to specific questions would be virtually impossible.

In exercising Party guidance of foreign policy, the CPSU takes into account the fact that the subjects of international relations are of different classes. Because of this, the degree of conscious influence on those relations depends on the nature and real force of the social systems involved. In principle, capitalism, because of its specific objective laws, restricts the possibility of consciously governing international relations.

The capitalist countries feature the market ele-

ment, anarchy, and competition—all based fundamentally on private ownership of the means of production and on the exploitation of man by man, the factors which determine how and why all spheres of social life under capitalism are directed. These factors also influence the emergence and development of capitalist international relations.

Throughout the entire history of capitalism, the ruling classes of the leading capitalist powers have tried to control and regulate them in their own interests, and to dictate their will to other nations and states while competing without mercy among themselves. The foreign policies of the imperialist power were and are still based on the principles of diktat, violence, domination, and subjugation.

With the advent of the era of transition from capitalism to socialism the situation changed. Socialist society, based on public ownership of the means of production and on the unity of class interests, is scientifically managed, and this is one of the basic differences distinguishing it from capitalist society. *The market element, anarchy and competition are superseded by scientific and systematically organised management.* Socialist society is characterised by conscious and purposeful use of the subjective factor, this showing primarily in the influence of the Marxist-Leninist Party on the entire system of social relations in general and on foreign policy in particular.

With the establishment of socialism, conditions also appear for gradually restructuring and consciously influencing the entire system of international re-

lations. As Lenin pointed out, "the Bolsheviks are establishing completely different international relations which make it possible for all oppressed peoples to rid themselves of the imperialist yoke."<sup>1</sup>

As socialism develops and consolidates, there are greater and greater possibilities for purposefully influencing the development of international relations in the spirit of equality and respect for national independence and sovereignty. In consciously developing their relations on the basis of strict observance of these general democratic principles of peaceful co-existence and, at the same time, on the principle of socialist internationalism, the socialist countries have created exemplary relations which increasingly influence the entire system of current international relations.

The nature of imperialism has not changed, of course, and it continues to be a source of peace-endangering trends that stem from its aggressive essence. Yet, the sphere of imperialist policy is steadily narrowing. Due to the continuing changes in the alignment of world forces in favour of socialism, increasingly more states are becoming involved in peaceful co-existence.

Proceeding from this tendency, some scholars suggest scientific management of the entire system of international relations as a possibility. In our view, however, this seems to be premature. Today, when the international scene is the area of an acute struggle between two opposing social systems, and when

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 477.

the international community is made up of many countries which have different social systems, and that most of these countries are still capitalist, it is somewhat unrealistic to speak of scientific management of international relations.

The CPSU bases its guidance of Soviet foreign policy on a profound study of the phenomena of social life and of the practice of the broad masses of the working people. The need for such an approach stems from the principle of objectivity, which is the foundation of scientific management of any kind.

In its guidance of Soviet foreign policy, the CPSU constantly takes into consideration a major factor: the balance of world forces.

Thanks to its tremendous manpower and material resources, imperialism long dominated international politics.

However, as the USSR became stronger, the balance of forces between socialism and capitalism changed in favour of socialism. The USSR's growing economic, political, and military strength; its successes in cultural development; the consolidation of the moral and political unity and friendship of the Soviet peoples; and the comprehensive advance and consolidation of the USSR's constituent republics became factors which imperialism was increasingly compelled to reckon with. The efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet state on the international scene was of great significance in consolidating socialism; it was also of great significance for the struggle to create a broad anti-war, anti-fascist front, and support for the world revolutionary movement. Yet, the bal-

ance of forces that had evolved by the late 1930s was insufficient to prevent World War II.

The crushing defeat in 1945 of Nazi Germany and militarist Japan resulted in fundamental qualitative changes in the balance of forces. The emergence of the world socialist system, the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism and the unprecedented upsurge of the international communist and workers' movement, all resulted in profound shifts in world development.

The successes of the socialist community countries in building a new society, the further consolidation of their unity and cohesion, and their alliance with all world progressive forces add up to the prestige and influence of world socialism and further changes in its favour in the balance of world forces. This has made it possible for the socialist countries to exercise a growing influence on the course of world events, and to restrict the sphere of action and potential of the aggressive circles of imperialism. World socialism has already blocked several imperialist attempts to forcibly prevent many countries from choosing their own way of development. This can be seen from the determined support and assistance given by the USSR and other fraternal countries to the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea in their struggle against US aggression, and also from their aid to the peoples of Cuba, Angola, Ethiopia, Afghanistan and other countries to enable them to defend their revolutionary gains.

A comprehensive approach to international devel-

opments constitutes a substantial element in their analysis, in charting a scientifically-based policy. This is moreover essential because international ties are becoming increasingly diverse and closely interrelated. This is fully characteristic of the economic, political and cultural ties of the USSR and other socialist countries among themselves and with capitalist and developing states.

No major international issue can be considered objectively if the totality of factors involved in the current international situation, and the domestic and foreign policies of many countries are not taken into consideration. This comprehensive scientific approach to international issues is a feature of political forums like international meetings of communist and workers' parties, meetings of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, and congresses of Marxist-Leninist parties.

Recognition of the fact that all the components and factors of international relations are related and essentially comprehensive is an inherent part of the Marxist-Leninist approach to society as a large, complex and dynamic system. The significance of a systems approach is that it regards society as a living organism developing according to its own laws, an organism whose components are closely correlated.

The foreign policy of any one capitalist country cannot be correctly understood if evaluated outside the world capitalist system, and outside the domestic policy it pursues. Lenin wrote: "Every people



lives in a state, and every state belongs to a system of states, which are in a certain system of political equilibrium in relation to one another."<sup>1</sup>

Lenin's systems approach to foreign policy and international relations was based on an analysis of the socio-economic nature of the state, and of its belonging to a given historical formation. This enabled him not only to characterise the domestic and foreign policies of individual countries, but also to reveal certain laws and relationships, to assess the balance of class forces on the international arena in the economic, military and political realms, to make scientific forecasts.

When he turned his attention to international relations, Lenin applied the concepts "system of international relations" and "system of states". Figuring in his works is also the concept regional "system of states".<sup>2</sup> Lenin's systems approach to the analysis of international relations and foreign policy is of great methodological and political significance. One of the principles of the current Marxist-Leninist theory on foreign policy is that international relations are considered in their totality.

The current world system of international relations is a complex structure and involves various types and forms of relationships. This is primarily because the transition from capitalism to socialism the world is now experiencing involves the opposing

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 442.

<sup>2</sup> See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, 1976, p. 273.

socialist and capitalist systems, each with its inherent complex system of international relations and their inherent socio-political forms. Scholars also distinguish regional systems of international relations among the countries of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Given this differentiation, it is necessary to determine the criteria for distinguishing subsystems with the general system of international relations. Fyodor Burlatsky says, for instance, that the criteria are socio-class, socio-economic, socio-cultural and regional factors, implying that countries can be grouped together on the basis of one of those factors. He considers that in many cases, groups and coalitions of states arise because of several of these criteria.<sup>1</sup> It seems sound enough to agree, in line with Burlatsky, that the socio-class factor is the principal criterion for determining existing international subsystems in today's world. This makes it possible to distinguish the socio-class structural units that reflect the current differentiation of countries in accordance with their socio-economic system and the level and orientation of their social and political development. This approach makes it possible to distinguish the following socio-class structural units within the system of international relations involving: (a) socialist countries; (b) indus-

---

<sup>1</sup> See: F. M. Burlatsky, "On a Systems Approach to the Study of Foreign Policy." In: *International Relations, Politics, and the Individual*, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 25 (in Russian).

trial capitalist countries; and (c) developing countries. This classification obviously reflects to a larger measure the alignment of forces in today's world, and we believe that because of this it can be taken as a basis.

The concept of an integral system is defined in science "as a totality of objects whose interaction determines the presence of new integrative qualities not inherent in its components."<sup>1</sup> The modern system of international relations is the reflection of this totality, or a developing integrity, with its intrinsic laws of origin, change, and development, with its intrinsic mechanism, and structural ties between components.

Given the need of a systems approach when examining any given system, one has to study its structure, external links, limits and environment, and establish the way in which it functions. Based on a study of the properties of the components of a system and their characteristic relationships, as well as of the conditions and specific features of the system's origin and development, one can determine its features, properties, and functional characteristics.

The Soviet state's foreign policy and Party guidance of it are so broad and diverse that they are the subject of study of an entire series of social sciences, including philosophy, scientific communism, theory of international relations, history of diplo-

---

<sup>1</sup> V. G. Afanasyev, *The Systems Approach and Society*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1980, p. 24 (in Russian).

macy, international law, theory of government and law, party building, etc.

The following fact alone enables one to judge the diversity of the CPSU's and the Soviet state's activities on the international scene: the Soviet Union is a signatory to over 10,000 international treaties and agreements, and its activity on the international scene encompasses an enormous range of economic, political, military, scientific, cultural, and other bilateral and multilateral ties governed by international law and developing on the basis of definite international conventions. Yet, despite all the diversity of the Soviet government's activity on the international scene, it is characterised by intrinsic unity, correlation and interaction of all aspects.

The close connection between Soviet domestic and foreign policies is ensured by the leading and guiding activity of the Communist Party, and by the system of state authority and administration. The national character of the CPSU and the Soviet state decisively determines the orientation and essence of Soviet foreign policy, and its subordination to the interests of the people.

At the same time, in analysing Soviet foreign policy, one must take into consideration that the USSR's international relations, being part of the system of world international relations, are in constant interaction with the latter. The CPSU invariably accounts for the further consolidation of socialism's positions, the deepening general crisis of the world capitalist system, the growth of the in-

ternational working-class liberation struggle, the successes of the communist and national liberation movements, the mounting activity of the broad masses in the struggle for peace, democracy and social progress, and for many other factors, and this is correspondingly reflected in Soviet foreign policy.

But politics is not only a science. Lenin made the apt point that "politics is a science and an art"<sup>1</sup>, and in this sense "is more like algebra than arithmetic, and still more like higher than elementary mathematics"<sup>2</sup>, and urged leading cadres to master the art of socialist politics.

Naturally, bourgeois or, rather, imperialist policy is also an "art", but of a different sort. It is aimed at preserving everywhere the system of capitalist exploitation, class and national oppression and plunder of other peoples.

Now, socialist foreign policy, which has no need to conceal its aims or to resort to blackmail, pressure, threats, and/or "secret" diplomacy, is based on completely different objectives and methods. Soviet foreign policy is a direct and honest policy; it threatens no one, and its purposes are clear to all honest people on earth.

The CPSU's political guidance of Soviet foreign policy combines a scientific approach and political art, the ability to respond to all current developments swiftly and flexibly.

Lenin was an outstanding politician, scholar and

---

<sup>1</sup> V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 80.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 102.

revolutionary, a consummate master of all forms of political activity, including diplomacy. In his memoirs, Georgy Chicherin, the first Soviet People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, noted: "Lenin instantly grasped the essence of every question and instantly interpreted it in the broadest political sense; he always provided a most brilliant analysis of the current diplomatic situation, and his counsel (not infrequently he momentarily offered the text of a reply to another government) could serve as examples of diplomatic art and flexibility." He said further: "In his daily telephone conversations, Lenin gave me the most accurate advice, displaying wonderful flexibility and an amazing ability to avert the opponent's blows."<sup>1</sup>

Lenin understood the most complex, the most involved and, often exceptionally dramatic and tense situations and intricacies of the class struggle with amazing quickness, enabling him to instantly find correct solutions and flexibly change his tactics. Lenin's art of political leadership was based on his powerful scientific erudition and on his ability to penetrate the very core of the innermost processes and to reveal the basic trends of social development. Lenin's very rich revolutionary experience, his high political culture, acumen, and rare political intuition were the sources of his political art. The qualities distinguishing Lenin as a politician were audacity, determination, a principled approach and,

---

<sup>1</sup> G. V. Chicherin, *Lenin and Foreign Policy*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1977, pp. 4, 8 (in Russian).

at the same time, political level-headedness, realism, and the ability to scientifically foresee the development of events. Lenin had a profound knowledge of the mentality and aspirations of various classes and social strata.

Various social and political forces involving classes, parties, social groups, their leaders, etc. interact and counteract in politics. Because of this, the realisation of any programme, plan or project, as well as the choice of the best possible decision in each concrete situation, are always questionable to a certain extent.

Since dozens of intersecting variables are involved, it is impossible, as Lenin pointed out, to foresee, calculate and envisage everything. Even so, the basic trends of political development are quite stable and can be objectively calculable.

Speaking of combining a scientific approach and political art in Communist Party guidance of Soviet foreign policy, one must note the important role of party and government leaders. In emphasising the decisive role in history of the popular masses, which is now evidenced by the large-scale struggle of the peoples for peace, the Marxist-Leninist doctrine nevertheless does not belittle the role of personalities. In fact, the role of historical personalities in international politics is well seen in Lenin's great services in establishing the Soviet state and in defending and consolidating Soviet government. Today, even bourgeois historiography admits that without Lenin, without his political prevision, without his very extensive erudition, without his foreign policy aimed

at defending the young Soviet State and securing it international recognition and peaceful good-neighbour relations with other peoples, without his principled approach and insistence in signing the Brest Treaty in 1918, the Soviet Republic might have perished.

Determining the main link in the criss-crossing set of problems to be dealt with is one of the key requirements of a scientific approach to politics and a component of the art of Party guidance of foreign policy. Lenin believed that the art of management and policy-making amounts to taking timely account of the principal forces involved and in knowing where to concentrate them.

In the struggle for peace and for the creation of favourable international conditions for building socialism and communism, the Communist Party has had—at every concrete stage, and taking into consideration the changes in the international situation—to determine the basic link in the chain of Soviet foreign policy objectives so that it could deal correctly with the complex set of problems facing the country. During the Russian Civil War and the armed foreign intervention, the link that helped defend and save the young Soviet Republic was the Soviet peace proposal to the bourgeois states; in fact, this proposal heightened inter-imperialist controversies, which the Soviet government took advantage of to ensure that the people's revolutionary gains were not lost. In the early 1920s, once the Civil War and intervention had ended, the decisive link in the chain of Soviet foreign policy objectives



was the establishment of normal, mutually advantageous economic and trade relations with capitalist countries. This helped the country rebuild the war-devastated economy, establish and develop political, diplomatic, cultural and other relations with capitalist countries, and create conditions for peaceful co-existence between the two opposing systems.

In World War II, the main link in Soviet foreign policy was the struggle to create united world anti-fascist front, to organise a collective rebuff to Nazi aggression, and to mobilize all peoples who desired freedom for a struggle that would result in the quickest possible and total defeat and extermination of fascism.

Contemporary scholars regard the question of the main link in terms of strategy and tactics, since "some of these links retain their dominant significance for a long period of time, as they can be said to be the basis of the system's strategic evolution. . . , while others are, in effect, bases of the system's tactical evolution; they advance to the forefront because of definite specific (often transient) circumstances, and may 'co-exist' alongside the strategically significant main links".<sup>1</sup>

If one were to start from these positions, in determining the main link in the CPSU's and the Soviet government's foreign policy in terms of strategy, that link would no doubt be the struggle for

---

<sup>1</sup> V. G. Afanasyev, *Scientific Management of Society*, Politizdat, Moscow, 1973, p. 308 (in Russian).

peace. The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties made the following conclusion: "*The main link of united action of the anti-imperialist forces remains the struggle against war for world peace, against the menace of a thermonuclear world war and mass extermination which continues to hang over mankind.*"<sup>1</sup>

In the struggle for its long- and short-term foreign policy objectives, the USSR has successfully employed forecasting the trends of international development. The experience gained by the CPSU and the Soviet state enables one to say that planning international co-operation is not a utopia, but a quite realistic possibility.

Naturally, planning foreign policy measures has its specific features and complexities. This is basically because, in international relations, it is very difficult and often even impossible to fully consider beforehand the effect of all economic, political, military, and other factors, especially since there are more than 150 countries in the world. One must also bear in mind the alignment and balance of forces between classes and social groups inside those countries, and it is not always easy (because of social revolutions, military coups, the advent to power of other political forces, etc.) to foresee the rapid changes involved.

Given all the difficulties in foreseeing the development of events and the implementation of fo-

---

<sup>1</sup> *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, p. 31.*

reign policy measures planned in advance, it is extremely important that the USSR take a prospective approach to international processes and pursue a purposeful foreign policy. This is necessary because of the great interdependence of socialist home and foreign policies, which requires a great deal of work for creating favourable international conditions for building a new society, especially because the scope of the tasks involved is enormous. This approach is also dictated by the further expansion and deepening of socialist economic integration, and by the fact that the USSR and the fraternal socialist countries are involved in other areas of multilateral and bilateral co-operation. The need for a purposeful and diversified policy is becoming increasingly significant given the vital necessity of consistently implementing a system of measures to strengthen trust between countries with different social systems, to limit armaments, and to provide guarantees for preventing a thermonuclear war, the danger of which has become far greater in recent years as a result of the actions of imperialist circles in the United States and other NATO countries.

Basing their international activities on prospective long-term programmes, the CPSU and the Soviet state supplement and revise them when the need arises.

The socialist countries' successful long-term planning of their economic co-operation is exemplified by the Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Co-operation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration

by the CMEA Member-Countries. The Soviet programme to extend international economic ties is also embodied in the many long-term bilateral co-operation agreements it has entered into with West Germany, France, Japan, Finland, Austria and some other capitalist countries. Here the key significance is long term. One example is the 25-year Agreement on Deepening and Developing Long-Term Co-operation between the USSR and the FRG in the Economic and Industrial Field signed in May 1978.

The purpose of the Soviet programme of economic co-operation with other countries is to expand trade and economic, scientific, and technological ties with socialist, developing, and industrial capitalist countries, and the results are becoming increasingly tangible. The USSR gives special attention to concrete economic projects involving companies from other countries and to economic projects involving the Soviet Union abroad. An example of mutually advantageous co-operation is the construction in the USSR of the Kostomuksha iron ore pellet mill in which Finland participated. And on the other side, the USSR has for a number of years provided assistance to many countries in building nuclear power plants and other facilities.

The policy of long-term international co-operation is also important because it bolsters trust and understanding between people of countries with different socio-political systems, creates the material foundation for détente, and helps protect and consolidate peace.

These are several aspects of the complex and diverse question of a scientific approach to guiding the foreign policy of the USSR. Naturally, it requires further creative elaboration in which the rapidly developing international situation, and new developments in individual countries are considered. This is being done thanks to joint efforts by the fraternal communist and workers' parties, and by Marxist scholars in many countries.

Another reason why a scientific approach to international relations has to be further elaborated is the ferocity of the current ideological struggle around the theoretical issues of international relations.

Recent efforts by bourgeois theory to de-ideologise foreign policy are now increasingly yielding to attempts to put imperialist foreign policy on an ideological and theoretical basis. Statesmen and politicians in imperialist countries are admitting more and more often that they deliberately subordinate their countries' foreign policies to ideological objectives, to the struggle against communism. For example, the purpose of the "human rights" campaign, launched by the former US President Jimmy Carter, was to slander real socialism and at the same time create a "smokescreen" for US expansionist policies in various parts of the world. The "crusade" against communism declared by President Reagan also serves the purpose of fighting real socialism. During the "crusade", aggressive imperialist circles reckon to weaken the position of the socialist countries and, if possible, to undermine socialism as a social system.

Another campaign initiated by Reagan under the false pretext of "fighting terrorism", serves the purpose of suppressing revolutionary movements in the Americas and in other regions of the world. A major task of Soviet foreign policy is to bring these aspirations to naught and to expose the corresponding "theories".

Today, the monopoly bourgeoisie is trying to make academic thought serve imperialist domestic and foreign policies. Monopoly capital will lavishly expend money and resources in search of "super-novel" concepts, which can be presented as alternatives to Marxism-Leninism, hoping they will be more than compensated for all their expenditures and efforts. This involves the huge "brain-drain" into the realm of politics, involving intellectuals to come up with ideas to modernise capitalism, ideas that might consolidate the supremacy of capital, substantiate a corresponding imperialist policy, and contain the liberation movement.

Eytan Gilboa, a bourgeois historian and educator, analysed the relationship between politicians and intellectuals in the making of American foreign policy. This is what he wrote about the role of intellectuals in policy planning: "However, their involvement did not last long, and in the course of the nineteenth century they withdrew from the political arena into a relative seclusion. In the twentieth century, first Theodore Roosevelt and later Franklin D. Roosevelt reintroduced them into the service of the state, but it was not until the election of John F. Kennedy to the Presidency in 1960

that they were given key policy-making positions in defense and foreign affairs.

"... Henry Kissinger as... Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs solidified a new pattern in the relationship between intellectuals and the Government in the United States. This position, which has become a most important one in the foreign-policy-making machinery, has been occupied in the last fifteen years by three prominent intellectuals: McGeorge Bundy, Walt W. Rostow, Henry Kissinger,"<sup>1</sup> (and also Zbigniew Brzezinski).

Gilboa points out that Kissinger, who succeeded in attaining such power and recognition, personified the key role of intellectuals in the US administration, who were increasingly becoming part of the state machinery and ousting career officials. Gilboa believes that at this moment, when the US administration is confronted by increasingly complex issues, it has to make use of intellectuals, and goes on to say: "Most decisions in foreign affairs since 1945 have been controversial and risky. They require judgments... In order to create alibis in advance for possible fiascoes or failures, presidents appreciate the opportunity to argue that the best minds in the country approve their actions."<sup>2</sup> Gilboa has this explanation as to why using intellectuals

---

<sup>1</sup> E. Gilboa, "Intellectuals in the White House and American Foreign Policy". In: *Yale Review*, Vol. LXV, June 1976, No. 4, pp. 481-497.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 487.

in US foreign policy decision-making has not been altogether successful: "The criteria for selecting intellectuals for government service explain why they usually do not challenge established concepts. Those invited to serve with Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford were chosen not just because they were highly knowledgeable people in foreign affairs, but because their basic philosophy and views on American foreign policy were known to be in harmony with those of their Presidents."<sup>1</sup> As a result what these intellectuals have been asked to do—to introduce planning and forecasting into US foreign policy, and to lower the factor of chance—was not accomplished. Moreover, "the foreign policy of the United States has not been, in the last fifteen years, more sophisticated, more moral, more rational, or more coherent than in earlier periods."<sup>2</sup>

A similar conclusion<sup>3</sup> was made by George W. Ball, the former US Undersecretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations, now a business executive, lawyer and contributor of many articles and works on foreign policy issues. In his view, the US State Department has become an ineffective institution where key decisions are made by the Pre-

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 493.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 496.

<sup>3</sup> See: George W. Ball, *Diplomacy for a Crowded World. An American Foreign Policy*, An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown and Company, Boston—Toronto, 1976.



sident and Secretary of State without actually consulting experts, i.e. on the basis of "personal diplomacy", although the State Department and other institutions have hosts of experts on staff.

Ball sees the lack of the important element of morality as a serious vice in US foreign policy. Without morality, he writes, Washington's foreign policy is not understandable to the American people, let alone to the peoples of other countries. But how can that policy be understandable and explainable if the Reagan administration during all the years in power has been continuing to increase international tensions. It has intentionally further aggravated US-Soviet relations, ignoring not only world public opinion, but also sober voices in America itself. This is clearly evident from the decision to deploy in Western Europe Pershing-2 and cruise missiles armed with nuclear warheads, a decision which Washington had imposed on its NATO allies. This is also evident from the new US military build-up programme stipulating for arming American forces with MX supermissiles and other types of nuclear strategic weaponry. These US actions have sharply increased the danger of a fatal nuclear catastrophe. And what about the US President's order to start producing the neutron bomb and developing space weapons? Could it be welcomed by those who dream of peace? No, this decision was adopted counter to the demands of the world public and has caused just anger and indignation the world over.

Washington is stepping up its interference in the internal affairs of other countries. This was shown

by its discriminatory sanctions and subversive activities against socialist Poland, by its continued threats against Cuba, by attempts to overthrow the revolutionary-democratic system in Nicaragua and strangle the liberation movement in El Salvador, and by its support for Israel's aggressive actions against Lebanon and for South Africa's incursions into Angola and Mozambique.

The ruling elite in the United States, Britain, France, and the other NATO countries are still trying to halt the onward march of history, the movement of the human race towards peace and progress. So how can one speak of a "scientific" approach to foreign policy by the major imperialist powers when their policies have long clashed with the objective course of history and irreconcilably contradict the objective laws of social development? The basically erroneous theoretical and methodological foundation of these policies inevitably dooms them to failure.

Significative in this respect is the theoretical concept advanced by Charles R. Beitz, Assistant Professor of political science.<sup>1</sup> In criticizing the ideas and concepts prevalent in the West which are derived from Thomas Hobbes' theory of "bellum omnia contra omnes" (war of everyone against everyone), from Samuel Pufendorf's theory of the "morality of States", and from John Rawls' "theory of justice", Beitz suggests that the present system of international relations be restructured on the basis of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Charles R. Beitz, *Political Theory and International Relations*, Princeton (N. J.), 1979.

the so-called principle of "justice", to which he gives priority over other principles of international relations, including the principles of self-determination and non-intervention in other countries' affairs. He believes that in certain instances, the right to national independence may be ignored, if so required by the principle of justice.<sup>1</sup> In Beitz's view, "only states whose institutions satisfy appropriate principles of justice can legitimately demand to be respected as autonomous sources of ends".<sup>2</sup> In maintaining that not all states have the right to self-determination, he asserts that if the social and political institutions of a state do not meet "appropriate" principles of justice, other countries have the right (!) to interfere in its internal affairs, so that a "just" domestic constitution within that state can be evolved.<sup>3</sup> By doing this, Beitz obviously ignores the basic principles of international relations recognised by most countries, i. e. peaceful co-existence and non-interference in the sovereign affairs of other countries.

This "approach" to international relations would lead to perpetual wars. Given that the concept of "social justice" is profoundly class-biased, and that the capitalists and the working people have a diametrically opposite understanding of "social justice", it is clear that countries with different social systems agreeing on a common approach to the concept of justice would be unrealistic.

---

<sup>1</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 81.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 82.

In rejecting commonly accepted standards of international relations and in making the criterion of "justice" their foundation, Beitz suggests, to say the least, that agreements be concluded on the just redistribution of national resources between countries. But what country would voluntarily agree to surrender its natural right to other countries?

Even more unacceptable to the people of the world are the patently pro-imperialist foreign policy concepts which seek to substantiate the "right" of the United States to "world leadership", to interference in the internal affairs of other countries, and to some kind of exclusiveness and privileges for itself in world affairs. All these concepts contradict the legitimate interests of other peoples.

Today, all theories that claim to justify the existence of certain "special" rights, all the stream of propaganda from imperialist errand boys addressed to revolutionary-liberation movements, and all direct threats by ruling imperialist circles to the socialist countries are bound to fail. The balance of world forces has changed, and the resultant shifts are irrevocable. The onward march of history can not be halted or reversed. The people of the world are no longer willing to accept the predatory foreign policies of imperialist powers; to accept their methods of blackmail, pressure, threats, or interference in their internal affairs; to accept robbery and exploitation. People no longer accept or support the objectives and principles of imperialist policy, or ideas of bourgeois political science,

As reality is indivisible, so is truth. The only genuinely scientific theory is Marxism-Leninism, and the trustworthiness of its conclusions has been confirmed by history.

## CONCLUSION

The discovery by the founders of Marxism of the laws of social development and its motive forces was a real turning point in views on foreign policy and international relations. By showing that economic relations are the foundations of each social system, and that the state and its policy reflect the interests of the classes which possess the principal means of production, Marx and Engels provided the key for analysing international problems.

A class approach based on dialectical materialism to foreign policy showed that foreign policy is organically linked with domestic policy, and made it possible to realistically assess the tendencies of current social processes and prospects for global development.

In their analysis of international events, Marx and Engels developed a system of views on major foreign policy issues; that system formed the fundamental basis of the theory of foreign policy and international relations.

For the first time ever Marxism established that there was a unity of purpose in the class struggle of the proletariat and its tasks in international politics;

revealed the fundamental antagonisms between the foreign policy objectives of the proletariat and those of the bourgeoisie; substantiated the need for the proletariat to counter the aggressive foreign policy of the exploiting classes; and showed the working class' deep concern for peace. Having shown that the national and international tasks of the working class were of a common nature, the founders of Marxism pointed out the tremendous significance of international solidarity of the working people, and indicated the basic goals and principles of the working class and its revolutionary party on the international scene.

Marx and Engels developed a theory of war and peace that elucidated the essence of these complex social phenomena and the class nature of wars, and indicated the ways of ensuring peace and their close relationship with the fight for peace and social progress. They sagaciously predicted that with the triumph of the new social system, the foreign policy of the exploiting classes would be replaced by the socialist foreign policy of the proletariat, under whose influence international relations of a new type would evolve.

The legacy of Marx and Engels was the theoretical and methodological basis for the further elaboration of questions of foreign policy and international relations in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolution, in the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Lenin's theory of imperialism, of socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, of the

proletariat's class allies in the struggle for democracy and socialism, and of the inseparable connection between the struggle for social and national liberation, as well as his theory of building socialism and communism, were instrumental in providing a scientific foundation for an understanding of the broad spectrum of international issues. Lenin's theory was a solid reference point for the young Soviet state, and for the international communist, workers', and national liberation movements.

Lenin put into practice many of the ideas of the founders of Marxism concerning international relations and problems of war and peace; he comprehensively developed and enriched them, creating as he did so a harmonious concept of socialist foreign policy.

It was Lenin who proclaimed and substantiated the basic tenet that peace is the highest ideal and objective of socialism, and the supreme principle of socialist foreign policy. He originated the idea of peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, and proved that observance of peaceful co-existence in international relations is in the interests of the people of all countries.

Lenin's development of the theory of socialist foreign policy and international relations was crucial to the destiny of socialism and peace. In fact, the subsequent successful socialist transformations in the USSR, the victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, the establishment and consolidation of the world socialist system, and the building of developed socialism in the USSR were



all achieved because that theory was pursued and implemented.

The Marxist-Leninist principle of proletarian internationalism has found its concrete and real expression in the establishment of the world socialist community, in the fraternal co-operation between the socialist countries, and in the assistance coming from the socialist world to the national liberation movement.

Ever since Lenin's Decree on Peace was issued in October 1917, the CPSU and the Soviet state have been waging a tireless and determined struggle for peace and for peaceful co-existence between countries with different social systems, a struggle based on equal rights of all countries; respect for their independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; non-interference in other countries' internal affairs; the non-use of force or the threat of force; and mutual benefit.

Since the end of World War II, the USSR has submitted to the world community more than 100 important documents and proposals that would help consolidate international security.

The 40 years without a major war is the result of the policy of peace by the CPSU, the Soviet Union, and the other socialist countries.

Today as well, the Marxist-Leninist principles of a class, genuinely Communist, and scientific approach, peaceful co-existence and proletarian, socialist internationalism are clear reference points for all the many activities of the CPSU and fraternal communist parties on the international scene.

The June (1983) Plenary Meeting of the CC CPSU pointed out: "Our goal is not just to avert war. We are seeking to bring about radical improvements in international relations and to consolidate and develop everything that is good in these relations. We shall press for respect for the sovereign rights of states and peoples and for strict observance of the principles of international law which imperialism is increasingly often trying to discard and trample on.

"In short, in our era it is precisely socialism that is the most consistent defender of the healthy elements in international relations, the defender of the interests of detente and peace, the interests of each people and of all humankind." The stability, consistency, and humanism of Soviet foreign policy have earned it the respect and sympathy of millions of people around the world.

## REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovskiy Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.



# REAL SOCIALISM THEORY AND PRACTICE

series is a co-production by Progress Publishers, a Soviet publishing house, and publishers in a number of other socialist countries.

The series deals with philosophy, constitutional law, economics, and sociology, and examines various aspects of the socialist way of life.

The authors are prominent Soviet analysts and international groups of writers from socialist countries.

The series appears in English, Spanish and Portuguese, and is for readers interested in the theoretical and practical problems of present-day socialist society.



PROGRESS  
PUBLISHERS  
MOSCOW