

**NATIONAL POLICY OF
THE PROLETARIAT**



TAMIL NADU MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY

NATIONAL POLICY OF THE PROLETARIAT

1. NATION AND NATIONALITY

What is a Nation ? Stalin has correctly defined it as " an historically constituted stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make - up manifested in a common culture. " (1) This sort of Nation is established only in the era when capitalism succeeds over feudalism. But, nationality belongs to a much earlier period.

Nationalities were formed when the first class society emerged from the society of tribal people. In other words, when for the first time people were established as societies of people on the basis of a territory, with a common language they became nationalities. Therefore, nationality is a stable society of people having one common language and living on the basis of territory. The first nationality consisted of slave lords. Next to it, the nationalities of the land owning society were established during the middle ages. Even though a common language would have evolved in the tribal establishments itself and since people establishing themselves as societies based on a common territory could occur only with the genesis of a class society, the genesis of the first ancient nationality is linked with the ancient slave society.

The most important difference between nationality and nation is the combining of the aspect of a common economic life with the common language and common territory. This takes place when capitalism succeeds over feudalism; not before that.

If nationality is an historical category of the period of the genesis of the slave owning society over the destruction of ancient tribal society, and the land owning society over the destruction of slave owning society, then nation is an historical category of the era when capitalism succeeded in destroying feudalism . The genesis of nation transforms the economic life of the people which so far remained scattered into fragments, as integrated within a territory with a common language, with the maximum division of labour and with independent and extensive class divisions into a common economic life of a modern nation.

The nation established in this way consists of two aspects. The first one is the racial aspect, the second one is the social aspect; common language and territory is the racial aspect. In this language alone is the principal one. The capitalist economic structure which succeeds over the feudal economy is the social aspect. This indicates the productive relations - class relations - of the capitalist society.

There cannot be a nation without a common language; at the same time, it cannot have more than one common language. Because, different common languages indicate different nationalities. In the same way a nation cannot exist without a territory having an integrated economic life with a common language at the same time separate territories having different and separate economic life cannot be considered as one nation, just because of one language.

2. NATIONAL MOVEMENT AND NATIONAL STATE

" A National movement is essentially a bourgeoisie movement " (2) said Stalin. " Throughout the world, the period of final victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements " (3) said Lenin. In fact, the victory of capitalism over feudalism and the formation of nations are linked with the national movement.

What is a national movement ? Basically it consists of four characteristic features. First a national movement is a renaissance movement of language, arts, literature and culture. Secondly, it is a peasant movement. Thirdly, it is a democratic movement. Fourthly, it is a movement to establish a national state. Thus the national movement consists of four characteristic features.

The victory of capitalism over feudalism is nothing but the victory of capital. For this capitalists should seize extensive market. For that, all the adjoining territories consisting people speaking the same language should be brought within the boundaries of a single state. Apart from that, for the expansion of market, for close links and free and extensive class divisions to be established among the people (between buyers and sellers, between employers and employees and between producers and consumers) the obstacles for the renaissance and the growth of language and its literature should be removed. That is why Lenin said: " the modern requirements of capitalism is undoubtedly the greatest possible national uniformity of population, for nationality and language identity are an important factor making for the complete conquest of the home market and for the complete freedom of economic intercourse " (4). Therefore it is clear that, the movement of capitalism against feudalism is principally a movement for the renaissance of language, arts, literature and culture.

The struggle of capitalism against feudalism apart from being the cause for the integration of nationality, extensive and free class divisions, renaissance of language, literature, etc., it ultimately overthrows all the feudal political and economic institutions. In this struggle all sections of people, including the broad sections of the most backward masses are drawn into the struggle for their political rights (for the rights of nationalities) and enter into the political arena. They participate in the movements in an unprecedented scale. Printed literature is published on a grand scale. People's organizations and people's representative assemblies come into existence. Constitutional form of rule comes into vogue. Thus the struggle of capitalism against feudalism is also a movement for bourgeoisie democracy.

Moreover, the movement of capitalism against feudalism is in essence only a peasant movement. Without the participation of the peasants, capitalism cannot achieve final victory over feudalism. Stalin said: " the peasant question is the basis, the quintessence, of the national question. That explains the fact that the peasantry constitutes the main army of the national movement, that there is no powerful national movement without the peasant army, nor can there be. " (5) His contention is that, the national problem comprises problems like national culture and national state along with the peasant problem. Therefore, it is also obvious that, the national movement is also a peasant movement.

It is only the national state which is capable of fulfilling in the best possible manner the onerous task of paving the path for the very much free, extensive and rapid growth of capitalism. That is why, " the tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of national states, under which those requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied. The most profound economic factors drive towards this goal ". (6) said Lenin.

Through out the world, it was only in Europe, the national movements against feudalism broke out for the first time and national states were established in West European countries like Britain, France, Germany and Italy.

Lenin emphasized that, the establishment of such national states is a common phenomenon not only for the Western Europe but also for the entire world in the era of capitalism. It is the law of history that, all the countries where feudalism has not yet been overthrown completely must pass through the national movements towards establishing national states. Lenin who said " for the whole of Western Europe, nay for the entire civilised world, the national state is typical and normal for the capitalist period " (7) citing the examples of not only the Western European countries but also Japan in Asia and Balkan countries said, it is only in an independent national state that " the conditions for the most complete development of commodity production and the freest, widest and speediest growth of capitalism have been created. " (8) More over he reemphasized that, " the example of the whole of progressive and civilized mankind, the example of the Balkans and that of Asia prove that . . . the national state is the rule and the " norm " of capitalism. " (9) He also said that, capitalism had created national movements even in Asia and " the tendency of the movements is towards the creation of national states in Asia. " (10).

The bourgeoisie national movements against feudalism in Western Europe established national states having national unity. They paved the way for the unobstructed and extensive capitalist development in those countries. But the events throughout the world did not take place in this manner. Even before the full development of capitalism certain big nationalities and imperialists created backward multi-national states and colonial states, defeating by force the weak nationalities which were not yet developed into nations through economic integration, which were economically backward, where feudalism not yet overthrown and where capitalism is still very weak.

In the multi-national states created in this way by force, the national movements of the oppressed nationalities had to encounter not only their own feudal forces but also the ruling classes of the oppressing imperialist nationalities. In the countries which were turned into colonies by the imperialists, the national movements were against both imperialism and feudalism.

However, there is no alteration in the object of all sorts of national movements with regard to establishing a national state which will facilitate the free and extensive growth of capitalism. That is why, Lenin said, " national state is the rule throughout the world " (11) and " nations are an inevitable product, an inevitable form, in the bourgeoisie epoch of social development " (12) and also said, that " the formation of independent national state is the tendency of all bourgeoisie-democratic revolutions " (13).

Even though the object of the surging national movements in colonial countries and in oppressed nationalities is to establish national states, its characteristic feature is that it could be achieved only through a national liberation war.

3. DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION AND NATIONAL PROBLEM

What is democratic revolution ? Democratic revolution is the revolutionary upsurge which totally destroys feudalism. This is only a bourgeoisie revolution. Even if the proletariat leads this revolution, there is no change in its essence of being a bourgeoisie democratic revolution. If colonized by imperialism before the complete overthrow of feudalism, this bourgeoisie democratic revolution will be against imperialism also.

What is the relation between bourgeoisie democratic revolution and national problem ? Before dealing with this issue we should make ourselves clear as to what we refer to as national problem. What we refer to as national problem, is the problem of a nationality in developing into a modern nation. Nationality is a society of people having a common language and a common territory. This sort of societies of nationalities are formed in the slave society and in the feudal society. However they are not called as nations. Nations are formed only when capitalism succeeds over feudalism. Therefore bourgeoisie democratic revolution and the formation of modern nations are simultaneous occurrences. In other words, bourgeoisie democratic revolution itself becomes the national movement for the formation of modern nations.

Lenin said: " Throughout the world, the period of the final victory of capitalism over feudalism has been linked up with national movements. For the complete victory of commodity production, the bourgeoisie must capture the home market, and there must be politically united territories whose population speak a single language, with all the obstacles to the development of that language and to its consolidation in literature must be eliminated. Therein is the economic foundation of the national movements. Language is the most important means of human intercourse. Unity and unimpeded development of language are the most important conditions for the genuinely free and extensive commerce on a scale commensurate with modern capitalism, for a free and broad grouping of the population in all its various classes and lastly, for the establishment of close connection between the market and each and every proprietor big or little and between seller and buyer. Therefore, the tendency of every national movement is towards the formation of national states under which these requirements of modern capitalism are best satisfied. The most profound economic factors drive towards this goal. " (14)

Capitalism apart from impelling people who had a fragmented economic life under feudalism, to come under an integrated economic life, unifies them politically also. It also creates close relations and extensive, free, class divisions among people. Lenin emphasized that, for this, people speaking the same language and a politically unified territory and an unobstructed growth of that language and its literature is necessary. He said that, " the greatest possible national uniformity of population " and " Nationality and language identity " (15) are necessary.

All these things makes it clear that, the democratic revolution and the national movement are inseparable and the (bourgeois) democratic revolution is possible only on the basis of national society speaking the same language. This is applicable whether it is a democratic revolution led by the bourgeoisie or the democratic revolution led by the proletariat.

This makes it clear that, in a multi-national state brought together on the basis of religion, national movement and a democratic revolution cannot be on that basis. In fact the unity of various nationalities created on the basis of religion is nothing but protecting the repressive measures of the repressing nationality. As a consequence of national repression in the name of religious unity the democratic

revolution of both the repressed and repressing nationalities are relegated to the back ground, as a result a backward condition exists here. Here it is worth mentioning the assertion of Lenin that, " states of mixed national composition (known as multi-national states, as distinct from national states) are always those whose internal constitution has for some reason or other remained abnormal or under-developed. " (16)

Religion cannot be the basis of a national state. A national state is based on nationality. It consists of people speaking a common language in a common territory. On the basis of religion an extensive multi-national state may be formed. But, it is not a national state. That is only a religious fundamentalist state. When democratic movements emerge there, when national movements emerge against feudalism, naturally this religious state will split and national states on the basis of nationalities will be established. Through out Europe the only religion is the Christian religion. It is an historical truth that, Europe which was a single state under that religion, scattered into various national states on the basis of nationalities when national movements - democratic movements - emerged there in a combined form along with the development of capitalism. Though there are several Islamic states in one and the same region, they remain scattered, unable to unite on the basis of religion. It was just from Pakistan united on the basis of religion that Bangladesh broke-away as a separate country. Therefore it is neither possible for the religion to unite various nations nor a democratic revolution is possible on that basis; unification of various nationalities on the basis of religion is reactionary which precede democratic revolution.

Democratic movement means that, its only object is to establish a national state. It is a general law. That is why Lenin referred to the state borders drawn on the basis of nationalities as " democratic " and Engels as " natural " borders

It is a fact that, in Russia under the leadership of Lenin a combined democratic revolution was conducted in a multi-national state community. But, in the democratic revolution of this multi-national state, the proletariat of the repressing nationality played a leading and decisive role in the revolution. It recognised the sovereignty - the right of self-determination - of the repressed nationalities. None of the nationalities gave up the objective of their own national state. After the revolution some of the nationalities established their own separate national states. The other nationalities established the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, only as a union of their own republics in the post revolutionary Russia. We know that, after the restoration of capitalism in Russia, these republics of nationalities recently established their own separate national states on the basis of their own resolutions. Therefore the Russian revolution just confirms, the policy of national states of the nationalities and the policy that democratic revolution's objective is the national state (or sovereignty). Due to its correct democratic nature, the policy of one national state for one nationality became an internationally accepted policy only after the Russian revolution (in 1920).

Therefore, the fact that, in a democratic revolution national problem is an important, inseparable aspect, that the democratic revolution cannot succeed without linking it with the object of (right of) national state and that a national state is established only on the basis of nationality and not on any other basis like religion etc., should be clearly understood.

4. IN THE STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM, THE NATIONAL PROGRAMME OF THE PROLETARIAT

" The principle of nationality is historically inevitable in bourgeois society and, taking this society into due account the Marxist fully recognises the historical legitimacy of national movements. " (17) Further, also, the Marxists don't deny the progressive and necessary, historical role played by the national movement and the national state which became an inevitable law in the social history and in the capitalist era. But the objective of the proletariat is higher than that. It is having socialism and communism as its goal. Only class struggle is the means to attain this goal. Therefore, at the same time while the bourgeoisie consider every national movement and every national state as a means to attain the objectives of the capitalists, the proletariat approaches them from the point of view of creating favorable conditions for the class struggle.

" There are two nations in every modern nation. " (18) One is the nation of bourgeoisie and the other one is the proletarian nation. The bourgeoisie have the objective of full protection, with in its nation for exploiting the proletariat, hegemony over other nations and internationally the exploitation and domination of capital. Land lords and other reactionaries are their partners. But, the proletariat has its objective of establishing socialism in its nation by abolishing not only the remnants of middle ages, but also the capitalist exploitation and maintaining fraternal relations with the other nations and attaining world wide socialist ideals through the struggle against international capital by achieving the solidarity of the international proletariat. All the labouring, toiling, exploited masses are with it. " There are toiling and exploited masses, whose conditions of life inevitably give rise to the ideology of democracy and socialism. " (19) Thus in the same nation the " bourgeois nation " has imperialist objectives and the " proletarian nation " has socialist objectives.

That is why Lenin declared against bourgeois nationalist objectives as, the " complete equality of rights for all nations, the right of the nations to self-determination, the unity of the workers of all nations - such is the national programme that Marxism, the experience of the whole world and the experience of Russia, teach the workers. " (20)

It is obvious that, this policy has the objective of eliminating national disputes between nations and to create conditions favorable for the class struggle; in which the proletariat in every nation to launch attacks against its own capital and the international proletariat to combine against the international capital.

However, the proletariat of a country while devising its own national programme, the following four points should be taken into account.

First, as far as the national movements are concerned it has two distinct periods of capitalism radically differing from each other. The first stage is the period of bourgeois national democratic movements to establish a bourgeois state and a bourgeoisie society. In other words, it is the period which thoroughly wipes out the remnants of middle ages and establishes complete bourgeoisie democracy. The second stage is the period when the bourgeoisie state is fully evolved and the bourgeois democratic movements of the common people has become rare; which could be termed as a period of the down fall of capitalism. In other words, it is the period of transition from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. It should be decided by the proletariat, in which period, of these two, a country is at present, whether in the bourgeoisie democratic period or in the period when it has come to an end. In this

respect all the countries will not be similar and will not be in the same period. Lenin pointed out that, while the democratic revolutions were completed in the West European countries, it remained incomplete in the East European and in the oriental countries. In such countries the proletariat cannot advance by abandoning the stage of bourgeoisie democratic revolution. Because, " the proletariat cannot be victorious except through democracy. " (21) If attempts are made to advance by abandoning the bourgeoisie democratic revolution in that way then, Lenin cautioned " if we were to declare that we do not recognise any Finsih nation, but only the working people, that would be sheer non-sense. We cannot refuse to recognise what actually exists, it will itself compel us to recognise it. " (22) and " from the socialists point of view , it was undoubtedly a mistake to ignore the task of national liberation in a situation where national oppression existed. " (23)

Secondly, the significant aspects of the growth rate of their own country's nationalities, national structure, distribution of population and various such issues and the way they differ from other countries should be concretely differentiated.

Lenin says that, without concretely analyzing these two things and taking into account " there can be no question of the Marxists of any country drawing up their national programme without taking into account all these general historical and concrete state conditions. " (24)

Thirdly, the national movement is not an absolute one. Only the victory of the working class could ensure the complete liberation of all nations. In these conditions the relations between the liberation movements of the proletariat of the repressing nations and bourgeoisie liberation movements of the repressed nations is of great importance. But, " it is impossible to estimate before hand all the possible relations. " (25) That can be assessed only in concrete conditions. Therefore, it is necessary that, the national programme of the Marxists of a country should also be based on the concrete analysis of these relations.

Fourthly, it is an era of imperialism. Lenin says that, " imperialism is the epoch of constantly increasing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of " Great " powers " (26) and he further adds that, " imperialism consists in a striving of nations that oppress a number of other nations to extend and increase that oppression and to repartition the colonies. " (27) Therefore, no national movement could be viewed in isolation from anti-imperialism. This emphasizes that, the proletariat " must link the revolutionary struggle for socialism with a revolutionary programme on the national question." (28)

5. THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION AND NATIONAL LIBERATION (FROM HISTORICAL EVIDENCES)

The right of self-determination is the right of every nationality to establish a distinct national state. Self-determination is to establish a distinct state or to live with that right jointly with other nations under one state. National liberation is to establish a distinct national state breaking the colonial shackles of the repressing nation or of imperialism.

The proletariat at the same time while recognizing the historical role of the bourgeoisie national state, " confines itself, so to speak, to the negative demand for recognition of the right to self-determination. " (29) In a multi-national state community which consists of repressing and repressed nationalities, the right of self-determination is a privilege of the repressing nationality. It was pointed out by Lenin that, in Russia only the great Russian nationality enjoyed this privilege. There-

fore, it is obvious that, here, it is only the right of repressed nation's self-determination which is to be recognised. It does not mean that, the proletariat should not take the stand of either supporting or opposing in each matter of national demand and in the matter of national liberation - secession - of the repressed nationalities. On the contrary, it means that, at the same time while recognizing the right of self-determination of all nationalities, in the matter of either support or opposition to each particular national demand for liberation - secession - a firm stand should be taken from the point of view of class struggle of the proletariat. That is why the proletariat " assess any national demand and every national seperation, from the angle of the workers' class struggles " (30) and " it is the only policy in the national question that is practical, based on principles and that really promotes democracy, liberty and proletarian unity. The recognition of the right of secession for all; the appraisal of each concrete question of secession from the point of view of removing all inequality, all privileges, and all exclusiveness. " (31)

But, on no account this could be a denial of the right of self-determination itself of the nationalities. Because, it will only amount to supporting the national repression and the national inequalities, as a result, it will become a cause for the bitterness and disunity among the proletariat of the repressing and repressed nationalities, consequently pushing the class struggle to the background and projecting national disputes, and through this pushing back the socialist objectives. " Repudiation of the right to self-determination, i.e. the right of nations to secede, means nothing more than defence of the privileges of the dominant nation. " (32) Therefore on no account the proletariat can afford to be against the right of self-determination of the nationalities.

It was due to this reason Lenin vehemently criticised Rosa Luxemburg in Russia, when she opposed the right of self-determination for Poland. He said, " When, in her anxiety not to assist the nationalist bourgeoisie of Poland, Rosa Luxemburg rejects the right to secession in the programme of the Russian Marxists, "....." she is in fact assisting the great Russian black hundreds " and "carried away by the struggle against nationalism in Poland, Rosa Luxemburg has forgotten the nationalism of the Great Russians. " (33)

At the same time he did not support the national liberation demand of the Poland socialist party. He vehemently criticized it as " bourgeoisie nationalism " and " petty-bourgeoisie militant nationalism. " Citing Marx's support in 1840 - 1870 for the secession of Poland (from Russia) and the secession of Ireland (from Britain) to those who insisted upon the secession of Poland, he established that, the ideological basis for Marx's support for the secession of Ireland and Poland and the basis for the Bolshevik party, for not supporting the secession of Poland are the same.

Marx who at first considered the secession of Ireland from England as " impossible " latter on he insisted it as " inevitable. " He first thought that, if the British working class gains an upper hand and if it leads the revolution, the liberation of Ireland is possible. But, since the British proletariat remained under the influence of liberals, tailed and followed their policies for a considerable long period, it stagnated without a revolutionary leadership. At the same time the bourgeoisie liberation movement of Ireland strengthened and took revolutionary forms. Marx who supported the liberation of Ireland at that time said, " reaction in England, is strengthened and fostered by the enslavement of Ireland " (34) and " the English working class will never accomplish anything until it has got rid of Ireland...English reaction in England had its roots in the subjugation of Ireland. " (35) When the English working class got nourished with reaction, the Irish bourgeois liberation movement took revolutionary forms. It was only in that condition Marx supported the liberation of Ireland. Lenin said , " if the Irish and English proletariat had not accepted Marx's policy, and had not made the secession of Ireland their slogan, this

would have been the worst sort of opportunism, a neglect of their duties as democrats and socialists, and a concession to English reaction and the English bourgeoisie. " (36)

During 1840 - 1860 when the masses in Russia and in a great majority of Slav countries were in slumber without any fervor, when there was no independent democratic movement of the masses, the liberation movement of the petty-feudals which took place in Poland, was of immense and prime importance not only from the point of view of Russian democracy but also from the point of view of Slav and European democracy." (37) In those times Poland as a whole, not only the peasantry, but even the bulk of the nobility, was revolutionary. The traditions of the struggle for national liberation was so strong and deep-rooted. " (38) It was in these conditions Marx supported the liberation of Poland.

But, at the beginning of the twentieth century the conditions became quite different. " St. Petersburg has become a much more important revolutionary centre than Warsaw, and the Russian revolutionary movement is already of greater international significance than the Polish movement. " (39)

It was only in these conditions that, the social democratic party of Poland which asserted that, the national problem has become a matter of secondary importance to the workers of Poland, insisted upon close unity in class struggle with the Russian workers. (40) Lenin, at the same time while emphasizing revolution, recognised the self-determination of Poland; but did not support the demand for secession.

However, it was pointed out by Stalin that, " this ofcourse , by no means precludes the possibility that certain internal and external conditions may arise in which the question of the secession of Poland may again come on the order of the day. " (41)

In 1905, in the conditions of no revolutionary upsurge in Sweden, Norway decided of its own accord and seceded from Sweden. The Swedish proletariat which continued to support the right of self-determination of Norway recognised this secession. When the Swedish feudals clamoured for the invasion of Norway, the Swedish working class opposed it. Lenin also supported the secession of Norway from Sweden. Lenin said, " the dissolution of the ties imposed upon Norway by the monarchs of Europe and the Swedish aristocracy strengthened the ties between the Norwegian and Swedish workers." (42)

Moreover, at the time of secession of Norway, majority of the people of Norway wanted monarchy; but the proletariat wanted a republic. Therefore, if the conditions are favorable, conducting revolution, otherwise accepting the wishes of the majority and conducting propaganda and agitation continuously, was the stand of the Norwegian proletariat (43) explained Lenin.

What does these three examples of Ireland, Poland and Norway indicate ?

First, when the oppressing nationality remained immersed in reaction without either democratic movements or proletarian movements in it, the national liberation struggle of the oppressed nationality should be supported persistently and resolutely, is made clear in the approach of Marx in Ireland and Poland issues.

Secondly, the approach of Bolshevik party in the Poland issue clarified that, when the democratic movements and the proletarian movements in the oppressing nationality are in a leading position than the oppressed nationality, then the oppressing nationality apart from recognizing the right of self-

determination of the oppressed nationalities, the proletariat of both nationalities should fight unitedly; it should not support the demand of the oppressed nationality for secession.

Thirdly, if there is a proletarian movement in the oppressing nationality and if the national liberation movement in the oppressed nationality is in the fore front, then, the proletariat of the oppressing nationality apart from recognizing the right of self-determination of the oppressed nationality, it should recognise its secession also. At the same time, the proletariat of the oppressed nationality should be ready for a revolution if possible, is indicated by the approach of the Sweden and Norway parties and the approach of Lenin.

To summarize, the truth indicated by these three examples is that, in the matter of deciding whether the national liberation or the class struggle in combination with the proletariat of the oppressing nationality by accepting the right of self-determination, which is to be put forward as a national programme of the proletariat of oppressed nationality solely depends upon the strength and behavior of the proletariat of the oppressing nationality.

At the same time, what should be the national programme of the proletarian parties of the oppressed nationalities in a multi-national country where there is no nationality called an oppressing nationality, but where there is national oppression. For example, Indochina which was under the colonial domination and India of the pre and post colonial period are such multi-national countries. Here, the Vietnam communist party and its leader Ho-chi-min are appropriate examples for what should be the national programme of the proletarian parties of the oppressed nations. Ho-chi-min led the Vietnam revolutionary war to victory only by changing Indochina liberation and Indochina communist party into Vietnam national liberation and Vietnam communist party. The history of Vietnamese revolution shows that, in a multi-national country without an oppressing nationality but with national oppression, the proletariat of the oppressed nationality should have its own national liberation as its programme.

Nevertheless, the proletariat cannot support another kind of national liberation demand. Like his support for the liberation of Poland and Ireland, Marx during 1840 - 1850 supported the liberation movement of Hungary also. At the same time, he opposed the liberation movements of both Chek and south Slav nationalities. Because Cheks and south Slavs were reactionary nationalities; they served as the 'out posts' of the Russian despotic rule in Europe. When Hungarians and Poles were fighting against the despotic rule, the Cheks and south Slavs stood in support of Czarism. Since Czarism was an enemy of the entire European revolutionary movement, Marx did not support the national liberation of Chek and south Slav nationalities which supported Czar.

Lenin who pointed out that, in Sweden and Norway issue, support for the right of self-determination of Norway was the duty - the Swedish worker who, in that way does not unconditionally support it, cannot be a social democrat, said Lenin- of the Swedish workers, at the same time highlighted that, it was not the duty of the Norwegian workers to support secession and in certain times - if a condition is created whereby, due to the secession, the possibility of British German war is certain or probable - could even oppose secession; only in that way they could fulfill their international duty at that time. (44)

The basic reasons for Marx opposing Chek and south Slav liberation and the basis for Lenin's assertion of possible reasons for the Norwegian workers to oppose their national secession are the same. That is to say, the liberation of a nation should be seen as a part of the total interests of the

international revolution; if it is against the interests of international revolution and is in favour of international enemies or if it becomes a cause for very big wars and destruction in the international arena, such demands for national liberation should be opposed; should not be supported. Marx opposed the Cheks and south Slavs demand for national liberation as it was against the total revolutionary interests of Europe; Lenin asserted that, if it becomes a cause for the possibility of a destructive war between Germany and Britain then, the Norwegian workers will oppose the secession of Norway.

6. IN THE NATIONALITY QUESTION, THE PROLETARIAN SOLIDARITY AND THE INTERESTS OF CLASS STRUGGLE

The right of self-determination for all nationalities, equality between nations and solidarity among the workers of all nationalities are the principles of the proletariat. On the basis of these principles the Marxists apart from recognizing the right of self-determination of all nationalities, take up the stand of either supporting or opposing the demand for secession - national liberation - of an oppressed nationality and evaluate every national demand - the secession demand - from the angle of class struggle of the workers.

In what way, accepting the principles of right of self-determination for all nationalities and equality among nations, along with the stand of either supporting or opposing specific national liberation - secession - problems are going to be appropriate for the interests of class struggle and the solidarity of the proletariat ?

It is national oppression to deny the right of self-determination and equality. It also creates division among the nationalities into oppressing nationality and oppressed nationality and into a privileged nationality and the nationality deprived of that right. This, apart from being the cause for the split between the proletariat of the two nationalities, is also the cause for national disputes. National disputes apart from relegating the class struggle against capital in every nationality to the back ground, scatters the international solidarity of the proletariat against capital. In contrast, recognizing the right of self-determination and equality (principally it is only the proletariat of the oppressing nationality which should recognise it), in addition to the confidence it creates in the proletariat of the oppressing nationality to the proletariat of the oppressed nationality; it will relegate the national disputes to the secondary position; it will enable the proletariat of every nationality to fight against their own capital and to unite against international capital. Thus recognizing the right of self-determination of nationalities and the equality among nations, are the necessary conditions for the class solidarity and class struggle. That was why when Plekhanov wrote, " the interests of the unity of the proletarians and the interests of their class solidarity, call for recognition of the right of nation to secede. " (45) Lenin wrote upholding him.

However, the proletariat of the oppressing nationality merely expressing its recognition of the right of self-determination of the nationalities and the national equality during those particular periods when the oppressed nationality raises its demand for secession - demand for liberation - is not sufficient for the interests of class struggle and for the solidarity of the proletariat. Along with the recognition, it should also take up a specific position of either support or opposition to the national liberation. The proletariat of the oppressed nationality should take up the position of either supporting - if possible assuming leadership - or opposing it. These decisions are the concrete decisions to be taken up in concrete conditions in each particular issue. Only by taking decisions in this way, the solidarity of the proletariat and the interests of class struggle can be safeguarded.

Lenin who specified three types of countries in connection with the self-determination of nationalities (46) clarified the international duty - which is the first condition for the interests of class struggle and proletarian solidarity - of the proletariat belonging to the oppressing nationality in them. He said that, the proletariat of the countries like America and western Europe, where bourgeoisie progressive national movements came to an end long ago and were transformed into imperialist countries, they should fight for the immediate independence of the nationalities oppressed by them and the colonial countries. He said that, the proletariat of the oppressing nationality in the multi-national state communities consisting oppressing and oppressed nationalities, where bourgeoisie national movements are not yet concluded - belong to the present time - should unite with the working class struggles of the oppressed nationalities by struggling for the right of self-determination of the oppressed nationalities. He said that the proletariat in the imperialist countries should offer firm support to the national liberation movements - to the revolutionary forces - in the colonial and semi colonial countries where bourgeoisie national movements are in the formative stage.

Lenin always insisted principally upon the duties of the proletariat of the oppressing nationality in safeguarding the proletarian internationalism. He emphasised that, " in the internationalist education of the workers of the oppressor countries, emphasis must necessarily be laid on their advocating freedom for the oppressed countries to secede and fighting for it. Without this there can be no internationalism. It is our right and duty to treat every social democrat of an oppressor nation who fails to conduct such propaganda as an imperialist and a scoundrel " (47) and he also said that " the question of self determination of nations to-day hinges on the conduct of socialists of the oppressor nations. " (48)

Marx's support for the liberation of Ireland is an instance for asserting that, the liberation of an oppressed nationality should be supported when the proletariat of the oppressing nationality is being nourished by reaction. Marx considered that, because of this liberation, the reactionary nourishment to the proletariat of the oppressing nationality will dry up and its condition of 'incapability of doing anything' will come to an end. Further, because of this national liberation, the national problem even in the oppressing nationality will become secondary and class struggle will become primary. Thus, in this matter class struggle and as a result class solidarity (when reactionary nourishment of the oppressing nationality is dried up, its solidarity in the class struggle with the proletariat of the oppressed nationality will be possible) is benefited.

An another example against those who said that, when the proletariat of the oppressing nationality is weak - when it is not in a position to immediately take over the leadership in the struggle to overthrow its own ruling class (e.g. the Swedish proletariat) - it will be splitting the proletarian solidarity to recognise the right of self-determination of the oppressed nationality and to give full support when it secedes. Lenin said that, it is only " common interests, the closeness of the Swedish and Norwegian people actually gained from the secession. " (49) and " they (the Swedish working class-Ed) will be able to preserve and defend the complete equality and close solidarity of the workers of both nations in the struggle against both the Swedish and the Norwegian bourgeoisie. " (50) Here, it was pointed out by Lenin that, through the secession of Norway from Sweden, national disputes were relegated to the background and the proletariat of both the nationalities were able to assign priority to the class struggle against their own bourgeoisie. Through this, the solidarity of the proletariat and the interests of class struggle were benefited.

More over, if the proletariat of the oppressing nationality is strong and if it recognizes the right of self-determination of the oppressed nationality, through that it can unite with the struggle of the prole-

tariat of the oppressed nationality. In such conditions, if the demand for secession is raised from the oppressed nationality it will be reactionary; its objective is not only the protection of the interests of its own bourgeois nationalism, but also by rejecting the opportunity to defeat the common enemy (the ruling class of the oppressing nationality) by jointly struggling against them, it is helping them indirectly. That was why Lenin opposed the demand for secession - by a section in Poland - which instead of struggling unitedly with the proletariat of the great Russian nationality, which was an important force of the revolution, when its movement was strong and when it was fighting for the right of self-determination for all the oppressed nationalities. In these conditions rejecting the solidarity between the proletariat of the oppressed and oppressing nationalities and demanding secession of the oppressed nationality is to reject the opportunity to push the national disputes to the secondary position and to cause damages to the interests of class struggle and the interests of class solidarity. In other words, in such conditions, when the proletariat of the oppressing nationality recognizes the right of self-determination - right to secede - of the oppressed nationality and propagates it, the proletariat of the oppressed nationality should accept it and propagate in its nationality for the " freedom to integrate " thus should " fight against small-nation narrow-mindedness, seclusion and isolation " said Lenin. (51)

Likewise, if the secession demand of a nationality is advantageous to the enemy of the world revolution and to the reactionary forces and if such conditions become the cause for a catastrophic war, in such an eventuality the proletariat of that nationality should oppose that liberation demand. This is necessary not only for the interests of the world proletariat in general but also for the interests of the proletariat of the oppressed nationality in particular. This is a struggle to " consider the whole and the general, subordinate the particular to the general interest. " (52) This struggle is necessary to maintain the solidarity of the proletariat of the oppressed nationality with the international proletariat and for the interests of national and international class struggle.

At the same time, in a multi-national country where there is no oppressing nationality but where there is national oppression, the proletariat of the oppressed nationality having its own national liberation as its national programme will be appropriate for the solidarity of the proletariat and the interests of class struggle. Because, where there is national oppression the proletariat cannot disregard the national liberation. If it disregards it in that way, then those nationalities will become a victim to the bourgeois nationalism and as a result damages to the proletarian solidarity and the interests of class struggle will become inevitable. When there is a powerful proletarian movement in an oppressing nationality and since its success will pave the path for the national liberation of the other oppressed nationalities, in such conditions it is possible for the proletariat of the oppressed nationalities to unite with the proletariat of the oppressing nationality with the demand for the right of self-determination. In the conditions where the oppressing nationality itself is not present, then there is no room for the problems like a powerful proletarian movement in it assuring the right of self-determination to oppressed nationalities and the proletarian movement of the oppressed nationality accepting it and uniting with it, etc. Therefore, in such conditions if the proletariat of the oppressed nationality fails to have national liberation as its national programme, it will only amount to sacrificing the people to bourgeois nationalism and causing harm to the interests of class struggle and class solidarity. When it is having the national liberation as its national programme, it can rescue its people from bourgeois nationalism and maintain equality and fraternal relations with other nationalities, there by quickening the liberation, it can create the most favorable conditions for the class struggle.

7. PROLETARIAN PARTY IN A MULTI-NATIONAL STATE COMMUNITY

How should a proletarian party be constituted in a multi-national state community consisting oppressing and oppressed nationalities ? Is it on the basis of the principle of one party under one state or on the basis of the principle of one party for one nationality - for one nation ?

Every proletarian party has got a programme. A party cannot function with more than one programme. Viewed in this way, in a multi-national state community only the oppressing nationality has got the right of self-determination as a privilege. For the other oppressed nationalities that right is denied. At the same time, when the proletariat of the oppressing nationality is facing the class struggle against its own ruling classes, the proletariat of the oppressed nationalities are facing the task of establishing a national state through immediate national liberation. Therefore the programme for the proletariat of both nationalities are not the same. In these conditions, due to the differing tasks they encounter, it is logically appropriate for them to be established in two separate parties.

But, if the proletariat in the oppressing nationality is strong and in a position to carry forward the revolution (like Russia and China) it is possible for the proletariat of both nationalities to combine under the same programme and in the same party. In other words, if the proletariat of the oppressing nationality recognizes and supports the right of self-determination of the oppressed nationalities and fights for it, the proletariat of the oppressed nationality by itself changing the demand for national liberation into the right of self-determination, can combine with it in the same party; this is not only possible but, in such conditions only this is proletarian internationalism. Because, the success of the proletariat of the oppressing nationality will pave the path for the liberation of other oppressed nationalities.

But, in the conditions of absence of an oppressing nationality, there is no room for the oppressed nationalities for accepting the right of self-determination put forward by the proletarian movement of those oppressed nationalities and combining with it. Since the liberation of any one of the oppressed nationalities will not pave the path for the national liberation of the rest of them, there is no possibility for all the oppressed nationalities to unite by changing their national programme for national liberation into the right of self-determination. Due to this, the proletarian parties of every nationality, in such countries, have no alternative other than establishing separate parties with their own national liberation programme.

Therefore, in a multi-national state community whether a proletarian party should be established on the basis of state borders or on the basis of nationality region borders, depends entirely upon the behavior and the strength of the proletariat of the oppressing nationality. In the absence of an oppressing nationality there is no room for discussion about the propriety of establishing a proletarian party on the basis of nationality region borders.

While saying so, we are aware of the criticism that; it is against the unity of the proletariat, it is splittism, it is a reactionary activity to split an already unified big state and there by spoiling the more favorable conditions for the economic growth and the interests of class struggle, it is to split the multi-national people who are already unified in one state into nationalities, it is to give up class struggle and to become a prey to nationalism, (so far it was only by relying upon this sort of criticism, we also persisted in wrong stands) etc. But all these are wrong criticisms not based on Marxism-Leninism. In fact, the principles which formed the basis for these criticisms, themselves deserve these criticisms.

We have already pointed out the clarifications of Lenin through the examples of Norway and Sweden that, when the proletariat of the oppressing nationality is nourished by reaction or when it is weak, the secession of oppressed nationalities will strengthen the solidarity of the proletariat and the interests of class struggle. Therefore, it is wrong and contrary to the facts to argue that, it is against the proletarian solidarity, for a nationality to secede and to establish a separate national state. The fact is that, on various occasions secession is necessary for the proletarian solidarity and the interests of class struggle.

Therefore, it is nothing but imperialist economism to put forward the principle of one party with in the frontiers of one state, with out studying the concrete conditions.

The proletariat accepts only two types of established state borders as democratic. In the first place: the national state borders established on the basis of nationality - (on the basis of language and sentiments). This sort of frontiers were called as " natural frontiers " by Engles and as " democratic frontiers " (53) by Lenin. The other one: the state borders established by more than one nationalities joining together on their own free will, with the right of secession. Lenin called this as " democratic centralism. " (54)

Lenin emphasised it as the duty of the socialists, to rectify and redraw the state borders established by force, in a " democratic way " by taking into account the sentiments of the people, except these two types of democratically established state borders.

He never cared about the state borders established through domination. On the contrary he cared only about " a close, unbreakable alliance in the class struggle of the proletarians of all nations in a given state throughout all the changes in its history, irrespective of any reshaping of the frontiers of the individual states by the bourgeoisie " (55) while replying to those who said that, Russia will scatter into separate republics because of the right of self-determination, Lenin said, " we have nothing to fear , whatever the number of independent republics. The important thing for us is not where the state border runs, but whether or not the working people of all nations remain allied in their struggle against the bourgeoisie, irrespective of nationality. " (56)

Lenin who mentioned about the " freedom of political separation". "Said this refers to the demarcation of state frontiers," (57) added further that, in Russia " We cannot vouch for any particular path of national development " and " whether the Ukraine, for example, is destined to form an independent state is a matter that will be determined by a thousand unpredictable factors. " (58) Later on when Finnish and Polish nationalities went out as separate countries Lenin recognised them.

All these are sufficient instances to clarify that, the Marxists are concerned only about democratically redrawing the state borders for safeguarding the solidarity of the proletariat and not about protecting the state borders established by force and domination.

Lenin wrote that, " capitalism's broad and rapid development of the productive forces calls for large politically compact and unified territories " (59) and " the great centralised state is a tremendous historical step forward from medieval disunity to the future socialist unity of the whole world, and only via such a state (inseparably connected with capitalism) can there be any road to socialism " (60), and the proletarian party strives to create a as large as state possible, for this is to the advantage of the working people; it strives to draw nations closer together, and bring about their further fusion. " (61)

The contention of those who argued pointing out these writings of Lenin, while upholding the following argument of Kautsky that, " states of mixed national composition (multi-national states) are always those whose internal constitution has for some reason or other remained abnormal or underdeveloped (backward) " (62) and while he wrote that, " it would however be inexcusable to forget that in advocating centralism we advocate exclusively democratic centralism " (63) and while asserting that as a first condition for the marxists naturally preferring large countries rather than small countries , when " all other conditions being equal " (64) and while writing " but it desires to achieve this aim not by violence but exclusively through a free fraternal union of the workers and the working people of the nation. " (65)

Against those who argued, by pointing out the economic integration and concentration, even though it was achieved through domination under a multinational state, that, the separation is reactionary and impossible, Lenin replied by castigating their arguments as " imperialist economism. " Instead of re-drawing the state borders respecting the sentiments and the will of the people, on the basis of people's language and sentiments and on the basis of nationality, arguing, what was already militarily captured and economically integrated by the imperialists, as progressive and arguing the division of it as an obstacle to the economic growth - the Polish friends argued in this way - is pointed out by Lenin as mere " imperialist economism. " (66)

More over, he pointed out that, the close economic links and dependence which Ireland had with England did not prevent Marx from supporting the liberation of Ireland and from the point of view of these imperialist economists, even the liberation of colonies which became economic dependencies under imperialism became reactionary; became impossible.

Further, even their allusion that, it is splitting the multi-national people who remain united with in the same state borders, is also imperialist economism. Even the very notion that the people remain united under national oppression is a false-hood. And so there is no question of splitting them. The Marxists, like all other things approach nation and nationality question also from the basis of historical materialism only. They don't consider them to be either everlasting or as final or as something to be preserved. But they consider that, its historical role should be recognised and full liberty and democracy should be given to it before removing it from history and only through the process of its full development the nationalities will mingle with each other democratically and finally disappear. But, the capitalists don't respect these sentiments of the people, on the contrary they suppress them; they expand the borders taking only their economic needs into consideration and establish imperialism. This is totally anti-democratic, which will create national disputes among people and reactionary. Lenin said that, " the policy of oppressing nationalities is one of dividing nations. At the same time it is a policy of systematic corruption of the peoples' mind. " (67) Uniting and merging various nationalities is not possible through the imperialist oppression of nationalities. On the contrary, the proletariat firmly declares that, it is possible only after all the nationalities have crossed the intermediate stage of national liberation. Lenin said, " in the same way as mankind can arrive at the abolition of classes only through a transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class , it can arrive at the inevitable integration of nations only through a transition period of the complete emancipation of all oppressed nations, i.e. their freedom to secede. " (68)

Even the argument that, the proletariat leading a national struggle is nationalism and it amounts to abandoning the class struggle is also wrong. Mao said that, " in a struggle that is national in character, the class struggle takes the form of national struggle. " (69) Lenin said that, " the working class could

not grow strong become mature and take shape without " constituting itself within the nation " without being " national " (" though not in the bourgeois sense of the word "). (70) Marx and Engles who said that, " the working people don't have a nation " also said that, when the national states were evolved, the part of the proletariat was of special interest to a certain extent. They also gave a call for national wars. (71) The seventh congress report of the Communist International also says that, " the communists at the same time while standing against every type of bourgeois nationalism are not the supporters of national voidists who don't bother about their people. " (72) Therefore, it is obvious that the proletariat leading the national movement is neither bourgeois nationalism nor abandoning class struggle. But, the proletariat refusing to lead the national movement will be nothing other than imperialism (can be called as colonial slavishness) and it will be supporting the national oppression. In fact, leading a national movement means, rescuing the bourgeois democratic revolution from bourgeois nationalism and completing it as a part of the proletarian revolution.

(This article appeared in Tamil Nadu Marxist - Leninist party organ "PURATCHI KANAL" February 1993 issue)

References

1. Stalin Selected Works, Vol. 2 Page 307
2. Ibid Vol. 2 Page 322
3. Lenin Collected Works, Vol. 20 Page 396
4. Ibid Vol. 20 P 48
5. SSW, Vol. 7 PP 71-72
6. LCW, Vol. 20, PP 396-397
7. Ibid, Vol 20, PP 395-400
8. Ibid
9. Ibid
10. Ibid
11. Ibid, Vol. 41, P. 314
12. Ibid, Vol. 21, P. 72
13. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 451
14. Ibid, Vol. 20, PP 396-397
15. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 48
16. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 397
17. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 34
18. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 32
19. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 24
20. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 454
21. Ibid, Vol. 21, P. 408
22. Ibid, Vol. 29, P. 174
23. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 432
24. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 401
25. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 440
26. Ibid, Vol. 21, P. 317
27. Ibid, Vol. 21, P. 293

28. Ibid, Vol. 21, P. 408
29. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 410
30. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 411
31. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 412
32. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 423
33. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 412
34. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 440
35. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 439
36. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 442
37. See Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 443
38. Ibid, Vol. 6, P. 456
39. Ibid, Vol. 6, P. 457
40. See Ibid, Vol. 20, PP 433-434
41. SSW, Vol. 2, PP. 324-325
42. LCW, Vol. 20, P. 429
43. See Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 428
44. See Ibid, Vol. 23, PP 53, 56-57
45. LCW, Vol. 20, P. 443
46. See Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 150
47. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 346
48. Ibid, Vol. 21, P. 293
49. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 222
50. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 429
51. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 347
52. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 347
53. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 323
54. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 46
55. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 434
56. Ibid, Vol. 26, P. 344
57. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 322
58. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 413
59. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 45
60. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 46
61. Ibid, Vol. 24, P. 73
62. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 397
63. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 46
64. Ibid, Vol. 19, P. 545
65. Ibid, Vol. 24, P. 73
66. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 324
67. Ibid, Vol. 20, P. 237
68. Ibid, Vol. 22, P. 147
69. Mao Selected Works, Vol. 2, P. 215
70. LCW, Vol. 21, PP. 72-73
71. Ibid, Vol. 35, P. 251
72. Report to the seventh Congress of the Communist International P. 581 (See Leninism and National Question, Tamil Translation Page. 298)