

# **PRINCIPLES OF LENIN'S FOREIGN POLICY**









1870-  
1970-



# PRINCIPLES OF LENIN'S FOREIGN POLICY

## CONTENTS

FROM EDITOR

V. Vladimirov, *Foreign Policy Promoting Peace and Social Progress* 29

V. Trukhanovsky, *Proletarian Internationalism and Peaceful Coexistence—Foundation of the Leninist Foreign Policy* 49

A. Gorokhov, *Leninist Diplomacy: Principles and Traditions* 76

Novosti Press Agency  
Publishing House  
Moscow, 1969





## FROM EDITOR

*The present edition is a collection of articles by Soviet foreign policy experts and journalists in the monthly, International Affairs.*

Novosti Press Agency  
Publishing House  
Moscow, 1969



## The Leninist Theory and Practice of Socialist Foreign Policy

### CONTENTS

**N. Kapchenko.** The Leninist Theory  
and Practice of Socialist Foreign Pol-  
icy 5

**V. Vladimirov, I. Orlov.** Socialist  
Foreign Policy Promoting Peace and  
Social Progress 29

**V. Trukhanovsky.** Proletarian In-  
ternationalism and Peaceful Coexist-  
ence—Foundation of the Leninist  
Foreign Policy 49

**A. Gorokhov.** Leninist Diplomacy:  
Principles and Traditions 76



# CONTENTS

FROM EDITOR

N. Kapchenko, The Leninist Theory of  
and Practice of Socialist Foreign Policy  
Soviet Foreign Policy and the  
International Situation

V. Vladimirov, K. Orlov, Socialism  
Foreign Policy Promoting Peace and  
Social Progress

V. Trukhanovsky, Proletarian In-  
ternationalism and Peaceful Coexist-  
ence—Foundation of the Leninist  
Foreign Policy

A. Gorokhov, Leninist Diplomacy:  
Principles and Traditions



*N. Kapchenko*

## **The Leninist Theory and Practice of Socialist Foreign Policy**

### **I**

“No one could rival Lenin in seeing the great and the small, in predicting turning points of vast historical importance, while taking into account and making use of every little detail; whenever necessary he knew how to attack furiously, and when necessary to retreat to prepare for a fresh offensive. He rejected all congealed formulas; he wore no blinkers on his penetrating, all-seeing eyes.” These words are taken from the message issued by a special Plenary Meeting of the Party’s Central Committee following Lenin’s death. That is the kind of man Lenin was, and such he remains for the Party which he created, for the state whose emergence is linked with his name, and for millions upon millions of working people building the new life and fighting for their social emancipation and national liberation.

To give a better and fuller idea of Lenin’s genius and greatness as thinker, political leader and statesman, let us add that even the enemies



of Communism, who hated the young Soviet republic heart and soul, felt bound to give Lenin his due.

Lenin's activity is a remarkably harmonious combination of the depth and breadth of theoretical thinker and an unsurpassed political practitioner, of fusion of thought and action. This remarkable quality was manifested in every sphere of his activity, including his guidance of the Soviet Republic's foreign policy. It not only left an indelible mark on Soviet foreign policy at the time when it was under Lenin's direct guidance, but also predetermined its key features today.

Lenin's theoretical and practical legacy is the most valuable asset of our people and the entire revolutionary liberation movement. It is many-faceted and inexhaustible and is a powerful instrument in the struggle to transform the world. No wonder the advocates of capitalism find his ideas just as terrible and dangerous today as they did in his lifetime. That is why Leninism has been and remains the target of the fiercest attacks and a subject for the most subtle falsifications and slanders. A special effort is being made to use every possible means to denigrate and distort Lenin's views on foreign politics and international relations and to play down their importance in our own day. Equally strenuous efforts are being made to cast the wrong light on Lenin's practical activity in directing Soviet foreign policy.

By now, the main directions of these attacks on Lenin's foreign policy views and ideas have fully crystallised.

First of all, the political and ideological



enemies of Socialism are waging an open struggle against the ideological and theoretical principles of Lenin's foreign policy under the banner of anti-Communism. Their efforts differ in form and method, as well as in the degree of their objectivity, but all these distinctions make no difference in principle, because ultimately the moderate liberals and the diehard anti-Communists have the same aim in view, namely to weaken the international positions of Socialism and to undermine the very foundation of the Socialist system.

Revisionists in our day appear to be defending Leninism, but in actual fact try to take the revolutionary content out of Leninism by their "undogmatic" approach to Lenin's legacy. They have been trying to revive the long bankrupt theories about Leninism being "purely Russian" and "nationally limited" in its significance. They pay lip-service to Lenin's teachings, but call for "going beyond the limited circle" of his legacy and overcoming the "narrow framework of the period", in which it is allegedly confined. Behind this reasoning lurks the suggestion that Lenin's ideas no longer meet the needs of our epoch and that they cannot be used as a basis for a correct explanation of the complex processes in modern international affairs.

Finally, fierce attacks are being directed against the basic principles of Socialist foreign policy, which Lenin worked out, by the Mao Tse-tung group, whose ideological and political platform is a mixture of adventurous petty-bourgeois concepts and the ideology of great-power chauvinism. The Mao group, which has made the final break with Marxism-Leninism, has been



conducting an extensive campaign designed to erase Lenin's ideas from the minds of the Chinese people and the Chinese Communists, and to replace them by "Mao-Tse-tung's ideas", which are proclaimed to be the "summit of Marxism-Leninism."

The international Communist movement and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union resolutely safeguard the purity of Lenin's teachings and take a firm stand against every attempt, wherever it may come from, to undermine or distort Lenin's ideas in the sphere of foreign policy. Real Marxist-Leninists regard these ideas as a guide to action, not as a sum-total of abstract rules and prescriptions which can be mechanically applied to any conditions. It is the creative approach of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and all fraternal parties to Marxism-Leninism, to Lenin's ideological legacy that enables them to work out correct domestic and foreign policy and to direct with success the building of the new society. But Marxism-Leninism can be creatively developed only through loyalty to the fundamental propositions of the revolutionary doctrine of the working class.

## II

A bulky compendium published in the U.S.A. a few years ago by a group of leading U.S. sovietologists contained an article by Prof. Richard E. Pipes, who tried to prove that Communists have no foreign policy theory at all. He flatly declared that "foreign policy had for him



[Marx] no value" and added that the same applied to Marx's followers. \*

It is hard to say whether these assertions spring more from ignorance or ill-will. Everyone knows that Lenin worked out the theoretical foreign policy principles of the Socialist state and formulated its key principles and aims on the basis of the views and propositions put forward by Marx and Engels. Marx repeatedly stressed that the working class must have and pursue its own *independent* foreign policy, and the founders of scientific Communism regarded such a policy as one of the principal means with which the working class fights for social emancipation.

Lenin worked in a historical period when increasing numbers of countries and peoples were being drawn in one form or another into the train of world affairs and when the role and importance of foreign policy activity within the system of international relations had substantially increased. It was natural, therefore, that Lenin gave so much attention to foreign policy problems and studied them in such depth.

One of Lenin's great historical services is his elaboration of a truly scientific approach to problems of international relations and the creation of a Socialist foreign policy theory. He regarded international relations as one of the most complex spheres of social relations, in which the most diverse class, national, state and other interests interweave and clash. Lenin viewed these relations in the light of historical materialism.

---

\* See *Russian Foreign Policy. Essays in Historical Perspective*. New Haven and London, 1962, p. 162.



From the diverse and contradictory processes of international life, he took and studied the main element determining their essence and principal development tendencies, namely, their social, economic and class roots. He did not ignore such factors as the various subjective elements which inevitably exert an influence on the course and development of international politics, but he attached to them the importance they deserve. This divested international relations and foreign policy of the veil of mystery which had been used through the ages by the ruling classes of all the successive exploiting socio-economic formations. This brought international relations, like other spheres of social human activity, within the scope of scientific analysis and research. Marxism-Leninism placed the study of international relations and foreign policy on a sound scientific basis, determined the place of foreign politics in the system of social, class relations, making it possible to see and explain the key facts, processes and tendencies in world politics in the light of the general uniformities of man's social development and of the socio-economic development of individual states.

The scientific approach to international relations is a mark of Soviet foreign policy, as was underlined by G. V. Chicherin, an outstanding diplomat of the Leninist school, when he wrote that it "operates through the Marxist analysis of the historical process and therefore seeks the roots of the basic, deep-going trends in the development of contemporary political and economic relations. Behind the concrete relations of the present day, it seeks to apprehend the principal motive forces of contemporary events so as to



adapt its activity to their progressive movement”.

Lenin made a truly invaluable contribution to the scientific view of the relationship between domestic and foreign policy. He linked up the two spheres of politics into a single whole, revealing the character and dialectics of their connections and interdependence.

He wrote: “Economic interests and the economic position of the classes which rule our state lie at the root of both our home and foreign policy. These propositions... constitute the basis of the Marxist world outlook.”\* Consequently, the foreign policy of a state is indissolubly bound up with its domestic policy and is a continuation and development of it. This connection rests on the fact that the domestic and the foreign policy of a state have the same class basis, namely, the system of relations of production.

These fundamental Marxist-Leninist propositions established for the first time in history the correct interdependence between domestic and foreign policy. The scientific and practical importance of these propositions becomes even more obvious in view of the fact that bourgeois political science has always tried to confuse and obscure this connection between domestic and foreign policy. Bourgeois writers either take foreign policy in isolation from domestic policy and regard it as some sort of absolutely independent sphere of activity, or set it above domestic policy. But bourgeois ideologists have also tried hard to refute or cast doubt on Lenin’s

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 365.



proposition on the connection and relationship between foreign and domestic policy. They have gone so far as to distort the very facts. Thus, they have spread the idea that Marxism-Leninism allegedly regards foreign policy as a purely automatic manifestation of domestic policy in international affairs. In that case, foreign policy appears to be nothing more than a simple translation of the laws and methods of domestic policy to the sphere of relations with other states.

This oversimplification of the relationship between domestic and foreign policy has nothing in common with the view held by Lenin, who did not regard foreign policy merely as an external and purely mechanical reflection of domestic policy in international affairs.

He said: "No idea could be more erroneous or harmful than to separate foreign from home policy." \* Elsewhere he wrote: "It is fundamentally wrong, un-Marxist and unscientific, to single out 'foreign policy' from policy in general, let alone counterpose foreign policy to home policy." \*\*

In his approach to international relations, Lenin always showed an understanding of the fact that foreign policy is a special, specific expression and manifestation of class and state interests. In the sphere of international relations, the laws of socio-economic development and the class struggle have their own specific features and appear in a different light than at

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, Moscow, 1964, p. 85.

\*\* *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, Moscow, 1964, p. 43.



home. Foreign policy is naturally implemented in conditions which differ substantially from those of domestic policy. By virtue of this and a number of other factors, foreign policy cannot be and never is a simple projection of domestic policy in the sphere of interstate relations.

Marxism-Leninism has never minimised the role and importance of foreign policy, nor does it deny its relative independence, but it has never regarded it as self-sufficient, as separated from economic and social processes at home, or as rising above domestic policy. Marxist-Leninist theory starts from the assumption that the deepest roots of foreign policy should ultimately be sought in domestic policy. But it obviously does not follow that, in some concrete historical conditions, foreign policy cannot determine the principal directions of domestic policy or affect it substantially.

What does follow from the interconnection between foreign and domestic policy is that it would be quite wrong to ignore or underestimate this reaction of foreign policy on domestic policy. Today, when such problems as the struggle to avert another war have become immensely important and the historical contest of the two opposed social systems has become the main content of international relations, and consequently the centre of gravity of world-wide class struggle is moving more and more into the international arena, the importance and role of foreign policy is also considerably growing. This explains why foreign policy and international relations have been of increasing importance in the activity of the C.P.S.U. and all the fraternal parties. This reflects the real processes



taking place throughout the world.

Lenin used to emphasise that "Marxism demands the consideration of objective conditions and their changes, that the question must be presented concretely as applicable to those conditions".\* That is the only correct approach to any problem, including, of course, the role of foreign policy in present-day conditions.

Lenin used the method of class analysis to discover the real essence of the foreign policy of the imperialist powers, and this can be justly regarded as one of the most important aspects of his work on the theory of Socialist foreign policy, because it would have been impossible to create a theory of Socialist foreign policy without exposing the imperialist nature of the policy pursued by the leading capitalist countries.

In his works, Lenin showed that the foreign policy of the imperialist powers does not express or reflect any abstractly interpreted national interests, which bourgeois propaganda has always tried to represent as a harmonious combination and sum of the interests of all classes and social groups in a given state. The foreign policy of every imperialist state expresses and safeguards the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie and never the country's national interests, whose real vehicles are the working people. There can be no question of national interests in such cases, because the bourgeoisie has always understood that they mean its own narrow class interests.

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, Moscow, 1964, pp. 251-252.



The contradiction between national interests and the class interests of the working people is abolished only in a Socialist state with the elimination of class antagonisms, which allows class interests to merge with the national interests and to become the supreme national interests. From this it follows that only under Socialism does foreign policy become the full expression of a country's national interests and an instrument for their protection in international affairs. The social basis of such a policy is immensely extended, and foreign policy first acquires a truly popular and democratic character.

One of the most important results of Lenin's theoretical and practical activity was the scientific elaboration and substantiation of the basic principles of Socialist foreign policy, which is fundamentally different in social character. It would be wrong to consider that Lenin put forward his basic ideas on Socialist foreign policy only after the victory of the October Revolution and the emergence of the Soviet state.

The fact is that the Communist Party met the October Revolution fully armed with a clear and concrete foreign policy programme, which it set before the working people. Several of Lenin's works written before the revolution, such as *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *On the United States of Europe Slogan*, *The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, and *The Foreign Policy of the Russian Revolution*, dealt with important problems relating to the future foreign policy of the Socialist state. The October Revolution ushered in a new stage in Lenin's elabo-



ration and practical implementation of the foreign policy principles of Socialism, a stage which was of exceptional importance in the history of the Soviet state and of its foreign policy.

Among the key principles of Socialist foreign policy which Lenin worked out, *the principle of proletarian internationalism* has a place apart. Basing himself on the works of Marx and Engels, and giving a creative generalisation of the experience of class struggle in the international arena, Lenin gave a much larger content to the principle of proletarian internationalism, showing its new role as a principle in interstate relations, demonstrating its irreconcilable hostility to bourgeois nationalism, and working out the relationship between the national and the international element in the policy of the working class.

Lenin attached exceptional importance to the correct understanding and interpretation of internationalism. He wrote: "Proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should 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." \*

Both during Lenin's lifetime and since, the principle of proletarian internationalism, as a fundamental principle of Socialist foreign policy, has been the object of the fiercest attacks

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966, p. 148.



and the most subtle falsifications. The ideologists of imperialism declare that proletarian internationalism is incompatible with the generally accepted rules of international law. They try to present it as a doctrine of open interference in the domestic affairs of other states. Here is what this principle looks like as interpreted by Prof. Walter Grottian, a rabid West German anti-Communist: "Aggressive wars by a Socialist state or states are part and parcel of so-called proletarian internationalism." \* The well-known American ideologist and political figure, George F. Kennan, insists that, because Communists adhere to Socialism and proletarian internationalism, they are bound "to the duty of interfering in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government and mode of life". \*\*

These distortions of the principle of proletarian internationalism are refuted by the foreign policy and practice of Socialism. This principle has nothing in common with the ideas of spreading Socialism by force, and it is intrinsically alien to the notorious theory of exporting revolution, which runs counter to Marxism-Leninism and the true interests of the working class.

Proletarian internationalism demands mutual support and solidarity among all national detachments of the working class, but it is inconceivable without respect for and observance of the principles of independence and equality

---

\* Walter Grottian, *Lenins Anleitung zum Handeln*, Cologne and Opladen, 1962, p. 102.

\*\* *Foreign Affairs*, January 1960, p. 173.



of each separate detachment of the world revolutionary movement, each Communist party and each Socialist state. That is one of the most important foreign policy functions of proletarian internationalism. Another equally important function is to provide the most effective and reliable resistance to the export of counter-revolution, whatever the means—military or peaceful—used to carry it out. These two aspects of proletarian internationalism are interconnected and inseparable.

The development of international relations since the emergence of the first Socialist state has shown that the efforts of imperialism to export counter-revolution are an essential part of global imperialist strategy. Earlier it laid emphasis on direct use of armed force, but subsequently, with the formation and strengthening of the world Socialist system and as the world balance of forces tilted against imperialism, “peaceful” means tended to predominate. But that does not change the essence of its policy towards the Socialist countries. It is quite natural, therefore, that the importance of the foreign policy function of proletarian internationalism as a means of preventing the export of counter-revolution, far from declining, actually tends to increase.

Of great theoretical and practical importance is Lenin’s view of proletarian internationalism as the basis of relations between peoples which have thrown off the yoke of colonial exploitation and oppression. From the standpoint of international experience, the break-up of the Russian empire and the emergence and growth of the Soviet multinational state have proved



Lenin's doctrine and policy on the nationality question to be absolutely correct. Lenin understood better than anybody else the need for a tactful attitude to specific national interests and features, and he taught the Communist Party accordingly. He emphasised: "Our experience has left us with the firm conviction that only exceptional attention to the interests of various nations can remove grounds for conflicts, can remove mutual mistrust, can remove the fear of any intrigues and create that confidence, especially on the part of workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which there absolutely cannot be peaceful relations between peoples or anything like a successful development of everything that is of value in present-day civilisation." \*

Stressing the paramount importance of taking into account national interests and factors, Lenin added that the interests of Socialism, the most basic and deep-going interests of each nation, should be in the foreground. He wrote: "We assert that the interests of Socialism, of world Socialism are higher than national interests, higher than the interests of the state". \*\*

Such was Lenin's principled stand, the stand of a patriot and an internationalist. Of course, Lenin's proposition should not be taken to mean that there is some sort of contradiction between national and international interests. Such a contradiction may arise only when national interests are artificially opposed to inter-

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, Moscow, 1966, p. 386.

\*\* *Ibid.*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 378.



national interests and are placed above them. In other words, when national interests are supplanted by bourgeois-nationalist interests.

Exceptional international and political importance attaches to the fact that, upon its emergence, the Soviet Republic based its foreign policy on such general democratic principles as *equality, respect for state integrity, independence and sovereignty and non-interference in the affairs of other countries*. Before the Socialist state came on the scene, these principles have been merely propounded, but, after its emergence, they were translated into practice for the first time in the history of international relations by the Soviet republic's foreign policy. This had a tremendous positive effect on the content and character of international relations as a whole.

The very fact that the Soviet state entered the world arena with an entirely new foreign policy started the break-up of the old system of international relations, and even the political and ideological enemies of Communism admit this. George F. Kennan, for instance, said: "...the Russian Revolution unquestionably hastened the disintegration of Europe's colonial empire and of her political influence in other parts of the world... But for the non-European countries themselves, the exemplary effects of the Russian Revolution were of enormous importance." \*

In elaborating the principles of Socialist foreign policy, Lenin devoted great attention to the relations between the Socialist state and the

---

\* *Foreign Affairs*, October 1967, p. 14.



capitalist world. He formulated and provided scientific substantiation for *the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems*.

Lenin's concept of peaceful coexistence is based on the class principle. It is subordinate to the aims and requirements of the world revolutionary process and the struggle against imperialism. It cannot be interpreted or applied in isolation from the fundamental Leninist propositions on the ways and forms of the world revolutionary movement. Accordingly, there is an indissoluble internal connection between the principle of peaceful coexistence and the other parts of Lenin's teaching.

In putting forward the principle of peaceful coexistence, Lenin proceeded not only from the character and nature of the Socialist system, for which it is just as natural to establish peace as it is for imperialism to breed war. Lenin took full account of the aggressive essence of imperialism and did not connect the idea of peaceful coexistence with any hopes for a change in the nature of imperialism, but with the deep-going tendencies which he had already discovered at the time and which have now acquired full force and become one of the crucial factors in present-day world development. He had in mind "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)." \*

As said above, all the principles of Socialist foreign policy are organically connected, and their interconnection follows from their class content. That is why it will avail bourgeois ideologists and other falsifiers of Leninism little to insist that proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence are incompatible. This dilemma—either proletarian internationalism or peaceful coexistence—is patently false, because a consistent foreign policy based on proletarian internationalism, far from requiring a repudiation of peaceful coexistence, actually implies resolute efforts to establish it as a principle in relations between states with different social systems. Similarly, the policy of peaceful coexistence is possible only on the basis of internationalist cohesion among the broad masses of the working people in all countries to fight the aggressive plans and schemes of imperialism. The correct, Leninist interpretation of the principles of proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence rules out the possibility of any contradictions or collisions between them.

Lenin regarded politics in general and foreign politics in particular as consisting of two elements, science and art. \*\* In his practical guidance of Soviet foreign policy, Lenin was unsurpassed in his ability to fuse the two elements organically. He always made a deep analysis of the most complex international problems in

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow 1966, p. 148.

\*\* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 80-81.



working out the practical line of Soviet foreign policy and invariably penetrated to the very essence of phenomena, displaying real diplomatic virtuosity in translating this line into concrete foreign policy acts. Here is what Louis Fischer, a prominent U.S. historian and journalist, writes about Lenin as a statesman and political leader: "Lenin brought to politics passion, faith and instinct. And these were effective because he harnessed them to a scientific mind.... Lenin could understand the daily thinking of a peasant, a soldier, a working man, as well as of a French politician.... Lenin won popular support by demonstrations of wisdom... Lenin was plastic if necessary, and adamant if necessary." \*

It is impossible in a single article to describe Lenin's practical activity in directing Soviet foreign policy. Many books, pamphlets and articles have been written on this subject. But if we are to have anything like a full picture, we must recall such important pages in the history of Soviet foreign policy as the issue of the Decree on Peace, Lenin's efforts to conclude the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the conclusion of the first just treaties and agreements between Russia and other states, the Soviet Republic's emergence from international isolation and the establishment of diplomatic relations with the capitalist countries, its participation and role in the conference of Genoa and The Hague, etc.

---

\* Louis Fischer. *Men and Politics. Europe Between Two Wars*, New York, 1966, pp. 71-72.



### III

In present-day conditions, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union relies on its rich historical experience and is guided by the Leninist principles of Socialist foreign policy in implementing its foreign policy programme and in tackling the international tasks before it. These tasks have changed in scope and character, and the real possibilities of fulfilling them have been greatly increased. The forces of Socialism now increasingly determine the main directions and tendencies in the development of international relations, whose very nature is being modified by the direct influence of Socialism and its foreign policy.

The new conditions call for a new approach, new solutions based on the Leninist understanding of the character, aims and principles of Socialist foreign policy. In the present complex international situation, the day-to-day practical activity of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government in the sphere of foreign policy is concentrated on fulfilling the tasks put forward by the Party Programme and the decisions of recent Party Congresses and Central Committee Plenary Meetings. The basic directions of the foreign policy activity of the Soviet Union were formulated by the 23rd Congress of the C.P.S.U., whose resolutions said: "The foreign policy of the Soviet state has as its purpose to ensure, together with other Socialist countries, favourable international conditions for the construction of Socialism and Communism; to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the Socialist countries, their friendship and brother-



hood; to support the national-liberation movement and implement allround cooperation with the young developing states; consistently to stand up for the principle of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems; to give a resolute rebuff to the aggressive forces of imperialism and save mankind from another world war".

Especially urgent and acute today is the task of mounting resolute and active resistance to the imperialist attempts on the Socialist countries, the task of strengthening the unity and cohesion of the world Socialist system on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The international situation today is complicated by the activation of the imperialist forces epitomised by the U.S. aggression against the Vietnamese people, the continued Israeli occupation of Arab territories, the growth of neo-fascist and revenge-seeking tendencies in West Germany, and the imperialist efforts to weaken the Socialist system from inside. Many facts show that imperialism has no intention of abandoning its line of building up international tensions and aggravating every form of struggle against Socialism and the national-liberation movement. "Imperialist reaction," say the Directives of the C.C. C.P.S.U. on preparation for the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth, "in its efforts to cope with economic and political shocks, to get out of the impasse of insoluble social contradictions, is increasingly resorting to military ventures and provocations. Imperialism threatens with destruction the lives of millions of people and the fruits of civil-



isation and culture." The policy of the Soviet Union and the other Socialist countries takes full account of these tendencies in international development.

Parallel to building-up international tensions, the imperialist circles have been stepping up their ideological fight against Socialism in an effort to generate a tide that would wash away the foundations of the new social system, a tide consisting of forces ranging from rabid anti-Communists to petty-bourgeois nationalists, from revisionists to dogmatists. Imperialism wants to make the struggle against Socialism not only global but total, and to advance the forward line of this struggle into the Socialist countries themselves. It is in fact trying to change the results of social development achieved in the first half of the century, and to stage a "replay" of the historical match which it has virtually lost.

Marxist-Leninists are firmly convinced that the progressive social changes which have taken or are taking place in the world are irreversible, but that does not warrant the assumption that the ideological subversions undertaken by the imperialist forces do not present any danger to the Socialist countries and do not require serious attention. There are many facts showing that the leaders of imperialist policy have been exploiting some of the difficulties in the development of the world Socialist system to promote their own ends. Their main purpose is to weaken the ties between the Socialist countries and to separate them, and this sheds light on the intensified attacks by bourgeois propaganda on the Warsaw Treaty Or-



ganisation, and the system of political and economic ties between the Socialist countries.

Bourgeois periodicals and Western statesmen and political leaders have been insisting that the contradictions between the Socialist and the capitalist countries have been losing their former sharpness and have been moving into the background. The implication is quite clear: since the Socialist countries are no longer threatened by anyone, they no longer need strong military-political alliance.

But very different evidence is provided by historical experience and actual developments throughout the world. Far from being ironed out, the political and ideological contradictions between the capitalist and the Socialist countries are becoming more acute, and this is expressed in the sphere of international politics. There remains the danger of broad imperialist aggression, and efforts to export counter-revolution have not ceased. That is why it is necessary to strengthen the unity and cohesion of the Socialist countries and continue reinforcing the defence capability of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

The international foreign policy front of struggle for Socialism has been and remains one of the tensest, if not indeed the tensest sector in the struggle against the forces of the old world, for there the interests of the two opposed socio-economic systems, Socialism and capitalism, and two policies—the policy of Socialism and the policy of imperialism—are in open contest.

The experience gained by the Soviet Union



and the other Socialist countries shows that the strength and effectiveness of Socialist foreign policy are inseparable from loyalty to the fundamental principles of Leninism. Any departure from these principles inevitably deprives foreign policy of its Socialist character, turning it into an instrument of the will and interests of a handful of individuals, as has actually happened in China.

The leading role of the Communist Party in Socialist society is also expressed in the fact that it works out the foreign policy line and sees to it that this line is put through. The principle in Party direction of foreign policy, whose primary importance Lenin repeatedly emphasised, has been and remains unchallengeable.

The foreign policy of Socialism now has a history of more than 50 years behind it and in that period, it has gone a long way and accumulated a wealth of experience to which all the Socialist countries, big and small, have contributed. The Leninist principles underlying this policy have stood the test of time. On the whole, Socialist foreign policy, like Socialism itself, has proved its viability and strength and has stood the tests of history with flying colours.



*V. Vladimirov*

*I. Orlov*

## **Socialist Foreign Policy Promoting Peace and Social Progress**

Present-day international affairs constitute an exceptionally complex and many-sided process; inherent in it are definite stages of mounting and abating political tension, and occasional new phenomena whose importance and consequences are hard to assess immediately.

But no matter how complex international relations or the difficulties confronting the forces of peace and social progress, the main trend of mankind's historical development is crystallising more and more unmistakably. The main content, direction and features of this development are being increasingly determined by the forces fighting imperialism and working for the Socialist transformation of society.

That these forces have a growing part to play in world affairs is now evident in the profound changes taking place in international relations, changes which promote the successful struggle against imperialism, for peace and social progress. The influence exercised by



world Socialism on international relations has increased tremendously in connection with the task of averting a thermonuclear war. World Socialism alone is capable of solving the problem and of rescuing mankind from catastrophe.

Over the last few years, international events have provided confirmation of Lenin's idea that Socialism and peace are indivisible. Lenin's ideas about Socialism's historic role in the struggle for peace and social progress in this age of ours are embodied in the concrete endeavour of the peoples and parties in the Socialist countries.

The influence Socialism exerts on world development is determined above all by the very fact that the new socio-economic formation is being consolidated and is scoring successes in economic and political development, and satisfying the material and spiritual needs of men. This influence is also manifested in the implementation of new Socialist principles in international relations and in active foreign policy aimed at settling international problems in the interests of the peoples.

"This policy," the Theses of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee, *50 Years of the Great October Revolution*, emphasised, "is designed to bring together all the anti-imperialist peaceloving forces in the struggle against the forces of reaction and war. The policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems is an integral part of it. This policy is aimed against the imperialists' starting a new world war, and against international provocations



and the export of counter-revolution, and designed to promote favourable conditions for the peoples' exercise of their sacred right independently to determine their national development, and carry forward mutually advantageous economic, scientific and technical cooperation and cultural exchanges between all countries."

The greater the might and successes of world Socialism, the broader the possibilities open to the Socialist states in conducting an active and effective international policy. On the other hand, a correct policy pursued by the Socialist countries ensures favourable conditions for the further growth of world Socialism and for new achievements in the construction of the new social system.

A most important economic condition for the successful foreign policy of the Socialist countries is a firm material foundation. Economic and military strength make the peaceful aspirations of the Socialist countries particularly potent.

In the basic economic indices, the Socialist countries are moving closer to the level of production in the capitalist countries. *The Economist* admits that "There has in fact been a marked improvement in the efficiency of Communist management". \*

The main production facilities in Socialist industry consist of new equipment, of which it has a greater proportion than many West European industries. In less than two decades, the CMEA countries have increased their share in world industrial output from one-sixth to one-

---

\* *Economist*, Apr. 20, 1968, p. 64.



third. Industrial output per head of the population in the CMEA countries is almost three times the world average. In 1968, industrial production in these countries was more than 8 per cent higher than in 1967, as compared with less than 5 per cent increase in the capitalist countries.

As the system of their close economic co-operation is developed and improved, the foreign policy of the Socialist countries will continue to become more effective. By now they have worked out forms for joint Socialist economic operations on a broad scale, and are tackling many economic problems in close co-operation involving mutual assistance and co-ordination of economic plans.

Of great importance in building up the economic potential of the Socialist world is active participation in the international Socialist division of labour by the Soviet Union, with its powerful and highly developed economy and its constant readiness to extend allround co-operation. More than 820 projects, carried out with Soviet assistance, have been completed and are being successfully operated in the Socialist countries. The refining facilities set up in these countries make it possible to handle 8.2 million tons of crude oil a year, smelt 13.5 million tons of steel, extract 22 million tons of coal, obtain over 660,000 tons of sulphuric acid, over 100,000 tons of synthetic rubber, and many other products.

The results of the economic integration of the Socialist countries which are members of the CMEA, and their successes in consolidating their material and technical basis open up fa-



vourable prospects for Socialism's victory in its economic competition with the capitalist countries, and consequently produce more favourable conditions for conducting a successful foreign policy.

Of course, Socialist construction, and the formation and development of a new type of relations between the Socialist countries is a long and complex historical process connected with the surmounting of disparities in economic and social development inherited from the past. At some stages, some Socialist countries may be faced with difficulties, and there could be differences between them. However, the fraternal parties invariably hold the view that these difficulties and differences cannot result from insoluble contradictions and can therefore very well be eliminated.

The existence of some difficulties and divergences within the Socialist community should not hamper the unity and solidarity of all the Socialist countries in their struggle against the threat coming from imperialism. The fraternal parties are aware of these problems and are trying to solve them on the basis of the principles of scientific Communism. It is of the utmost importance that these principles should be correctly understood and defended.

In his work, "The Revolution Teaches", Lenin wrote: "Differences within or between political parties are usually resolved not only by polemics over principles, but also by the course of political developments. In particular, differences on a party's tactics, i.e., its political conduct, are often resolved by those with incorrect opinions going over in fact to the correct



path of struggle, under the pressure of the course of developments that simply brushes aside erroneous opinions, making them pointless and devoid of any interest." He urged that the adopted tactical decisions should be tested as frequently as possible in the light of fresh political developments. He added: "Such verification is necessary from the standpoint of both theory and practice: from the standpoint of theory in order to ascertain in fact whether the decisions taken have been correct, and what amendments to these decisions subsequent political events make necessary; from the standpoint of practice, in order to learn how to use the decisions as a proper guide, to learn to consider them as directives for practical application." \*

The ability of the Socialist community successfully to play the part of chief guarantor of peace is connected with a consolidation of the solidarity, cohesion and mutual assistance between the Socialist countries, based on the great principles of proletarian internationalism. A profound analysis and evaluation of the importance of Socialist internationalism in the present situation is contained in the decisions of the April, July and October Plenary meetings (1968) of the C.P.S.U. Central Committee. The Soviet Communist Party has expressed its resolute determination to continue developing fraternal relations between the Socialist countries and in every way to strengthen the world Socialist system and the cohesion of the Social-

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 9, Moscow, 1962, p. 146.



ist countries on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism. The decision of the July Plenary Meeting said, in part, that "success in Communist construction in this country meets the interests of the fraternal Socialist countries, all revolutionary forces, and the interests of the struggle against international imperialism, for peace, national independence, democracy and Socialism".

The Socialist countries have been conducting a long and persistent struggle to establish normal relations and develop cooperation between states belonging to different social systems, to ensure international security and achieve agreements to provide organisational forms for the guarantees of the mankind's peaceful development. This activity of Socialist foreign policy is one of its most important aspects.

In the conditions that have taken shape, the prospects for international security and cooperation between countries of the two systems can be elaborated gradually, through the consistent solution of a number of particular problems. That is why the Socialist countries have put forward proposals for the conclusion of partial agreements, above all, on specific disarmament problems. Such agreements can create a favourable atmosphere for broader and more far-reaching agreements.

The Socialist states will not stop their struggle for peace even after a settlement of some important international issues, which is possible and attainable. The Socialist countries are aware that forces opposing international security will continue to step up their activity in the



political circles of the imperialist states. That is why the fraternal parties insistently call for greater vigilance in face of the moves of world reaction, consolidation and extension of the united front in the struggle against imperialism, and concerted action in this struggle.

The need for coordinated action by the Socialist countries in tackling common basic problems and in ensuring security throughout the world does not cancel out active initiative on the part of each Socialist country in putting forward and solving various specific tasks. The important thing here is ability correctly and consistently to correlate the national interests of the individual countries and their common international tasks on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and the observance of the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty, mutual benefit and fraternal mutual assistance.

The foreign policy of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet state provides numerous striking examples of consistent implementation of the fundamental principles of Socialist foreign policy elaborated by Lenin, which make for indissoluble ties between international tasks and state interests in any approach to the solution of cardinal international problems of today. The C.P.S.U. has invariably abided by Lenin's demand that in Socialist foreign policy there should be "a minimum of general assurances, solemn promises and grandiloquent formulas, and the greatest possible number of the simplest and most obvious decisions and measures that would certainly lead to peace, if not to the



complete elimination of the war danger" \*

Present-day international developments furnish increasing evidence of the growing role played by Socialism, and the utmost importance of the cohesion and unity of action between the Socialist countries in the struggle for peace and against imperialist aggression.

In his critical appraisal of the postwar policy of the U.S.A. and other Western powers in respect of the Socialist countries, the well known publicist Cyrus Sulzberger wrote: "We have vacillated between fake slogans of 'containment' and 'liberation' from Communism achieving neither.... We have strayed to an apparent dead end from which neither of our favourite policy slogans, containment or liberation, can extricate us." \*\*

Having failed in their frontal attacks against Socialism, the imperialists decided to undermine the Socialist countries from within, and to wrest them one by one from the Socialist community.

The year 1968 will go down in history as one in which the imperialist counter-offensive against the forces of Socialism and progress in the international arena, prepared long and painstakingly, suffered a major set-back. Its initiators based their political and strategic calculations on various economic and political factors, which they believed gave them grounds to

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, Moscow, 1966, p. 386.

\*\* C. Sulzberger, *What's Wrong with U.S. Foreign Policy*, New York, 1959, p.p. 13-14, 239.



expect success in their anti-Socialist plans. Imperialist circles took account of the relatively stable growth of industrial production in the U.S.A. and in most of the large capitalist countries since the first half of 1961. At the same time, they hoped that some of the difficulties appearing in a number of Socialist countries which had attained a definite level of economic development demanding the elaboration and implementation of new methods of economic management, would become permanent, weakening the economic strength of the Socialist system and its capacity to maintain the high and diversified military-technical potential required for effective struggle against imperialist aggression.

In the political sphere, the imperialist strategists pinned their hopes on the Mao Tse-tung's group splitting the Socialist system and the world Communist movement.

International developments over the last few years, 1968 in particular, has provided sufficient proof that in pushing the world into another period of dangerous political tensions to help the big monopoly bourgeoisie achieve its class aims, imperialism has failed to hold back the change of the world balance of power in favour of Socialism. The imperialist strategists have undoubtedly overrated various negative economic and political features in the development of world Socialism and the world revolutionary process.

Meanwhile, as was to have been expected, the growth of industrial production in the U.S.A. and some other capitalist countries has also proved to be transient. The monetary and



financial upheavals suffered by the Western countries in 1967 and 1968 clearly showed that the capitalist economy was unstable, and that it was incapable of curing its ills either through state monopoly regulation or by setting up interstate monopoly associations.

The crisis of imperialist strategy in respect of the Socialist countries extended to the sphere of international affairs. U.S. policy in Viet-Nam, which in recent years has taken the form of open and unprecedentedly broad-scale aggression against a Socialist country and a people fighting for national liberation, proved to be a fiasco. A heavy blow was also dealt at anti-Socialist plans and policies in Europe, where the imperialists concentrated on eroding the Socialist system through ideological subversion and provocation, and revival, encouragement and support of local counter-revolutionary forces in the Socialist countries, and by inflaming nationalism, revisionism and anti-Sovietism.

The Socialist countries displayed their solidarity in the summer of 1968, when the forces of international imperialism and reaction, exploiting the complicated internal political situation which had arisen in Czechoslovakia, tried to wrest the country from the Socialist community. The parties and governments of five Socialist countries took the required steps, including the despatch of military aid to the Czechoslovak people, to safeguard the Socialist gains against encroachments by internal and external enemies.

The extraordinary measures taken in connection with the events in Czechoslovakia were



the result of a profound and allround analysis of the situation by the fraternal parties and governments. This analysis was put on record in the course of further Soviet-Czechoslovak negotiations and written into the relevant documents. In particular, the resolution of the November Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party notes: "The C.C.P. Central Committee entirely supports the principles expressed in the Moscow agreements of August 26, 1968, in the communiqué on the talks between the C.P.S.U. and the C.C.P. of October 3-4, and also the principles contained in the Sixth Party Declaration issued at Bratislava on August 4, 1968, and emphasises the responsibility of all Communists, especially on a nationwide scale, for the practical implementation of the principles laid down in these documents."

The imperialist politicians failed to wrest Czechoslovakia from the Socialist community. A heavy blow was dealt at anti-Socialist scheming. U.S. foreign policy strategist, Herbert Kahn, could not conceal his disappointment over the failure of the imperialist plans in respect of Czechoslovakia. He has made some rather interesting admissions on the pages of the November issue of *Fortune*, writing: "...many American students of the Soviet Union—myself included—continue to underrate the ability of the leadership [of the Soviet Union] to act resolutely in defence of its interests."

However, imperialism has not abandoned its new long-term strategy in respect of the Socialist countries. *Le Monde* noted that "there is wailing, perturbation and indignation in Wash-



ington, but no burning of bridges”.

The notorious “bridge-building policy” has been clearly designed not as a tactical expedient but as a long-term global policy for world imperialism in its struggle against the Socialist community. That is why, after recovering from the latest shock, the imperialist strategists have been trying to revive their former policy as soon as possible and set it moving again along the shattered “bridges”. At the same time, reactionary and militaristic circles of U.S. and West European imperialism have been trying hard to fan tension throughout the world, goad on the arms race, and obstruct the development of normal relations between the countries belonging to the two systems and the laying of foundations for international and European security. The possibility of their resorting again to “balancing on the brink of war” cannot be ruled out altogether. The imperialists’ practice of overrating their own forces and underrating those of the adversary has repeatedly been the cause behind the failure of the anti-Socialist strategy. However, it could lead to gambles presenting a great danger to world peace.

The influence which Socialist foreign policy exerts on social and political processes outside the Socialist countries is not always straightforward or direct; this is a complex and many-sided phenomenon constituting one of the most important aspects of the class struggle in the international arena. The internationalist orientation of Socialist policy is reflected in its efforts to create favourable conditions for the



revolutionary struggle. However, the scope and results of the struggle in the various countries depend on internal factors, above all, the level of organisation and political consciousness of the revolutionary forces and the mass nature of the movement.

Socialist foreign policy has enormous advantages because its character, basic trends and aims are in complete accord with the vital interests of the vast masses of mankind, appreciated and supported by all peaceloving peoples. The struggle for the peace and security of nations, in which Socialist foreign policy has now become a powerful accelerator of the world revolutionary process, is bringing Socialism's historic victory on a world scale ever nearer.

This influence of Socialist foreign policy on the world situation, facilitating the struggle for social progress and national independence, has nothing in common with forcible "export of revolution". Socialist policy is based on the firm foundation of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, whose letter and spirit reject the export-of-revolution theory. Of course, the world capitalist system is ripe for social revolution, but such a revolution cannot win out overnight, but after a series of class battles waged over a long historical period. In this age these battles have assumed unprecedented proportions, and there are now radical changes to be observed in the world balance of power between the two systems. However, the growing might of world Socialism is no substitute for revolutionary situations. External factors, whatever they may be, cannot cause revolution in the absence of the appropriate local conditions. Marxism-Le-



ninism teaches, and this has been confirmed by the revolutionary practice of the 20th century, that Socialist and national liberation revolutions develop out of acute class struggle waged by the working masses.

That is why one of the main tenets of true Socialist policy has been and is the exhortation that there must be no promotion of revolution in any country by violent means or the use of arms. Lenin resolutely opposed any such "prodding" and irresponsible juggling of the "revolutionary war" slogan, and relentlessly exposed "Left-wing" adventurers. He defined the ways in which the Socialist state can exert an influence on the world revolutionary process, but added: "Of course, there are people who believe that revolution can break out in a foreign country to order, by agreement. These people are either mad or they are provocateurs." \*

In rejecting such an approach, Lenin emphasised that it was the principal national and international task of the Socialist state and its people, together with the Party leading them, to carry on economic construction, create the economic conditions necessary to ensure all-round progress in Socialist society, and to protect its gains against external threats. He said that this problem had to be solved if Socialism was to win out on an international scale.

The results of the last few years show that the Socialist countries have been steadily implementing Lenin's precept.

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 480.



It is the task of Socialist foreign policy to secure the best possible external conditions for Socialist and Communist construction in the Socialist countries. At the same time, there is also the important task of promoting the creation of favourable conditions for the advance of the world revolutionary process in the non-Socialist part of the world. These two interconnected functions illustrate the class essence of Socialist foreign policy and show that national and international tasks are closely linked. In the present situation, the revolutionary strategy and tactics of the Socialist states, and the influence they exert on the class struggle in the capitalist countries and on the national liberation movement acquire particular importance, because the influence exerted by the Socialist system on world politics and economics has assumed vast proportions. At the same time, there now exist closer links between the struggle for peace, which is led by the Socialist states, and the struggle for national liberation and social emancipation, and also between the deployment of class forces within the individual countries and their deployment in the international arena.

Socialist foreign policy, which aims to consolidate peace and international security, is fully compatible with the interests not only of the Socialist states themselves, but also of the other principal detachments of the revolutionary forces of today, primarily, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement, because the preservation and consolidation of peace help to create favourable conditions for the popular



struggle to achieve national liberation and social emancipation.

The struggle for peace, in which Socialist foreign policy has such a vital part to play, is a struggle against militarism and imperialism. Relying on the changes in the world balance of power in favour of Socialism, the popular masses are now able to isolate the extremist circles of imperialism to prevent them from using war as a means of maintaining imperialist domination, to ensure the triumph of the principles of peaceful coexistence in international relations, and in these conditions to work for fresh successes in the struggle for social progress and national independence.

The policy of the Socialist states, notably, the policy of peaceful coexistence, is spearheaded against the most aggressive, militaristic circles of monopoly capital, that is, the arch enemies of the working people. For its part, the struggle in defence of the interests of the working class, for democracy and against monopoly oppression, a struggle which is led by the Communist parties of the capitalist countries, is directly connected with the struggle against the threat of war for peace and security.

Socialist foreign policy is of unquestionable importance in relation to the success of the national liberation movement. Foreign armed intervention has always been the main obstacle in the way of peoples fighting for their national liberation.

Today, the export of counter-revolution by world imperialism has been made more difficult by the existence of the Socialist countries and their solidarity with the peoples fighting for



their freedom. The Socialist states regard the right of the oppressed peoples to national independence as a sacred one, and support every form of their struggle to achieve it, including wars of liberation. The Socialist states oppose armed intervention by the imperialists in the internal affairs of countries which have won their political independence.

Recent events have shown that a most important factor in the successful struggle against imperialism and every form of colonialism is the Socialist countries' economic, scientific, technical and military assistance (the latter in weapons and military equipment) to the national liberation movement and the young sovereign states, together with allround political support in international affairs and vigorous action by Socialist diplomats. Every stage of the national liberation movement has shown that the main condition for its further advance in every sphere is joint action in the anti-imperialist struggle by the Socialist and developing countries in world affairs, and their mutual support. The great strength of world Socialism, which prevents world imperialism from boundlessly escalating its interventionist actions, together with the Socialist countries' direct military and political assistance, has become the main external factor without which national liberation revolutions could not have scored the successes that have transformed the map of the world in the postwar decades.

The most striking manifestation of the Socialist countries' international solidarity with the fighting peoples in recent years has been



the allround assistance and support which they have given the Vietnamese people in beating back the aggression of U.S. imperialism, unparalleled in scale and intensity. Wladislaw Gomułka said in his report to the Fifth Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party that the war in Viet-Nam, while actually remaining a local one, has virtually become a great worldwide battle between Socialism and imperialism, between the international forces of liberty, progress and peace, and the forces of colonialism, reaction and war. Last year, the U.S. aggressors suffered a serious defeat in this battle as a result of joint action by the forces of Socialism and the national liberation movements.

International developments confirm that a stronger alliance between world Socialism and the national liberation movement is a necessary condition for consolidating the independence of the newly liberated peoples and eliminating vestiges of colonialism. Any effort to undermine this alliance or to isolate the national liberation struggle from world Socialism weakens this struggle and the world's forces of progress as a whole.

That is why it is the earnest desire of all the main revolutionary forces of our day to achieve closer cohesion and allround cooperation and coordinated action in the struggle against imperialism. The Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties scheduled for May is bound to become an important milestone on the way to this goal.

The present situation is distinguished by increasingly acute political and ideological strug-



gle between the two systems in the international arena, and makes the most stringent demands on Socialist foreign policy and diplomacy, on whose activity and effectiveness the fortunes of peace and progress depend.

The foreign policy of the Socialist countries is peaceable, active and effective because their governments have been analysing world developments in the correct Marxist-Leninist light. The conscious activity of the Socialist states in international affairs and its scientifically-based foreign policy are, in terms of their impact on the world situation, a most important manifestation of Socialism's global influence on the future of peace and progress.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries shows that they have been true to the principles of proletarian internationalism and have always carried out Lenin's precepts. This policy helps to unite the Socialist community, provides protection for its common interests and strengthens its security, extends help to peoples engaged in the struggle for national liberation and social emancipation. It is a consistent struggle against imperialism and aggression, in defence of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the campaign to promote disarmament and prevent another world war. The results achieved by Socialist foreign policy and the whole of international developments over the last few years demonstrate that this foreign policy is fully in line with the interests of the peoples of the Socialist countries and the interests of the world's progressive forces.



*V. Trukhanovsky*

*Corresponding Member, Academy  
of Sciences of the USSR*

## **Proletarian Internationalism and Peaceful Coexistence—Foundation of the Leninist Foreign Policy**

Lenin went down in history as the father and leader of the first Socialist state in the world. His doctrine on the ways of building Socialist society and the immeasurable ideological wealth of his legacy have become a reliable instrument of our Party and of the world revolutionary liberation movement. Leninism is the theoretical basis for solving important problems of the revolutionary struggle and the building of the new society.

The principles of the foreign policy of the Socialist state formulated by Lenin are a major component of the Leninist legacy. For more than half a century, the foreign policy programme of building Socialism elaborated by Lenin has been steadily carried out by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. The C.P.S.U. is developing and enriching this programme as applied to the changing conditions within the country and throughout the world.



Lenin proceeded from the premise that two basic principles must underline the activity of the Soviet state in foreign affairs: the principle of proletarian, Socialist internationalism in relations with other Socialist countries and the working people of the capitalist world, and the principle of peaceful coexistence in relations with bourgeois countries.

In elaborating the question of proletarian internationalism, Lenin drew on the works of Marx and Engels. The idea of proletarian internationalism was pithily formulated by the founders of Marxism in the slogan: "Workers of all countries, unite!" Thus, as early as the mid-19th century, Marxism, in the name of the working class which had independently entered the historical scene, opposed proletarian internationalism, a cardinal revolutionary principle, to bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

The theory of Marxism provided scientific substantiation of the international solidarity of proletarians in different countries, the appearance and operation of which is an objective necessity. The need for this solidarity is dictated by the very conditions in which the proletariat lives and wages the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, against the exploiting society. Marxism bases itself on the principle that the living conditions of the working class in different states are almost identical; consequently, life itself confronts them with the same fundamental aims and tasks. Workers of different countries encounter a united class enemy, the international bourgeoisie. Since the workers are opposed by a united world front of the bourgeoisie, their class struggle becomes interna-



tional even if it is waged in the concrete situation of a given state. Hence it is clear that such a struggle can be successful only given international solidarity of the working class. "As the condition of the workers is the same in all countries," Engels pointed out, "as their interests are the same, and their enemies are the same, they must fight together and they must counterpose to the fraternal union of the bourgeoisie of all nations the fraternal union of the workers of all nations."

The founders of Marxism held that the emancipation of the working class is a task of international scope. "The emancipation of labour," they say, "is neither a local nor a national, but a social problem embracing all countries in which modern society exists." Marx and Engels considered proletarian internationalism one of the most important prerequisites for the success of the proletariat's class struggle, for the abolition of the capitalist system and the victory of the Socialist revolution. "Past experience has shown," Marx wrote, "how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggles for emancipation will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts." \* Marx and Engels regarded betrayal of proletarian internationalism as betrayal of the cause of the working people, the cause of Socialism.

---

\* Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1958, pp. 386, 384.



Lenin adhered to the same position, developing the idea of proletarian internationalism as applied to the new conditions. "Capital," he noted, "is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed. We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists." \* Lenin noted that, in order to undermine the international solidarity of the working people, the bourgeoisie frequently plays on nationalist and chauvinist sentiments and passions. He demonstrated the fundamental, profound difference between the "internationalism" of bourgeois nationalists and the solidarity of workers of different countries. "Petty bourgeois nationalism," Lenin wrote, "proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations and nothing more... preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian internationalism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should 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." \*\*

Lenin repeatedly stressed the very close link between the national and international

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Moscow, 1965, p. 293.

\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966, p. 148.



tasks of the proletariat. Struggle for the liberation of the proletariat, for Socialism within a country was inseparable for him from the struggle for Socialism throughout the world. In 1917 Lenin wrote: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working whole-heartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle *in one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) this struggle, this *and only this*, line in *every* country without exception." \* The working class of any country, in solving its national revolutionary problems, thereby assists the international proletariat and thus discharges its internationalist duty. At the same time, the revolutionary movement in other countries creates for the working class of a given country favourable international conditions for revolutionary changes and the successful accomplishment of the Socialist revolution within state and national bounds.

The Great October Socialist Revolution is a splendid example of dialectical combination of the national and international elements in the policy of the Bolshevik Party. When it was leading the working masses of Russia to overthrow the power of the landowners and capitalists, to establish a Socialist system in Russia, it pursued not only national aims. Lenin and the Party understood the tasks of the revolution in a much broader manner; the Russian revolu-

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, Moscow, 1964, p. 75.



tion had to open the road to Socialism to all peoples, to become the beginning of the world revolutionary process designed to put an end to capitalism throughout the world.

A year after the Great October Revolution, Lenin wrote: "The Bolsheviks' tactics... were the only internationalist tactics, because they did the utmost possible in one country for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in all countries." \*

Since then, the process of the revolutionary transformation of the world has spread all over the globe. In his book, *The Soviet Union: The Fifty Years*, Harrison Salisbury, an American journalist, wrote that as the result of the October Revolution, "The social fabric of Western Europe, the life of painted warriors in Africa, the aspirations of men and women in the rice-fields of Asia... metamorphosed. The world of kings, emperors and czars... vanished." \*\*

Lenin was able as no one else to make a deep analysis of the objective processes of society's socio-economic and spiritual life, to examine from every angle the relation of class forces and the concrete distinctions of each historical moment. He pointed out that the October Revolution, having divided the world into two systems, the Socialist and the capitalist, has shifted the basic contradiction of the epoch, the contradiction between moribund capitalism and growing Socialism, into the sphere of international

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, Moscow, 1965, p. 292.

\*\* H. Salisbury, *The Soviet Union: The Fifty Years*, New York, 1967, p. 4.



relations. Struggle between the two opposite social systems has become the principal process in world history. This basic contradiction in the world after the October Revolution impels the capitalist governments to set up a united front of bourgeois states to fight against Socialism. Lenin stressed that, at the same time, contradictions between the imperialist powers are operating in the contemporary world, weakening the unity of the anti-Socialist front of the bourgeoisie.

A comprehensive analysis of international relations after the October Revolution enabled Lenin to formulate the basic principles of the foreign policy to be pursued by the first Socialist state in the world. In relations with other Socialist countries—in the emergence of which Lenin had profoundly believed and with good grounds, as history has shown—and also with the working people of the world, it is proletarian internationalism. In relations with capitalist countries, which, in a definite period of history—up to the worldwide victory of the Socialist revolution—will exist side by side with the Socialist state—it is peaceful coexistence. Since then, both these principles have determined the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

After the victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, Lenin headed the first Socialist government in the world, and his understanding of proletarian internationalism was embodied in the foreign policy of the Soviet state. Lenin held that chatter about internationalism, solidarity in words, was not worth anything. He taught "to be able to be an internationalist in deed, even when times are most



trying” \*

The position of Lenin and the Bolshevik Party on the conclusion of the Brest Peace is a model of such internationalism at a desperate time for the young Soviet state. Lenin wrote: “The bitterness, resentment, and violent indignation provoked by this peace were easy to understand, and it goes without saying that we Marxists could expect only the class-conscious vanguard of the proletariat to appreciate the truth that we were making and were obliged to make great national sacrifices for the sake of the supreme interests of the world proletarian revolution”. \*\*

History proved how necessary the sacrifices made in those hard years were both for the world destinies of Socialism and ultimately for the vital interests of Russia’s working people.

The decision of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee of November 13, 1918 annulling the Brest Peace, signed by Lenin and Sverdlov, outlined some of the main features of future relations between Socialist countries. The decision stated that such relations could be based “only on principles conforming to fraternal relations between the working people of all countries and nations.... Relations between peoples established on these foundations will be not only peaceful relations. This will be an alliance of the working masses of all nations in their struggle for building and strengthening the Socialist system on the ruins of the system

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, Moscow, 1964, p. 82.

\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, Moscow, 1965, p. 187.



of militarism, imperialism and economic slavery."

The principle of proletarian internationalism was embodied in the mutual assistance and support which the working people of Soviet Russia and other countries began to render each other immediately after the October Revolution. The Soviet state was prepared to render even armed aid to its class brothers in their revolutionary struggle. This position was both reasonable and just, because the international bourgeoisie had no compunction in helping with troops and arms the capitalists of countries where revolutions broke out. A striking example was the defeat of the Hungarian revolution in 1919.

During the years of Civil War and intervention, the international solidarity of the working people of Soviet Russia and other countries was of great importance for the cause of Socialism and progress. The gains of the October Revolution were preserved in the U.S.S.R., and the first Socialist state in the history of mankind was firmly established. In the bourgeois world, the working people scored big victories in the struggle for their political and economic interests, which clearly would not have happened had there been no October Revolution in Russia.

After the end of the Civil War, the Soviet Union was engaged for about twenty years in building Socialist society. In that, its peoples made an inestimable contribution to international revolutionary proletarian solidarity. The building of Socialism created conditions for the further development of the Socialist Revolution. The Party and the Soviet people fulfilled the



directive of Lenin, who as early as 1921 said: "We are now exercising our main influence on the international revolution through our economic policy." \*

Simultaneously, the Communist Party invariably discharged its internationalist duty, rendering assistance to the working-class and revolutionary movement in foreign countries. The 14th Party Congress, held in December 1925, instructed the Central Committee "to strengthen to the utmost the alliance of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., as the basis of world revolution, with the West European proletariat and the oppressed peoples". The same line was pursued in the decisions of all subsequent congresses. On the eve of the Second World War, the 18th Party Congress called for "strengthening the international ties of friendship with the working people of all countries".

The Soviet Union supported all the biggest actions of the proletariat. We can recall such instances as the Soviet support of the 1926 general strike in Britain and the great assistance rendered to the revolutionary people of China from 1924 to 1927. When the people of Spain rose to fight a national revolutionary war, they received every assistance from the Soviet Union. The U.S.S.R. has always supported the peoples of the colonial world in their struggle for national liberation.

Lenin held that the principle of peaceful coexistence must underlie relations between the Soviet state and bourgeois countries. This idea

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, Moscow, 1965, p. 437.



was elaborated by Lenin even prior to the victory of the Socialist revolution in Russia. Peaceful coexistence was proclaimed by the Communist Party as one of the principles of its foreign policy immediately after the victory of the October Revolution.

When the Decree on Peace was adopted at the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets, Lenin noted that the secret treaties concluded by the bourgeois government of Russia also included "economic agreements and various other clauses on good-neighbourly relations". In this connection he said: "We shall welcome all clauses containing provisions for good-neighbourly relations and all economic agreements, we cannot reject these."\* This means that, in laying the cornerstone of its foreign policy, the Bolshevik Party in the very first hours of the Soviet state's existence was thinking of the forms of peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries. Later on, many bilateral and multilateral agreements of Russia with other countries were confirmed by the Soviet Government, and a number of them remain in force to this day.

The Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence provides first of all for peace in relations between states. But this does not exhaust its content. Coexistence means not only renunciation of war as a means of resolving disputed questions, but also cooperation. Lenin had in view cooperation of Socialist and bourgeois states in the political, economic and cultural spheres. He attached particularly great import-

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, Moscow, 1964, p. 255.



ance to international trade, considering it a prime means for consolidating peace and peaceful coexistence.

Even when the imperialists compelled the young Socialist state to defend, arms in hand, its right to existence, the Bolshevik Party did not rule out the possibility of cooperation, in the interests of Socialism, between Socialist and bourgeois states on definite conditions, not only in the political, but also in the military sphere.

At the beginning of 1918, when Germany was mounting an offensive on the Russian front, Lenin was ready to negotiate with the Entente countries to get arms and military assistance from them. On February 22, 1918, when the Central Committee of the Party discussed the offer of the French and the British to help the Soviet Government in the war against the Germans, Lenin spoke up "for accepting potatoes and weapons from the brigands of Anglo-French imperialism". In 1918, Lenin and the Party took a fundamental decision on the possibility of cooperating with bourgeois states even in the military sphere. This possibility was translated into reality more than 20 years later, during the Second World War, when the U.S.S.R. entered into a military and political alliance with other members of the anti-Hitler coalition to defeat Nazism.

When the Civil War ended, a period of peaceful coexistence of the Soviet state with the capitalist world began during Lenin's lifetime. It was a new stage in implementing the principle of peaceful coexistence. Lenin said: "We are in the position of having won conditions



enabling us to exist side by side with capitalist powers.” \*

The activity of the Soviet Government at the 1922 Genoa Conference offers an outstanding example of struggle for the triumph of the idea of peaceful coexistence. The Soviet delegation declared: “Adhering to the principles of Communism, the Russian delegation recognises that in the present historical epoch, which makes possible the parallel existence of the old system and the incipient new social system, economic cooperation between states representing these two systems of property is an imperative necessity....”

To preserve and strengthen peace, the Soviet Union took steps to establish normal diplomatic relations with the capitalist countries. The Soviet Government kept up its efforts in this sphere for many years and they were successfully consummated in 1933, when diplomatic relations were established with the United States. The Soviet Union’s consistent and constructive disarmament campaigns in the 1920s and the 1930s are generally known. To facilitate its struggle for peace, the Soviet Union joined the League of Nations in 1934. Treaties were concluded with some bourgeois states and definite measures were taken with the object of setting up a united front to curb fascist aggression. The Soviet Union advocated the development of broad economic cooperation with the capitalist countries, acting on the principle that trade, as a factor consolidating

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966, p. 412.



peace, is in this case not only of economic, but also of political significance.

The successes of Soviet foreign policy in the 1920s and 1930s are indisputable. The U.S.S.R. succeeded in preserving peace for 20 years; during that time it built Socialist society and prepared for the impending armed clash with the most reactionary imperialist forces. This was in both the national interests of the Soviet people and the supreme interests of the Socialist revolution, as was conclusively demonstrated by the Second World War.

Even the most inveterate enemies of the Soviet Union must recognise the grandeur of the feat performed by its people in the Great Patriotic War, a feat without equal in history. The immense sacrifices made by the Soviet people for victory preserved the national freedom and sovereignty of the U.S.S.R. Thereby a reliable bulwark of all the forces fighting for freedom, progress and Socialism, a bulwark of the world working class was preserved. To gain an idea of the importance of the Soviet Union's victory in the Second World War for the cause of progress, it is enough to ask: what would have happened without that victory, what fate would have been in store for the peoples of Eastern and Western Europe, and not only Europe? Fascist barbarity would have descended on many countries for long years. The Soviet Union dispelled this danger and therein lies the revolutionary and international importance of its feat.

The Soviet Union made big sacrifices to liberate a number of countries in Eastern and Southeastern Europe from the Nazi invaders



and their allies. Hundreds of thousands of soldiers laid down their lives to free the peoples of Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Austria, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia from the fascist yoke. As many as 144,000 Soviet servicemen perished only in battles for the freedom of Czechoslovakia. This also was fulfilment by the Soviet people of their internationalist duty.

No other country would have made such sacrifices. Prime Minister Winston Churchill, for example, feared that the Soviet Army, having expelled the enemy from its territory, would stop at the border, preserving its forces. Probably the government he headed would have acted that way had it been faced with such a problem. But the Soviet forces continued the offensive and did so not for the sake of conquest, but to enable the peoples of a number of countries to take their destiny into their own hands and to steer the development of their countries onto the road of freedom, progress and Socialism.

After the Second World War, the main line of historical development was determined both by the triumph of the ideas of the October Revolution and the defeat of the fascist states in that war. This created conditions for the conversion of Socialism into a world system, for the rise of a Socialist community of states, and the disintegration of the colonial system.

The Second World War brought about a sharp change in the balance of world forces. The Soviet Union emerged from the war more powerful than it had entered it. At the same time, the most aggressive imperialist powers were



defeated. As a result, the positions of Socialism were greatly strengthened. The wave of Socialist revolutions which unfurled after the war led a number of European and Asian countries onto the Socialist road. This was also facilitated by the colossal successes of the Soviet people in developing their economy, science and technology and in building up the state. The consolidation of Socialism simultaneously meant the weakening of imperialism's positions, which, moreover, were greatly undermined by the disintegration of the colonial system and the spread of a powerful revolutionary democratic movement in the capitalist world. All this is objective reality.

But it is just as much of a reality that capitalism still possesses huge material and technical resources and military strength, displays cunning ingenuity in fighting the revolutionary forces and remains a powerful and dangerous enemy of the Soviet Union, of the entire Socialist community.

The history of the Second World War and the postwar period conclusively shows that, as Socialism grows stronger, the hostility of the imperialist forces mounts. This intensifies and deepens the main contradiction of our time, the contradiction between Socialism and capitalism, in consequence of which the class struggle in the sphere of international relations grows much sharper. As capitalism is weakened, it by no means becomes more good-natured and tractable; it grows more aggressive, more vicious and hostile towards progress and Socialism.

Representatives of the Western political and scientific world speak directly and openly about



the deepening of contradictions between the two socio-economic systems. U.S. President Kennedy wrote in 1963: "Two great forces—the world of Communism and the world of free choice [i.e., capitalism.—*U. T.*] have, in effect, made a 'bet' about the direction in which history is moving." \* The innocuous word "bet" implies struggle between Communism and imperialism, a struggle "viewed as mortal", U.S. Prof. H.S. Dinerstein remarks. \*\* Another American expert on foreign affairs, R. Osgood, stresses that American foreign policy has been dominated by the general objective of containing Communism. Intervention is the means for achieving this end. "Intervention is here defined," Prof. Dinerstein explains, "as the use of force by the United States, directly or indirectly, in order to prevent... Communist assumption of power in a state, or in order to overthrow an established Communist regime." \*\*\*

Nor is there a lack of such admissions by British bourgeois leaders. Foreign Secretary and subsequently Prime Minister Harold Macmillan stated in 1955 that the ultimate aim of British policy is "reconversion of the Communist world", \*\*\*\* that is, the destruction of Socialism as a state system and the restoration of the capitalist order throughout the world. Another British ex-Prime Minister, Anthony Eden, firmly believed that "in a contest for the survival

---

\* *Look*, Jan. 15, 1963, p. 18.

\*\* H. S. Dinerstein, *Fifty Years of Soviet Coexistence*, Washington, 1967, p. 8.

\*\*\* H. S. Dinerstein, *Intervention Against Communism*, Baltimore, 1967, p. V, 3.

\*\*\*\* *The Times*, Sept. 23, 1955.



of a free civilisation... the Communist threat is absolute". \*

The exacerbation of contradictions between Socialism and capitalism prompts bourgeois governments to look for ways and means of somehow settling and easing the international squabbles disuniting the imperialist countries in order to maintain and reinforce the anti-Communist front. It goes without saying that even the wisest bourgeois leaders are unable to abolish the inter-imperialist contradictions. But it would be short-sighted to underestimate their efforts aimed at pooling efforts to fight Communism.

After the Second World War, the sharpening of the class struggle on the international stage made the policy of peaceful coexistence more difficult to pursue. Soviet readiness to maintain relations with the United States and Britain in the spirit of the anti-Hitler coalition after the war was answered by the cold war against the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist countries.

But Soviet successes in science, technology and industry, which resulted in the development of the most modern means of defence, restrained the imperialist politicians from turning the cold war into a hot one and compelled the bourgeois world to accept peaceful coexistence or at least coexistence with the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries. American Professor D. F. Fleming writes: "We cannot conquer or rule the Soviet Union, any more than she can subdue or control North America.... We literally have no alternative except to live on the

---

\* *Foreign Affairs*, January 1961, p. 170.



same . . . planet with the Soviet Union and learn to adjust our differences with her without war. It is a matter of life and death to us." \* Strausz-Hupé explains the spread of such a view of peaceful coexistence in the United States and other capitalist countries by the U.S.A. having lost its "freedom of decision" whether "to stay at peace or go to war". With the development of the Soviet nuclear-missile technology, the right of decision went over to the Soviet Union. \*\*

The Soviet Government, pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence in the interests of the U.S.S.R., the other Socialist countries and the entire international Communist movement, is trying to save mankind from the threat of a devastating nuclear war. It acts on the principle that peaceful coexistence of countries with opposite socio-economic systems means renunciation of war as a means of resolving disputed issues between states.

But peaceful coexistence is a dialectical phenomenon which contains elements both of cooperation and of struggle. For us it is above all a specific form of the class struggle in the international arena. Lenin described the concessions form of economic cooperation as a form "of economic war" between Socialism and capitalism. \*\*\* As for the ideological sphere, here any cooperation whatsoever is precluded;

---

\* D. F. Fleming, *The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917-1960*, Vol. I, London, 1961, p. 3.

\*\* See *American Strategy for the Nuclear Age*, New York, 1960, p.p. 46, 48.

\*\*\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966, p. 456.



here consistent and persistent class struggle is waged with ever increasing intensity. On ideological questions there can be no compromises for Marxists.

Such an interpretation of the concept of peaceful coexistence rules out any contradiction between it and proletarian internationalism. Moreover, peaceful coexistence facilitates the provision of conditions for realising the principles of proletarian internationalism. The policy of peaceful coexistence is aimed at preserving world peace, at securing peace for all the peoples of the Socialist countries and providing the external political conditions necessary for the constructive labour of the peoples in the Socialist community building Socialist and Communist society. This fully meets the aims pursued by all true Marxist internationalists.

Since the Second World War, the Leninist principle of proletarian internationalism has been strikingly embodied in the relations of the Soviet Union with other countries of the Socialist community. Part and parcel of these relations is fraternal mutual assistance, which is a powerful manifestation of the principle of Socialist internationalism. When the peoples of these countries undertook to carry out a Socialist revolution, it was the political and military might of the Soviet Union that protected them from the export of counter-revolution from the West and ensured favourable external political conditions for the victory of the revolution. The U.S.S.R. also played a similar part when peo-

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966, p. 456.



ple's rule was asserting itself in the young Socialist states. Soviet economic assistance facilitated the building up of the economy in other Socialist countries. The economic achievements of the Socialist countries are also due in large measure to the Soviet Union's assumption of a considerable share of the expenditure for the joint defence of the Socialist community, including the development of nuclear-missile weapons, which involves tremendous material outlays and the efforts of scientists, technicians and workers.

The formation of the Socialist system of states signified that the principle of Socialist internationalism, preserving all its old functions, the operation of which has been greatly extended in the new conditions, became a principle regulating relations between states in the Socialist community.

The relations of the Soviet Union with the working people of the capitalist countries continue to be based on the principle of proletarian internationalism. But with the Soviet Union increasingly influencing world development, the spread of Socialist and national-liberation revolutions, the rise in the political consciousness and activity of the masses and the further expansion of the various streams of the mass progressive movement, the international ties between the U.S.S.R. and the working people of the non-Socialist states have assumed a truly unparalleled scope. The principle of proletarian internationalism also regulates relations of other Socialist states with the working people of the capitalist world.

A characteristic feature of postwar world



politics is the concentration of forces of the bourgeoisie for struggle against Socialism and the revolutionary movement, a concentration without equal in the past. The numerous aggressive military blocs built up by the main counter-revolutionary force of our time, the United States, constitute an important element in contemporary international relations.

Political leaders of the bourgeois world are driving for further integration of the economic, military and political resources of the principal capitalist states. As early as 1961 Anthony Eden demanded: "Faced with this challenge, the free nations must unite and integrate more closely than ever before in war or peace." For "we are engaged in a conflict for the survival of a free civilization [that is how Eden qualifies capitalism.—*U. T.*]\*

Another British political leader, Douglas Home, assured the public in 1962 that "our one purpose is to try to create the interdependence of nations and bring the Communist nations into the fold with the free peoples".\*\* What he implies is the abolition of the Socialist states and the restoration of the capitalist system on their territory.

The foreign policy pursued by the bourgeois states requires that the Socialist countries, and the entire world Communist movement, further extend and strengthen revolutionary internationalist ties and joint action. The bourgeois counter-revolutionary front, which is stepping up its activity, must be met by the mighty

---

\* *Foreign Affairs*, January 1961, p. 169.

\*\* *The Times*, Oct. 24, 1962, p. 13.



revolutionary force of proletarian internationalism.

The Soviet Union is carrying out its internationalist duty embodied in the plans of building Communist society in the U.S.S.R. Thereby, the Soviet peoples are not only accomplishing their national task, but also stimulating the working people in other countries to struggle for the Socialist revolution. "We have said, and still say, that Socialism has the force of example," Lenin wrote. "...We must show the significance of Communism in practice, by example." \*

The successful building of Communism in the Soviet Union shows the working people of the world the direction followed by world social development. It also reveals the historic doom of capitalism. Our constructive activity raises the economic and political might of the world Socialist system, helps it to outstrip capitalism in material production. Our economic achievements reinforce the defence potential of the Socialist camp and create more favourable possibilities for averting another world war and cutting short the export of counter-revolution and neocolonialism by the imperialist powers. Achievements in building Communism, the growth of the economy and culture, the extension of democracy and improvement of the living standard of the Soviet people enrich the theory of Marxism-Leninism with the experience of transition from Socialism to Communism. The world revolutionary process is thereby accelerated.

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966 p. 457.



The working-class movement in the capitalist world in recent years has been largely indebted for its gains to the achievements of the Soviet people. In face of the growing might of Socialism, the bourgeoisie is compelled to manoeuvre and make concessions to the working people, who are stepping up the struggle for democracy, for their economic rights.

The C.P.S.U. is working for the international unity of the revolutionary vanguard of the world working class, for unity of action by all Communist Parties. The loyalty of the Soviet Union to proletarian internationalism is displayed in the great moral, political and material support the Soviet Union is giving the national-liberation movement and the peoples of new states which have won national independence.

The assistance rendered by the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic and Bulgaria to Czechoslovakia in the summer of 1968, when the gains of Socialism in that country were endangered by the intrigues of internal and external counter-revolutionary forces, is a striking manifestation of internationalism on the part of Socialist countries. The C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government acted in perfect conformity with the Leninist concept of internationalism. Lenin believed that the working class of the Soviet state would "support the fraternal revolutionary movement of the proletariat of all countries with all its strength and with every means at its disposal." \* The outburst of frenzy in the bourgeois

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, Moscow, 1965, p. 119.



world in this connection was convincing proof how justified this action was on the part of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

The conditions today are such that the members of the Socialist community do not have to make sacrifices as great as those borne by the Soviet Union in the initial period of its existence and in 1941-1945 in the interests of Socialism.

The relations of the Soviet Union with other countries of the Socialist community are based on fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance, strict consideration for the interests of every country and their proper combination with the general interests of the world Socialist system. But to assert these relations is an intricate and none too easy task. Numerous difficulties of an objective and subjective nature must be eliminated. It is impossible to create at once a voluntary alliance of Socialist nations, based on full confidence and clear awareness of the need for fraternal unity. For this purpose it is necessary gradually and patiently to eliminate "distrust inherited from centuries of landowner and capitalist oppression, centuries of private property and the enmity caused by its divisions and redivisions".\* Nationalism and chauvinism are among such adverse consequences of capitalism.

Besides objective difficulties, the establishment of internationalist relations within the Socialist community is also impeded by the greatly intensified intrigues of Socialism's enemies. By political, ideological propaganda and, at times, also economic means, they try to set the Social-

---

\* *Ibid.*, Vol. 30, p. 293.



ist countries against each other, and especially against the Soviet Union, aware that the U.S.S.R. is the bulwark of the entire world Socialist system. They doggedly carry on subversive work to disunite the Socialist countries and the world Communist movement from the national-liberation movement.

Contemporary Right-wing Social-Democracy, that long-standing and consistent enemy of internationalism, plays an unseemly part in this respect. Betrayal by the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders helped the imperialist forces to unleash two world wars. Today, Right-wing Social-Democracy, hand in hand with the imperialists, participates in the campaign against Socialist internationalism. In 1966, George Brown, one of the British Labour Party leaders, solemnly proclaimed at the party's conference: "We are internationalists." But the stand taken by the Wilson Government in connection with the events in Czechoslovakia leaves no room for doubt on this score. The leaders of the British Labour Party indeed act as "internationalists", not of the Socialist camp, but of the anti-Communist international counter-revolutionary front, headed by the U.S. imperialists and the Bonn revanchists.

The splitting activity of the Mao Tse-tung group is doing great harm to the cause of Socialist solidarity. It can hardly be doubted that had the group not weakened the united Socialist front, the United States would have not been able to apply its aggressive policy in Southeast Asia and especially to start the piratical war in Viet-Nam.

Imperialist propaganda is elated over the



“special” stand of Yugoslavia on the Czechoslovak question. The imperialists have cause for rejoicing. The Yugoslav leaders are paying tribute to nationalism to the detriment (and it is always only to the detriment) of Socialism.

The results of the Soviet Union’s half-century development conclusively demonstrate the correctness and vitality of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the correctness of the road followed by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party. These 50 years put to the test the Leninist principles of the foreign policy of the Socialist state—proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence. The half-century experience has revealed the vital importance of these principles for Socialism. The successes of the Soviet Union in Socialist and Communist construction clearly prove the correctness of the internal and external political course charted by the founder and leader of the first Socialist state in the world.



## **Leninist Diplomacy: Principles and Traditions**

Soviet diplomacy born of the October Revolution has travelled a long and extremely complicated path of development. The experience it has accumulated is diverse and, to a certain extent, unique—it reflected the process of the establishment of Socialism and the steadily increasing role and influence of the new social system in world development.

The character and most important peculiarities of Soviet diplomacy were and still are determined by the revolutionary and class content of Soviet foreign policy, which rests on the solid basis of Marxist-Leninist science. In their works, K. Marx, F. Engels and V. I. Lenin expounded and vindicated the genuine scientific understanding of the most significant theoretical problems of international relations and foreign policy. They formulated the basic principles of the proletariat's foreign policy and revealed the content and essence of proletarian



internationalism. V. I. Lenin outlined the chief aims and directions of a Socialist state's foreign policy under the conditions of simultaneous existence of two opposing social systems—Socialism and capitalism.

The whole history of the U.S.S.R.'s foreign policy, which has always focused the attention of the Party and its leading bodies, is an example of loyalty to the aims and principles bequeathed by Lenin. The successes scored by the Soviet Union in foreign policy are the direct result of the Leninist course and of the Party's activity based on Lenin's directions.

At each stage of the Soviet Union's development, the world situation was different; so were its foreign policy tasks. A creative approach to the implementation of these tasks organically combining loyalty to the Leninist principles and traditions and flexible utilisation of the new favourable conditions enables the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government to achieve the main foreign policy goal—preservation of peace for Communist construction.

Our Party has made a significant contribution to the theoretical elaboration, further development and practical application of Socialist foreign policy principles. The creative development of the Leninist ideas and traditions in foreign policy was necessitated by life and the need to take into account the new features and phenomena in international affairs which emerged due to radical changes in the general balance of forces in favour of Socialism.

On the eve of the Great October Revolution and in the years immediately following it,



the Bolshevik Party guided by V. I. Lenin elaborated and declared the programme of Socialist foreign policy. The Leninist foreign policy is an obviously new stage in the history of international relations and diplomacy. Lenin wrote: "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". \*

The young Soviet state regarded as the chief aim of its foreign policy the attainment of a democratic and just peace. In both its content and its practical methods, Lenin's doctrine of peace was revolutionary from the beginning to the end and inseparable from the struggle for Socialism. At the same time, it is impossible to achieve a democratic peace and create favourable external conditions for Socialist and Communist construction without a consistent and decisive struggle against imperialism and its policy of preparing and unleashing predatory wars.

Soviet foreign policy is internationalist in its very essence and is determined by the class nature of the Socialist state. The ideas of internationalism inspire not only the main goals and directions of Socialist foreign policy, but also its everyday practical actions.

With the existence of the Socialist community of nations, the internationalism of Socialist foreign policy is determined by the fact that these nations have an identical economic basis and state structure, a common ideology, com-

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, Moscow, 1964, p. 87.



mon interests in defence of their revolutionary achievements and national independence against imperialist encroachments. The Socialist countries have a common aim—Communist construction. The principle of proletarian internationalism is the cornerstone of Socialist foreign policy and determines its content and essence. That is why the question of the role and significance of proletarian internationalism in the Socialist countries' foreign policy is of the utmost importance.

The principle of proletarian internationalism, in which the ideology and political aims of the working class are embodied, has its peculiarities and manifests itself in different spheres, including the class struggle, international relations, domestic and foreign policy.

It would be erroneous to regard proletarian internationalism as no more than a principle of working class solidarity in the struggle against exploitation and oppression. This principle imposes upon the workers of the world the duty of pooling efforts on an international scale against aggressive wars and for peace among nations. It was this peculiarity of proletarian internationalism that extended its scope and offered an opportunity for rallying under the working class banner the broadest sections opposed to war. The anti-war trend of proletarian internationalism has always been one of its most important features.

Today the role played by internationalism in all spheres of social life, especially in the peoples' struggle to avert a new war and to thwart the military schemes of the imperialists, is considerably enhanced. This results first and



foremost from the intensified internationalisation of social life, the sharpening of the struggle between the forces of Socialism and of imperialism, the strengthening of the interrelations and interdependence of the three streams in the world revolutionary process—the Socialist system, the workers' movement in capitalist countries, and the national-liberation struggle of the peoples. The pressing necessity to pursue an international foreign policy is dictated by the fact that at present the war menace of imperialism is continually growing. This menace should be countered by the consolidation of all forces which are opposed to imperialism and its aggressive policy and advocate peace among nations.

At each stage of historical development, the content of proletarian internationalism has been enriched, the forms of its manifestation becoming more varied and perfect. The establishment of the world Socialist system ushered in a new stage in the development of proletarian internationalism, which has now become the basic principle of inter-state relations between Socialist countries. This substantially increased its sphere of activity—which in itself is of tremendous importance. The functions of the proletarian internationalism have also become more complex and it now determines not only the relations between the working class of the Socialist countries, but also the relations between the peoples of those countries and the relations between those states, that is, it determines both class and inter-state relations, which is certainly a most complex task.

One of the most important requirements log-



ically arising from the principle of proletarian internationalism is the Socialist countries' coordination of action in international affairs. The Socialist countries' consolidation of efforts and coordination of action in foreign policy are particularly necessary not only because they are opposed on the key issues by the imperialist bloc. Unity and coordination of action increase the Socialist countries' strength and are the most essential condition for the triumph of peace, democracy, national independence and Socialism over war, reaction, colonialism and imperialism. As V. I. Lenin pointed out, "complete victory over capitalism cannot be won unless the proletariat and, following it, the mass of working people in all countries and nations throughout the world, voluntarily strive for alliance and unity." \*

Besides, the Socialist countries are faced with such issues as thwarting the aggressive schemes of the imperialist circles, rendering most effective assistance to the national-liberation movement, preserving peaceful coexistence, solving such international problems as disarmament, creation of a reliable collective security system in Europe and other areas. All these tasks can be solved only if there is unity of action and coordinated effort of the Socialist countries. Both the character and the scope of these tasks make it urgent for the Socialist countries to pool their efforts and coordinate their action. This necessity also follows from the significance and complexity of the problems facing the Socialist states. Many national problems

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Moscow, 1966, p. 151.



of certain Socialist countries (e.g., ensuring individual Socialist countries' national security) can be solved only through joint effort, agreement and unity of action of the Socialist countries.

Coordination of action and joint effort by the Socialist states in their struggle against the imperialist policy of aggression and war to guarantee the most favourable external conditions for Socialist and Communist construction are dictated by the objective demands of life itself. Accordingly, the Warsaw Pact countries have committed themselves "to consult one another on all important international issues related to their common interests...." In fulfilment of this commitment, regular consultations on all key international issues are held, and the general line and position of the Socialist states are elaborated.

Wide-scale diplomatic cooperation of the Socialist states does not mean, however, that the diplomatic activities of these countries have no specific features of their own, arising from a number of political, economic, historical, geographical and other factors. The Foreign Minister of the Polish People's Republic, Adam Rapacki, says: "The community of foreign policy principles and aims [of the Socialist countries—*Ed.*] does not mean application of some stereotype in the Socialist countries' diplomatic activities in the international arena. Each Socialist state has its own specific interests, its historically shaped economic ties with other countries, certain special methods and forms of action. These peculiarities can be and are reflected in the foreign policy of all Socialist states and are beneficial to the peoples concerned as well



as to the common policy of the entire Socialist camp and the common cause of peaceful coexistence."

It can be added that, within the framework of the common line, the diplomatic positions of the Socialist states may not completely coincide on certain particular questions. Here it is of importance to elaborate by collective efforts a general position which meets the interests of each Socialist country and of the entire Socialist camp. Proletarian internationalism neither ignores the diversity of the present-day world nor calls for automatic identity of methods in foreign policy; it presupposes efforts and ability to find a solution of the common international problems under specific national conditions. Far from weakening the coordination of foreign policy acts by the Socialist community in opposing the global strategy of imperialism, this makes it still more imperative.

Socialist diplomacy is not stagnant. Proceeding from the changes in the international situation, its principal concepts are creatively elaborated and developed; on the basis of the experience accumulated, tactics and methods are being perfected, and diplomatic personnel are being trained and tempered to put into practice the ideas of peace and Socialism. Socialist diplomacy has unmasked the filthy machinations of imperialism and enabled the broad masses to play their part in world politics.

The entire history of Soviet foreign policy is convincing proof of our country's firm and consistent efforts to fulfil its internationalist duty. The Soviet Union does not shirk the responsibilities imposed on it by the principles of



proletarian internationalism. This was the case in the first years of Soviet power, when foreign policy was directed personally by V. I. Lenin; it was the case also in the 1930s and the hard years of the Second World War; and it is still true in the postwar period.

The experience gained by Soviet diplomacy is the basis which enables our country to work effectively for peace and social progress. L. I. Brezhnev said in his speech at the Karlovy Vary conference: "If it is true that the struggle for peace promotes the struggle for Socialism, it is no less true that the struggle against imperialism and reactionary elements for democracy and social progress is an important condition for consolidating peace and international security."

In his report on peace at the Second All-Russia Congress of the Soviets of the Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on October 26 (November 8), 1917, V. I. Lenin set the task: "...to help the peoples to intervene in question of war and peace."\* The years that have passed since then have been years of strenuous and consistent action by our country for peace in the anti-imperialist struggle, which has united the masses and increasingly involved them in the peace movement.

Today, the struggle for peace is still for us a class and revolutionary task, since fighting for peace means isolating the most militant and aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The struggle against the threat of war arising from imperialism has always been concrete

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, Moscow, 1964, p. 252.



in character; its ways, forms and methods are determined by real circumstances and the necessity to counter imperialism's aggressive acts. During the Korean war, the peoples concentrated their efforts on curbing the aggressors and making them stop the predatory war. Today, the chief efforts of peace supporters are aimed at putting an end to the barbarous war waged by the American imperialists against the Vietnamese people. It is typical that the anti-war wave is gaining strength in the U.S. itself.

Year after year, the peoples are more actively intervening in questions of war and peace. V. I. Lenin foresaw the great difficulties which would have to be overcome on the road to lasting peace. Imperialism, losing its positions one after another, will not voluntarily withdraw from the struggle. Moreover, the latest events testify that it is even trying to mount a counter-offensive.

All these efforts, however, are doomed to inevitable failure. Today, the international working class and its creation—the world Socialist system—which is continually increasing its political, economic and military might, is the most important anti-war force. The history of the postwar period has proved that the Socialist countries possess the necessary resources and possibilities to curb the imperialist policy of aggression and war.

An essentially new postwar factor is the part played in the anti-war movement by such a powerful force as the young sovereign states of Asia and Africa which have emerged on the ruins of the colonial empires.

While stressing that the principle of prole-



tarian internationalism in foreign policy is expressed, first and foremost, in the relations between the Socialist countries, it is necessary to note that this does not exhaust the sphere of its manifestation. The Socialist countries' policy towards the national-liberation movement is another notable field where this principle is reflected.

V. I. Lenin regarded the national-liberation struggle as an important part of the general world revolutionary process. He connected the successes of the national-liberation movement directly with the assistance it received and would receive from the forces of organised Socialism. "... This revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only by direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism."\* In these conditions, V. I. Lenin considered it necessary to approve a new slogan "Workers of All Countries and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!" which expresses the unbreakable organic link of the national-liberation movement with the Socialist forces and the international workers' movement.

In compliance with this slogan, one of the most important tasks of Socialist foreign policy has always been all-round assistance and support to the national-liberation struggle of the peoples against imperialism and colonialism. This follows from the principle of proletarian internationalism.

---

\* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, Moscow, 1965, p. 151.



Among the forms and types of assistance rendered by the Socialist countries to the national-liberation movement are direct material support, both economic and military, to the oppressed peoples, political and diplomatic support in the international sphere; frustration of the imperialist powers' aggressive actions against the peoples fighting for liberation; prevention of the export of counter-revolution, and broad-scale scientific and technical assistance to the developing countries.

The choice of the various forms of assistance to the national-liberation movement and the emerging states is conditioned by concrete historical circumstances, the peculiarities of the situation in these countries, their needs, etc. But whatever the forms and methods of the Socialist countries' assistance to the national-liberation movement and the developing countries, their essence is the same—the genuine internationalism underlying the policy of the Socialist community.

Assistance and support of the national-liberation movement by the world Socialist system and the working class in the capitalist countries are of vital importance for complete and final liquidation of colonialism. It would be erroneous, however, to view this assistance as unilateral and to ignore the fact that the peoples' national-liberation struggle is substantially strengthening the general positions of the Socialist countries and the entire world workers' movement.

Proletarian internationalism must not be interpreted in a dogmatic and narrow sectarian manner. If the principle of proletarian in-



ternationalism and its influence on foreign policy are thus viewed, various errors are inevitable.

It is common knowledge, for example, that assistance to the oppressed peoples struggling for their liberation from national oppression is one of the most significant requirements of proletarian internationalism. Here the principle of proletarian internationalism is in full force. But, after the victory of the national-liberation movement and the formation of a national independent state, a new situation arises, since power goes to a government which opposes imperialism and at the same time expresses the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Can it be said, in such a case, that the principle of proletarian internationalism is observed to a certain extent in relations between these countries and the Socialist countries?

If we view the question from the broader angle of what principles cooperation between the Socialist and the emerging countries rests on and whether it is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence alone or outgrows the framework of that principle, it is obvious that it would be absolutely wrong to define those relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence alone. The assistance and support which has been and is being rendered by the Socialist countries to the young national states are dictated by genuine internationalism.

The relations between the Socialist and the emerging countries are such that they cannot be determined by peaceful coexistence alone. Relations of sincere friendship, mutual confidence and support, solidarity and fraternity in



their common struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for independence, peace and freedom of all peoples, are developing and strengthening. But that does not mean that the whole complex of relations between the Socialist and developing countries is based on the principle of proletarian internationalism. Such an approach and such an assessment would ignore the key difference in the social structures of the Socialist countries and of the young national states. While it would be erroneous not to see differences between them, it would also be a mistake to attach paramount importance to those differences and to pay no attention to the profound socio-economic processes taking place in some of those states already today or maturing in others. When analysing the relations between the Socialist and the developing countries, one should proceed from the concrete conditions, and, in the first place, take into consideration what path of socio-economic development this or that African or Asian country has chosen.

Events show, that real conditions are to hand for bringing closer together the Socialist and the emerging countries and an objective foundation is available for strengthening their solidarity in the struggle against imperialism.

The Socialist states play an exceptionally important role in thwarting the imperialist powers' attempts to restore their influence and control over their former colonies and semi-colonies and to halt by military force the widening and deepening of the national-liberation struggle. The failure of the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956, the flop of the imperial-



ist plot against Syria in 1957, the defeat of the imperialist aggression against Iraq and Jordan in 1958, and the assistance given by the Socialist states to the Arab countries in their struggle against the Israeli aggression in 1967 are all striking examples showing the efficacy of proletarian internationalism, its profoundly vital force in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

Since the national-liberation struggle has now reached a qualitatively new stage in its development, when the elimination of the economic backwardness of the former colonies and dependent countries has become the main task, the economic assistance and support rendered by the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist countries to the young national states assumes special significance. The internationalism of the Socialist countries' policy is manifested in their economic aid to the national states. Both the volume and the character of this aid are well known, as is also the role it plays in developing and consolidating the emerging countries' economy.

One of Soviet diplomacy's fundamental tasks is to draw the peoples and states of the East into world politics and the solution of key international issues. The Soviet proposals drawn up by Georgi Chicherin shortly before the Genoa conference (1922) and approved by V. I. Lenin ran: "The novelty of our international scheme should lie in the fact that the Negro as well as other colonial peoples should participate in conferences and committees on an equal footing with the European peoples and have the right to reject interference in their internal life."



At that time, this was but a programme. Now the developing countries' foreign policy and diplomacy are playing an ever growing role in international affairs. The conferences and meetings they hold and at which steps and measures are discussed for the struggle for universal peace and against imperialism and colonialism, the diplomatic activities of the non-aligned states in the United Nations, etc., are proof of this. It is noteworthy that when the United Nations Organisation was established (1945) there were 12 Asian and African members out of a total of 51; by 1955, their number had increased to 26, and today about 70 seats out of 123 belong to African and Asian countries. The fact that states freed from the imperialist yoke, as well as millions of working people vitally interested in ensuring just and democratic peace, are being involved in activity to solve key international issues undoubtedly strengthens the Socialist community's position and promotes successful activities in the international arena by the diplomacy of both groups of countries.

Relations with capitalist countries form an important field of Soviet foreign policy. Soviet diplomacy spared no effort to make them normal. For example, on April 30, 1925, the Soviet Ambassador to France, L. Krasin, reported to the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs: "I told Briand that the Soviet Government's directive given to me when I left for France was aimed at restoring not only normal diplomatic relations, but the closest possible relations between the two peoples..."

The Soviet Government attached great importance to normalisation of relations with the



U.S.A. Deputy People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs wrote in his instructions to the Soviet Ambassador in France on February 20, 1926: "You should state to the U.S. Ambassador [in Paris—*Ed*]... that since the very first day of its existence the Soviet Government has been continually seeking an opportunity to establish normal relations with the great American people and settle the existing misunderstanding."

Soviet-German relations in the 1920s and early 1930s deserve appreciation, since they were marked by development of broad economic and political cooperation between the two biggest European states. These relations were formalised by the conclusion of the agreements of Rapallo (1922) and of Berlin (1926) and a number of mutually advantageous trade and economic treaties. These agreements were in accord with the national interest of the German people as well. Even bourgeois politicians had to admit the constructive nature of Soviet-German cooperation. Thus, the former Counsellor of the German Embassy in Moscow G. Hilger and the American historian A. Meyer pointed out that in the 1920s there was "no small friction and conflict" between the U.S.S.R. and Germany and added, "It is nevertheless important to understand that these conflicts were settled, even if after long and drawn-out negotiations." \*

In the period between the two world wars, business ties between the U.S.S.R. and the cap-

---

\* Gustav Hilger, Alfred G. Meyer. *The Incompatible Allies. A Memoir-history of German-Soviet Relations 1918-1941*, New York, 1953, p. 151.



italist countries expanded, and the trade turnover increased Soviet diplomats took part in international conferences and stepped up their activities in defence of peace in the League of Nations. Practice has confirmed the possibility and necessity of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The anti-Hitler coalition which emerged during the Second World War due to the decisive contribution of the Soviet Union is proof of the possibility of fruitful cooperation between the states with different social systems.

Despite vigorous opposition from militant imperialist reaction, the policy of peaceful coexistence is making headway in present-day international life. In recent years a number of problems have been solved (the Moscow Treaty of 1963 on banning nuclear tests in the three media, the 1967 Agreement on the Peaceful Use of Outer Space). Negotiations on the conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty have made a considerable step forward. In international practice, negotiations are the only reasonable and real way of reaching agreement on urgent questions.

The Soviet Union resolutely repulses the attempts of certain Western countries to interpret the principle of peaceful coexistence in a manner which completely distorts and practically rejects internationalism. As a matter of fact, the conceptions of the ideological and political opponents of Communism boils down to the following: If you strive for peaceful coexistence, you should discard the principle of proletarian internationalism. The form in which this is expressed may vary, but its essence re-



mains the same.

In stepping up their aggression in Viet-Nam, U.S. ruling circles hoped that the Socialist countries would be unable to rebuff their action. Hopes of disunity and lack of solidarity in the Socialist community have been and still are playing an important role in the strategy of U.S. imperialism.

Pursuing the policy of direct aggression against a Socialist country—the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the U.S. ruling circles at the same time make statements in which they express the desire for steps to improve Soviet-U.S. relations. The idea behind them is quite clear: if the Soviet Union wants peaceful coexistence with the United States, it should abstain from any action which could “hamper” the process of normalisation of relations with it. In other words, for the sake of improving relations with the U.S.A. the Soviet Union should remain indifferent to U.S. aggressive actions and discard the principle of proletarian internationalism.

All these calculations are built on sand. The Soviet Union resolutely opposes imperialist attempts to interpret peaceful coexistence in such a way as to limit it to Soviet-American relations and exclude individual Socialist countries. The Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures is absolutely incompatible with such an interpretation. The principle of peaceful coexistence is equally applicable to big and small states belonging to different social systems, and in this respect no exceptions or restrictions are possible.

No phrase-mongering by Washington poli-



ticians about their desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union can be considered sincere as long as they wage the dirty war against a Socialist country—the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The thesis of the indivisibility of peace formulated by Soviet diplomacy in the 1930s is no less actual now that then.

The new diplomacy born of the October Revolution is characterised by entirely new relations among those who implement the Leninist general course of foreign policy. The work of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin is the best example. He would often have long talks with Soviet diplomats; he briefed them himself before they left for abroad, paid close attention to their work from Moscow, criticised them in a friendly manner, thus forming the personnel for the foreign policy service. All this established quite a friendly working atmosphere.

The Party has educated a number of prominent diplomats and created the school of Soviet Socialist diplomacy. The Communist party carefully preserves and develops the Leninist style and method in directing Soviet diplomacy. The key issues of Soviet foreign policy are regularly discussed at C.P.S.U. Congresses and C.C. plenary sessions. Foreign policy issues hold an important place in the everyday activities of the Party's Central Committee.

The International Workers' and Communist movement and all progressive people of the world highly assess the foreign policy activities of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government. Soviet diplomacy has passed the difficult 50-year-long examination with flying colours. It managed, as V. Lenin put it, "to maintain



loyalty to its principles, its class, its revolutionary task”.

Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy, resolute in the struggle against the aggressive imperialist forces, and consistent in following the Leninist course of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, promote the further strengthening of the Soviet Union's international positions and substantially contribute to the defence of peace, the security of nations and the working peoples' struggle for freedom, peace and social progress.

**Ленинские принципы  
советской внешней политики**

*на английском языке*

Цена 12 коп.







