

# TRANSLATION



SOME OF OUR  
CONSIDERATIONS  
ON THE BASES OF  
SOCIO-POLITICAL,  
ECONOMIC,  
AND CULTURAL  
DEVELOPMENT  
OF THE TURKIC  
PEOPLES OF ASIA  
AND EUROPE

And Other Historical Documents

*Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev*

## Introduction

### *Örsan Şenalp and Asim Khairdean*

#### *A Program for World Revolution from the East and the Spectre of the Colonial International*

What follows is an attempt at an English translation of one of the key texts of the visionary militant Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, written between 1923 and 1925, entitled “Some of Our Considerations on the Bases of the Socio-political, Economic, and Cultural Development of the Turkish People of Asia and Europe.”<sup>1</sup> We believe that Sultan-Galiev’s work and writings are highly relevant for today, in relation to, among other things, important debates about identity politics and the Left, decolonisation, political Islam, Marxism, the Russian Revolution, Bolshevism, the new Eurasianism, and the re-emergence of the extreme right. The text below is one of the key sources in which Sultan-Galiev summarizes the main tenets of his analysis of the contemporary world situation in the given conjuncture, in the aftermath of the 1917 Russian Bolshevik Revolution, and he lays down an original and alternative strategy for world revolution. Alongside this we are also publishing two supporting documents from the political trial against him, which began in 1923, was re-opened in 1928 and remained open until a final verdict was pronounced in 1939, sentencing Galiev to execution, which took place on 28 January 1940.

A decade in prison and exile divides the two supporting texts: the first document is Galiev’s testimony of 18 December 1928 and the second is the official sentence, which is dated 8 December 1939. Both of these have been translated from the Russian versions. We provide a translation of these documents in order to furnish the historical and materialist context, not only for the text but for the conditions of its writing and distribution, as well as its subsequent disappearance and re-emergence.

The primary text was found in the early 90s in KGB archives Box. No. 4: Volume No. 2: List No. 1.<sup>2</sup> The text was published in Russian (in Tatarstan) for the first time in 1995, following the opening of the archives to public, with the following reference and with an introduction written by I. Tagirov: “Nekotorye naši soobraženiâ ob osnovah social’no-političeskogo, èkonomičeskogo i kul’turnogo razvitiâ Tureckih narodov Azii i Evropy.”<sup>3</sup> The article was published for a second time in 1998, this time with the title

<sup>1</sup> The literal translation of the first (1995) text’s title from Russian reads “Some of our Considerations...,” yet the text is often referred to as a “political program” or “theses” by both the prosecutors and Galiev himself. Presumably this is why the 1998 title of Tagirov begins as “Theses on the...” We find it more appropriate to translate it as “considerations” here, since Galiev provides an extended analysis rather than bulleted items in the format of “theses.” Besides, in Galiev’s 1928 testimony, it becomes clear that the text was written between 1923 and 1925.

<sup>2</sup> Central Archive of the Federal Counterintelligence Service. N 6169. T.2. L.101-109.

<sup>3</sup> Indus Tagirov and Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, “Osvoboditel’noe dviženie sušestvuet, progressiruet

“Tezisy ob osnovah social’no-političeskogo, èkonomičeskogo i kul’turnogo razvitiâ Tureckih narodov Azii i Evropy” in *Izbrannye Trudy* (Selected works), together with the two accompanying texts we present below.<sup>4</sup>

With this translation we have tried to overcome certain challenges, which we must outline here. First of all, we had to take as the source material for our translation the Russian text, which was published in the 1990s. This text was arranged and kept in the archives of the Politburo / GPU and later KGB. It was difficult to determine whether the original text was written in the Tatar language by Sultan-Galiev or not. If indeed the original text was in Tatar then the translation must have been the work of the GPU, and if so we would not know how much might have been lost in translation from Tatar to Russian. The translation could have been compiled before, during or after the trial, or even after Galiev’s execution. This would imply that the GPU may have modified the text. At any rate, it contains several inconsistencies of style and apparent absences, such as the abrupt ending and missing second part.

The political and historical context in which the original text was written and received by the Soviet authorities and leaders therefore also generates serious problems. This text, whose only surviving copy is the one produced and kept by the GPU, was the main grounds for Sultan-Galiev’s second arrest in 1928. This was under Stalin’s orders, on accusations of anti-party political activity, at the start of the first of the Stalinist purges from the Communist Party, which Galiev notably survived for a further decade. During this time he was sent to exile for ten years, and was finally sentenced to death on 8 December 1939. The article was seen as the main evidence for Galiev’s betrayal, and so it is worth noting some inconsistencies in the references to it by Galiev and by the GPU. For this reason we have tried to retain the formatting as much as possible.

In his 1928 testimony, Sultan-Galiev confesses that he wrote the text in 1923 and completed it in 1925, and although he planned it in two parts, he claims that he then gave up on the entire idea, and so did not complete it.<sup>5</sup> However, we understand from his testimony and sentence that the activities he was accused of and actually undertook were organisational activities in line with the vision already set forth. According to Galiev’s own introduction, the second part was supposed to be where he would outline the practical and organisational aspects of his political strategy, as well as the tactics to realize it. Notably, this is where the idea of a Colonial International is supposed

i razvivaetsâ,” [The liberation movement exists, develops, and grows], *Gasyrlar avazy* (May 1995), pp. 119–131.

<sup>4</sup> Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, “Tezisy ob osnovah social’no-političeskogo, èkonomičeskogo i kul’turnogo razvitiâ Tureckih narodov Azii i Evropy”, in *Izbrannye trudy* (Kazan: Gasyr, 1998), pp. 525–540.

<sup>5</sup> Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, “Avtobiografičeskij očerk “Kto â?”: Pis’mo členam Central’noj kontrol’noj komissii, kopiâ – J.V. Stalinu i L.D. Trockomu. 23 maja 1923” [Autobiographical essay “Who Am I?”: Letter to members of the Central Control Commission of the Party, copy for Stalin and Trotsky, May 23rd, 1923], in *Izbrannye trudy*, pp. 446–509.

to be expounded, since this does not appear anywhere in the existing first part but does appear in both Galiev's testimony and in the GPU's sentence. The GPU sentence even mentions aspects of the organisational structure of the CI as outlined in the text which are conspicuously absent from the current version. Galiev's denial might have been motivated by self-preservation. Obviously, the content could have been direct and sufficient evidence to have him executed immediately. However, in the absence of such evidence, it is the existing text and Galiev's ongoing activities after 1928 that are presented as the rationale for his sentencing and execution in 1930–1940. Although Galiev denies the existence of the second part before his executors, there is good reason to assume that the text might have been hidden or destroyed by the author, or by a third party close to him or other interested parties.

This leads to the next problem concerning this text: the first ever reference to it was made in the literature by the curious figure of Alexandre Bennigsen,<sup>6</sup> who came to fame as a “Cold Warrior,” having led an academic wing of the “nation building” campaign under the coordination of Zbigniew Brzezinski and his right arm Paul Henze.<sup>7</sup> This situation creates another enigma around Galiev and the text below. We learn from Bennigsen and Quelquejay that all the Russian analyses of Sultan-Galiev written after 1930 refer to the content of Galiev's program (“Considerations...”), yet they state that they are unaware as to whether the text was ever published or if it was just copied by militants and passed from hand to hand (1986, p. 221). Here the authors refer to two publications, the first by A. Arsharuni and Kh. Gabidullin (*Očerki panislamizma i pantürkizma v Rossii*, chapter 4, pp. 76–91), and the second L. Rubinstein's *V bor'be za leninskuû nacional'nuû politiku*, which we could not access. We also know that Bennigsen and his team entered the Ottoman state archives in order to trace the text during a study of the Crimean Tatars. The ‘operation’ was led by Bennigsen himself in the Topkapi Palace.<sup>8</sup> In any case, the first reference to Galiev's text by Bennigsen seems to have been picked up on and used secondarily by others, including the French Marxist historian Maxime Rodinson.<sup>9</sup> And

<sup>6</sup> Alexandre Bennigsen et Chantal Quelquejay, *Sultan Galiev, le père de la révolution tiers-mondiste: “Les inconnus de l'histoire”* (Paris: Fayard, 1986), pp. 221–222. The first book the authors published on the topic was Alexandre Bennigsen et Chantal Quelquejay, *Les mouvements nationaux chez les musulmans de Russie: Le “Sultangaliévisme” au Tatarstan* (Paris et La Haye: Mouton & Co., 1960).

<sup>7</sup> Artemy M. Kalinovsky, “Encouraging Resistance: Paul Henze, the Bennigsen School, and the Crisis of Détente,” in Michael Kemper and Artemy M. Kalinovsky (eds.), *Reassessing Orientalism: Interlocking Orientologies during the Cold War* (London: Routledge, 2015), pp. 211–231.

<sup>8</sup> Halil İnalçık, “Review: Le Khanat de Crimée dans les Archives du Musée de Palais de Topkapi by Alexandre Bennigsen,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (Aug. 1981), Vol. 13, No. 3, pp. 373–374.

<sup>9</sup> Maxime Rodinson, “A Forgotten Precursor,” in Gilbert Archar (eds.), *Marxism and the Muslim World*, trans. Jean Matthews (London: Zed Press, 2015), pp. 133–141; see also the report by Marxist-Leninist Research Bureau: *The Case of Sultan Galiev* (1995), No.3 (online at <http://ml-review.ca/aml/MLRB/Sultan-Galiyev-FINAL.htm> [accessed Nov. 16, 2018]).

these references have made Galiev's article known to other scholars and researchers, who refer to it. It seems certain that Galiev's text was never translated and published in any language other than Russian before the 1990s. Bennigsen and Quelquejay, the first Western writers to discover Galiev and refer to his key text, thought of Sultan-Galiev as the father of Third Worldist revolutionism, due to his alternative vision – crystallized in the present translation – of the establishment of a “Colonial International,” an “International of Oppressed Peoples.” Besides this, the controversial notion of “Muslim National Communism” was first attributed to Galiev's overall thought by Bennigsen, and has since been adopted by other authors writing about Galiev.<sup>10</sup>

Although Bennigsen and his students tried to use him to undermine the unity of the USSR within the framework of the Cold War, their work has revealed the historical originality of the figure of Galiev and his ideas. Galiev's thinking and political struggle to realize his ideas by building an alternative to the Comintern was inspired by his version of historical materialism, in which he views his analysis as built upon a revision of Lenin's theory of imperialism and Marx's theory of capitalism. He claims to achieve this by using a methodology he argues is a more radical version of dialectical and historical materialism. Galiev terms his methodology *energetic materialism*, and asserts that this way of thinking has its roots in the East, before it was established by Marx and Engels in the West. Independent of Bennigsen's objectives, what we see in the text below is a highly original analysis, which can be seen as a precursor of the work of Frantz Fanon, CLR James, Che Guevara, Andre Gunder Frank, and Dependency and World System theorists. It is important to note that some authors have argued that the original ideas referred to as Galievism were initially based on ideas developed by Mullanur Vahidov. Galiev himself confirms this, in his 1923 testimony, by mentioning Vahidov as his mentor.<sup>11</sup> As Bennigsen highlighted in 1986, Galiev does not cite or provide sources either for his term *energetic materialism*, or for the predecessors of this system of thought in the East. It was Alexander Bogdanov, however, who in his earlier work on empiriomonism, synthesised the *energetism* of Ernst Mach and Wilhelm Ostwald with the *materialism* of Marx and Engels. Curiously, Bogdanov, in his magnum opus “Tektology,” also makes a claim similar to Galiev's, namely that “tektological thinking” has its roots in Eastern philosophy.<sup>12</sup> Therefore, one might assume that it was Bogdanov's thought that was the source that Galiev neglected to cite here. Bogdanov's arrest on similar charges of “counter-revolutionary” activities in September 1923, some months

<sup>10</sup> Matthieu Renault, “The Idea of Muslim National Communism: On Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev,” *Viewpoint Magazine* (2015) (online at <https://www.viewpointmag.com/2015/03/23/the-idea-of-muslim-national-communism-on-mirsaid-sultan-galiev/> [accessed Oct. 19, 2018]).

<sup>11</sup> Halit Kakinç, *Sultangaliyev ve Milli Komünizm* (Bulut Yayınları, 2004); Hakan Reyhan, *Doğunun Büyük Devrimcileri Mollanur Vahidov ve Sultan Galiyev* (Alter Yayıncılık, 2006).

<sup>12</sup> Alexander Bogdanov, *Bogdanov's Tektology*, trans. Vadim N. Sadovsky, et al., ed. Peter Dudley (Hull: University of Hull, Centre for Systems Studies, 1996).

after Galiev's first arrest in May 1923, might indicate a connection to be researched further.<sup>13</sup> More recent work by Craig Brandist<sup>14</sup> and James D. White<sup>15</sup> might provide a direction for such future research.

In any case, all references to the archived text and its published Russian versions in the English speaking world remained secondary, referring only to the work of Ben-nigsen. Strikingly, but also probably because of the problems mentioned above, no English translation has been produced until now. There may be other reasons for the lack of motivation amongst historians for translating Sultan-Galiev's work into English or other European languages, such as Galiev not being as prolific a writer as Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky, Bukharin or other Bolshevik leaders and intelligentsia. After all, *Iz-brannnye trudy* contains only around 1000 pages of material, collected in one volume, and is mainly composed of official writings found in the Soviet archives and published in 1998. However, Galiev was undoubtedly a key political figure, the highest ranking Muslim amongst the Bolshevik leaders, and one of the first high ranking leaders to be arrested and accused of anti-party activities, as early as 1923, and to be expelled from the party. He and his fellow travellers and followers were accused of being "Galievists," adherents of a certain line of thinking and practice. The line of thinking and action that was labelled "Galievist" was strategically linked to issues concerning policies on colonies, nationalities, self-determination, the approach to the agrarian classes, to Islam, and thus to the confrontation with the imperialism of the West in the East. Therefore, the Galiev case related not only to the spread of world revolution, but also to issues of Russian nationalism and the practice of revolutionary democracy in the Soviet government itself.<sup>16</sup>

The overall enigma of the Galiev case and the lack of English translations of at least his key texts motivated us to undertake this initial effort towards a translation, even though we cannot read or write Russian. Of course, we are aware of the fact that this constitutes a problem for the reader with regard to the trustworthiness of the end result. We decided to proceed anyway and then look for solutions to minimize the effects of these problems as much as we could. Our starting point was the early Turkish translations of the present text (also published in 1998), as well as Turkish translations of other works

<sup>13</sup> John Biggart, "Alexander Bogdanov and the short history of the Kultintern," (2015), revised version of an article that first appeared in *Vestnik Meždunarodnogo Instituta A. Bogdanova* [Bulletin of the International Bogdanov Institute] (2001), No.3 (7), pp.76-87. (online at <https://bogdanovlibrary.files.wordpress.com/2016/08/2016-08-14-biggart-bogdanov-kultintern.pdf> [accessed Nov. 12, 2018]).

<sup>14</sup> Craig Brandist, *Dimensions of Hegemony: Language, Culture, and Politics in Revolutionary Russia*, Historical Materialism Book Series 86 (London: Brill, 2016).

<sup>15</sup> James D. White, *Marx and Russia: The Fate of a Doctrine* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2018)

<sup>16</sup> See Brandist, *Dimensions*, Brill.



by Galiev, a selection taken from *Izbrannye trudy* and published by Halit Kakinç.<sup>17</sup> The Turkish translation of the article below was produced by Arif Acaloğlu, and published simultaneously by the *Ulusal* and *Toplumsal Tarih* (Social history) journals.<sup>18</sup> One of the co-translators of the article, Örsan Şenalp, was then a member of the editorial board of *Ulusal*, and was acquainted with the text and its Turkish translation. Asim Khairdean worked on the English rough translations of the Russian and Turkish texts. Finally, we compared and corrected the outcomes of the two versions, and we also applied this to the two annexed documents, while the final document has been checked against the original by a Russian speaker. Needless to say, this initial translation might still be improved upon by others.

Before we finish, we would like to thank Fabian Tompsett, Zbigniew Marcin Kowalewski, Matthieu Renault, John Biggart, Craig Brandist, Eric Blanc, and Sebastian Budgen for the suggestions and insight they provided. We also owe special thanks to the editors of *Contradictions* for their invaluable efforts, which made the publication of the text in its final form possible.

\*

## Document I: Excerpt from the Testimony of M. Sultan-Galiev to the Investigator of 18 December 1928<sup>19</sup>

To put the question squarely: am I ready to disarm ideologically and organisationally or not? I answer immediately: yes, I am ready. What is my armament and what should be my disarmament? My armament consisted of well-known ideas and thoughts, a certain worldview about the development of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and the work of Soviet power and the Communist Party in the nat. [national] republics and

<sup>17</sup> Halit Kakinç, *Destansı Kuramcı Sultangaliyev: Yorumlu Külliyyat* (Bulut Yayınları, 2004).

<sup>18</sup> Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, "Asya ve Avrupa Türk Halklarının Sosyopolitik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel Gelişmelerinin Esaslarına İlişkin Bazı Görüşlerimiz," *Toplumsal Tarih* (Feb. 1998), No. 50, pp. 39-42.; Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, "Asya ve Avrupa Türk Halklarının Sosyopolitik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel Gelişmelerinin Esaslarına İlişkin Bazı Görüşlerimiz II," *Toplumsal Tarih* (Mar. 1998), No. 51, pp. 50-55.; Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, "Görüşlerim: Asya ve Avrupa Türk Halklarının Sosyopolitik, Ekonomik ve Kültürel Gelişmelerinin Esaslarına İlişkin Bazı Görüşlerimiz," *Ulusal* (Spring 1998), No. 5/6, pp. 9-21.

<sup>19</sup> The following documents are translated from Indus Tagirov and Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev, "Освободительное движение существует, прогрессирует и развивается," in *Гасырлар авазы* (May 1995), pp. 119-131, by Örsan Şenalp and Asim Khairdean with additional work by Evgenia Ganberg. (Editors' note)

regions, mainly the Turkic ones, a worldview which grew gradually over the course of the development of the revolution in Russia, starting as early as 1917.

This worldview has its own dynamics and history, which was determined by my peculiar perception of certain moments in the development of the international revolution in general and of the party – Soviet work in the national parliaments – in particular.

The basic principles of my outlook were laid out by me in my testimonies to the OGPU back in 1923 – when I was arrested on charges of trying to establish contact with Zaki Validov.<sup>20</sup> I consider it necessary to repeat them now in brief. The formulation of my views was:

First: The crisis in the development of the world revolution, which forced the party to shrink into the framework of building socialism in one country, is the result of a “re-evaluation of the significance, on the part of the European Communists, of the role of the Western European proletariat in organising the world socialist revolution on the one hand, and in underestimating the significance of national liberation movements in the colonial countries in the system of international revolution, on the other.”<sup>21</sup>

Secondly: The Party’s insufficiently firm policy on the national question before the Eleventh Party Congress,<sup>22</sup> in the sense of underestimating its national manifestations in its work in the national parliaments and, as a result, the growth of great-power tendencies on the one hand, and the discontent of the nationals on this basis on the other.

As you know, I then recognized as erroneous my attempt to establish contact with Zaki Validov, accepted that it was a crime against the party of which I was a member, and declared my readiness to accept the deserved retribution from your hands.

I did not, however, make a clear statement on my part about my renunciation of the assessment of the course of the development of the revolution that had developed in my mind.

When I was released from prison I, at least, had no clear answer: who, after all, is right on the main issues – myself or the party? I remember only one thing: I had made a firm decision to put an end to all my past if released from prison and allowed to stay in one form or another in the party. I learned about my expulsion from the party, as you know, here at the OGPU, before my release, after you received from me a written commitment to desist from anti-Party and anti-Soviet work. This message made a depressing impression on me. Some hope appeared to me to lie in the possibility of reinstating my rights as a party member after visiting Stalin some time after my release from prison, when I was instructed that this question could be put in about a year. Somewhere in the depths of my soul there was, in addition, a hope for Vladimir Ilyich. For some rea-

<sup>20</sup> Here Sultan-Galiev refers to his autobiographical essay “Who am I?” (Editors’ note)

<sup>21</sup> Here Sultan-Galiev refers to his autobiographical essay “Who am I?” (Editors’ note)

<sup>22</sup> Sultan-Galiev here refers to the Eleventh RCP Congress held in 1922 (online at <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1922/mar/27.htm> [accessed Nov. 11, 2018]) (Editors’ note)

son it seemed to me that Ilyich would be interested in my business and restore me to the party. That is why I keenly awaited his recovery. His death killed this hope in me. Ilyich's loss for me was therefore a double blow. I loved this man as a God in my youth. If you had searched me, you would have found in my papers a small sheet on which I recorded my impressions of the deceased after returning from his funeral. The image I painted on this little piece of paper will forever remain in my soul.

My hope for a return to the party was rekindled after my statement to the Central Control Commission in 1924. The promise of support for my request on the part of comrade Stalin strengthened this hope in me. The Central Control Commission, as you know, denied me my request. It was the third fresh and heavy blow to me.

The moment of negotiation and consideration of my application to the Central Control Commission coincided with the moment of the withdrawal from Tatarstan of a group of Tatar communists – Mukhtarova, Enbaev and Gasim Mansurov, comrades close to me through my joint work with them during the revolution. It also coincided with the expulsion from the party by the local Party organization of the People's Commissariat of the Tatarstan Republic of Yunus Validov,<sup>23</sup> and of the deputy head of the Sovnarkom Comrade Ishak Kazakov, an old revolutionary who had worked among us since the days of October. It was also preceded by my open defamation, in the pages of the Tatar and Russian press and in separate pamphlets, as a counter-revolutionary. I learned about the classification of my act as objectively counter-revolutionary by the Second National Meeting under the Central Committee of the Party a year later, after I was expelled from the party, and before that it was not clear to me why I was being attacked as furiously as a counter-revolutionary would be (article by comrade Salah Atnagulov in "Esche," brochure by comrade Gal. Ibragimov "Black Milestones," etc).

The counter-revolutionary label, pinned to me, oppressed me even more, because in my heart I considered myself a Communist, a Leninist, a party member, a revolutionary. I protested against it in all parts of my being (in my notes you might find a letter to the Central Committee, which I thought to compose at one time on this occasion, but for some reason lost faith in and abandoned). I considered this a great injustice towards myself and experienced it as the greatest tragedy. To me it was all the worse that I had already experienced a serious tragedy in your prison. After all, I'm not only a revolutionary but also a person. I then, as a revolutionary, signed a death sentence upon myself. I considered this to be the greatest act of revolutionary honesty and courage on my part, in which I found great moral satisfaction. I think you understood that then. But as a man, as an animal organism, I still experienced a heavy sense of death. And under this heavy feeling, I was with you for 2 weeks, while my fate was being decided. You see for yourself – I'm only 36 years old, and almost all my hair is gray. You will understand, therefore, that strange feeling of resentment, insult, and humiliation that

<sup>23</sup> Not to be confused with Zaki Validov, mentioned above. (Editors' note)

I felt and experienced at moments when I was denounced as a counter-revolutionary. Especially in those cases when this came from the people against whom I had once fought as against the opponents of the October Revolution and the Soviet government.

Here is the psychological background on the basis of which I gradually came to the decision to create an independent party, based on a revision of Marxism and Leninism on colonial and national issues. This was also facilitated by the extremely difficult situation that was created around the so-called “right” Tatar and partly Bashkir communists.

The result of this was my initial sketch of a part of the theses on “some issues of economic and cultural development of the Turkic peoples of Europe and Asia.” In them I wanted to justify the opposition to the communist slogan of national self-determination by the slogan of colonial radicalism, “liberation of the colonies through the dictatorship of the colonies over the metropolises.” Communism, according to my analysis and a new understanding, appeared to me for the time being as a new and progressive form of European nationalism, meaning a policy of consolidation and unification of the material and cultural forces of the metropolitan countries under the aegis of the proletariat. In the future, I intended to expand these theses on the colonial question in general, based on a radical revision of the Leninist theory of imperialism and Stalin’s interpretation of it. I speak quite frankly, as ultimately I want to be, before you and before history, one person, and I have nothing to hide. If during the search a pamphlet fell into your hands by VI Lenin entitled “Imperialism, as the newest stage of development of capitalism” with my notes in the margins and on the covers, then from them you will be able to form an approximation of my understanding of imperialism. According to my theory, imperialism is inherent in capitalism in general, regardless of the stage of its development; it seemed to me that in this respect Ilyich nevertheless lacks clarity. From my formulation, therefore, there was a possibility in both theory and practice of the existence of socialist or communist imperialism, since at this stage of its development international capital (which must grow after the revolution into socialism) still represents a system of colonial management.

I here ask you not to confuse my concept with the battered and rotten lampoon of Kautsky and the dirty lies of the imperialist bourgeoisie about the “red imperialism of the Soviets.” From my same theses you will see that I am an irreconcilable enemy both of the world bourgeoisie and Menshevism.

I first read a draft of my theses to Yunus Validov. He insisted on making some amendments, especially with regard to the formulation of the content of the national liberation movement of individual colonial countries (including the Turkic-Tatar nationalities of Soyuzia) and questioned the correctness of the basic slogan of “colonial dictatorship over the metropole,” in which we opposed ourselves to the Communist International. Validov then lived in my apartment. He had already been expelled from the party. Hanging over him was the threat of a public trial on charges of a criminal offence. We both lived in poverty. Nevertheless, the discussion of the program for the future of the “International of the Colonial Peoples” was very intensive. Our main provisions were worked out by us,

but they were not set out on paper. Tactics and strategy were defined. The social base of our future “Colonial International” party was determined by the workers, peasants, and the petty bourgeoisie. Tactically, we stood for the use also of the progressive part of the large national bourgeoisie (the industrial bourgeoisie). It was decided after the trial of Validov, if he was not allowed to remain in the party, for him to flee abroad and begin negotiations with underground or semi-legal colonial revolutionary organizations concerning the establishment of the Bureau of the International in one of the eastern countries. First of all, Validov was to contact Sun-Yat-Sen, and then to transfer to India. I was to stay in the USSR and organize a small but strong nucleus, and then go abroad and contact the Fourth International and the anarchist organisations of Europe. Such was our decision before the trial of Validov. In court Validov maintained himself, in my opinion, as a revolutionary. You know that. The court, as is known, did not rule in his favour... Nevertheless, we carried out our decision, and were then detained ourselves. We once again thoroughly contemplated the issue and decided to seek a review of the court’s decision before the Central Control Commission, and in case of a negative decision in this instance, to appeal the decision of the Central Control Commission first to the party congress and then to the Comintern. The decision of Validov in this sense was unshakable. He believed in his own right. I supported him. Before the fate of Validov was to be decided, we decided to stay in the USSR regardless of whether you pursued us or not, and deemed it possible to move abroad, that is, to make a full break with you possible (as it should be understood), depending on the verdict concerning his expulsion from the party. Validov’s severe illness and subsequent death, however, removed this issue from the order of the day.

The loss of Validov was a heavy blow to me. In him I lost one of my most loyal friends and sources of support. The son of a serf-peasant, he was a genuine rebellious and revolutionary slave.

I kept the transcript of his speech from the trial. It must have got to you. There on the first page there should be a signature from the hand of Validov himself. He spoke about the growth of the danger of the right in the country and the need for an organized fight against it. Validov, before his death, asked me to reproduce his speech and distribute it among the population. In this way he wanted to rehabilitate himself after his death. I, however, did not do this and kept his speech only as historical material, as I did not want to bring our discord with the party into the public arena.

After the death of Validov, I suspended work on the preparation of the theses. It seemed to me that our planned course of action was after all wrong. In the program we had been planning there was no clarity, firstly regarding the social body of the organisation we were creating, and secondly regarding the definition of our attitude to communism as a system, as a principle. It was unclear what we should promise to the colonies liberated from the hegemony of the metropolitan countries: communism, or capitalism, or a third way that was “not bourgeois,” and how to ensure the organisational triumph of communism as a system in general if we accept it for the colonies. The

question as to the stages in the development of the national liberation movement with regard to communism was also unclear: whether communism should be established after the end of national liberation, or whether its growth would coincide with the development of the national liberation movement. I've thought about these questions for a long time. In addition I was sick with tuberculosis, which had greatly exhausted me, and I had to go to the Crimea.

Later, having already returned from the Crimea, in the winter of 1925 I read extracts from my theses to Comrade Budayli from the Tatarstan Republic. He also gave readings to Mukhtarov and Enbaev, and even later, probably in 1926, showed them to their comrade Deren-Ayerly. When reading my theses or having them presented by others, I pointed out to my comrades that they represented only a draft outline of my views on the development of the revolutionary movement in the Turkic regions of Europe and Asia. My comrades, agreeing in general (with certain corrections) with the analysis of the Turkic world in the system of world economy and politics, nonetheless resolutely disputed the first part of the theses regarding the antagonism between the colonial and European communists about the slogan "the dictatorship of the colonies over the metropolises."

I did not show my theses to anyone else. As you can see, the theses are not finished, but there among the papers on separate sheets there are rough drafts of the formulations of the remaining parts of the theses, only not in the form of completed and ready-made thoughts, but in the form of "possible productions." In the process of their analysis, their antitheses could also be formulated.

I did not manage to finish them. I did not have time to spare, nor was there an "Engels" at hand. This is the first point. Secondly, I still did not lose hope for my reinstatement to the party. For some reason it seemed to me that the Central Committee of the Party would finally consider my position. This hope grew especially strong in the period when you started talking about "changing the route of the revolution" in terms of a turn towards active participation in the national liberation movement of the colonies, specifically the Chinese revolution. The result of this was my second letter to comrade Stalin at the end of 1925 or the beginning of 1926 on the question of whether it was possible for me to raise the question of my restoration to the party and on what conditions. Moreover, even later, under the influence of the experience of the Chinese revolution and the development of the national liberation movement in India and other colonial countries, as well as in the USSR itself, I gradually began to ask myself whether I had been mistaken in the main, namely: in determining the revolutionary significance of the theory and practice of Leninism in applying them to resolving the colonial question and hence in determining the revolutionary role of the CPSU (B.) and the Comintern, thus simply speaking, whether I was attempting to break down an open door.

\*

## Document II: Sentence Union of Soviet Socialist Republics – Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR, 8 December 1939

consisting of:

Chairman – Brigade-Military Jurist comrade ALEKSEYEVA,

Members: Brigade-Military Jurist SUSLINA and Comrade BUKANOVA,

In the presence of the secretary – junior military jurist lawyer comrade MAZUR, in a closed court session in the city of Moscow, 8 December 1939, examined the case on charges of – Sultangaliev MIRSEID<sup>24</sup> HAYDAR GALIEVICH 1892, born in the Bashkir ASSR, by nationality Tatar, in service, non-partisan, exiled by the NKVD 1928 (on 28 June 1930, Col. of the State Political University) previously exiled for 10 years for counter-revolutionary activity, now charged with criminal activity, provided for by Articles 58-1a, 58-2 and 58-11 of the Criminal Code.

The preliminary and judicial investigation found that since 1919, SULTAN-GALIEV had been the organizer and actual leader of an anti-Soviet nationalist group, which for many years had been actively fighting against Soviet power and the CPSU / b /.

Throughout 1919-1920, he was in organizational connection with the well-known nationalists in exile IBRAGIMOV, [...],<sup>25</sup> ABDURRAN and others, together with whom they agreed on organizing a struggle against Soviet power on the basis of pan-Turkism and pan-Islamism, with the aim of secession from Soviet Russia of the Turkic-Tatar regions and the establishment therein of a bourgeois-democratic Turanian state.

In 1923, Sultan-Galiev M. together with a certain KARA-SACAL formulated the foundations of a political program common to all the Turkic nationalities of the USSR and the colonial peoples of the foreign East, and in addition a cipher was developed, a password and nicknames were established.

In the period of 1925, Sultan-Galiev wrote a program of struggle under the heading “On the Basics of the Economic, Political, and Cultural Development of the Turkic Peoples,” in which he put forward the idea of creating a “colonial International,” with the organization of a special committee for the leadership of the Pan-Turkic movements of the Turkic peoples in the USSR, with branches on the ground whose task was to organize the preparation of a secession of the national Turkic republics and regions from the Soviet Union.

<sup>24</sup> The name is written here as it appears in the document. Correctly: Mirsaid.

<sup>25</sup> One last name is illegible.

From 1923 and for several years SULTAN-GALIEV had an organisational relationship with the Trotskyite-Zinoviev underground, contacting them with subversive work against the CPSU / b / and the Soviet authorities.

In the period 1931-1933, SULTAN-GALIEV, even while in the Solovetsky camps, did not abandon his criminal activities with like-minded people – ENBAEV, BAKIYEV, and others – negotiating the establishment of the so-called “Turan Workers’ and Peasants’ Socialist Party.”

In the same year of 1933 Sultan-Galiev undertook an assignment to establish a connection with the leader of the Tatar White emigration GAYAZ ISKHAKOV.

Along with these criminal acts during the period from 1919 to 1928 and from 1934 to the date of his arrest, Sultan-Galiev conducted a large recruitment activity to create anti-Soviet bourgeois-nationalist organizations and groups.

In addition, it was established that from 1922 Sultan-Galiev was in contact with diplomatic representatives of a foreign state who, for espionage purposes, he informed of secret decisions of the Central Committee of the CPSU / b / on eastern issues and on the national question, and also gave his consent to the transfer of information about the armed forces of the USSR. In 1927 he provided the representative of foreign intelligence with a verbatim report of the so-called “Ryskulov national meeting.”

Recognizing SULTAN-GALIEV as guilty of the crimes provided for in Articles 58-1a, 58-2 and 58-11 of the Criminal Code of the RSFSR, the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the USSR, guided by Articles 319 and 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the RSFSR

HAS SENTENCED:

SULTAN-GALIEV MIRSAID HAYDAR GALIEVICH to the highest measure of criminal punishment – execution by firing squad, with confiscation of all personal property belonging to him. The verdict is final and not subject to appeal.

Authenticated by the appropriate signatures.

TRUE: Court of the Secretary of the Military Collegium

Ml. Junior military jurist / MAZUR /

TsKhIDNIT.<sup>26</sup> F.30.OIP.3.D. D41. A copy of the document was transferred from the Central Archive of the Federal Counterintelligence Service of the Russian Federation.

Central Archive of the Federal Counterintelligence Service.

N 6169. T.2. L.101-109

<sup>26</sup> Centr hraneniâ i izučeniâ dokumentov novejšej istorii Tatarstana (Center for the Storage and Study of Documents from the Recent History of Tatarstan). (Editors’ note)



# Some of Our Considerations on the Bases of Socio-Political, Economic, and Cultural Development of the Turkic Peoples of Asia and Europe<sup>27</sup>

*Mirsaid Sultan-Galiev*

## I. Methodology

Before we lay the foundations on which we will establish the socio-political, economic, and cultural developments of the Turkic peoples of Asia and Europe in the epoch we are experiencing, we must, at least briefly, consider the methodology of our views on the topic.

To avoid any ambiguity and misunderstanding, we must first point out that we approach this particular issue, as well as other issues in general, from a materialist worldview and philosophy. From the various currents of this revolutionary philosophical school we are adherents of a more radical branch, of so-called historical or dialectical materialism. We believe that this branch of materialistic philosophy is the most exact and scientifically grounded system of cognition of individual phenomena in the social life of human society, since with its help we can produce the most correct and accurate analysis of their causes and predict or anticipate their consequences.

However, at the same time, let us state in advance that our belonging to this school – of dialectical, or rather, *energetic materialism* – should not be interpreted as a blind imitation of the Western European representatives of this school (i.e., so-called Marxists or Communists), nor a blind copying of all that they consider or pass off as its product. We do not do this for the following reasons:

We believe that materialistic philosophy is in no way the exclusive “preserve” of Western European scientific thought, since this kind of philosophy, in one form or another, as a particular system of thinking, has arisen elsewhere – among non-European peoples (Persians, Arabs, Chinese, Turks, Mongol, etc.) long before the birth of modern European culture.

Many of us, even before the last revolution in Russia, were imbued with an energetic materialist world outlook, which was not artificial and grafted from the outside, but naturally arising from the essence of the conditions surrounding us: the most severe economic, political, and cultural oppression of us by Russian nationalism and Russian statehood.

<sup>27</sup> The article was seized by the NKVD from M. Sultan-Galiev during the search.

Our adherence to the supporters of historical materialism does not at all oblige us to agree to and regard as “sacred,” indisputable and indestructible anything that might be proclaimed as such by contemporary Russian or even European monopolists of the idea of dialectical materialism.

You can declare yourself a thousand times a materialist, a Marxist, a Communist or, as is currently the fashion in Russia, a Leninist, scream about it to the whole world, with as much strength and opportunity as you have, and write hundreds and thousands of volumes on hundreds and thousands of aspects of this subject, but at the same time not have the slightest dose of true materialism or communism, or a grain of genuine revolutionism in your judgments and conclusions, let alone actions. And we not only do not offer any commitments to them, but even in spite of all their expectations, we “dare” to challenge their right to monopolize the idea of dialectical materialism.

So, for example, we find that in the basic questions of the restructuring of the social life of mankind, which are firstly the national-colonial question and secondly the question of the methods of implementing communism, namely the social system in which there will be no classes and there will be no exploitation of man by man, Russians, and following them the West-European Communists at the present time, commit the grossest errors, which may result not in the salvation of mankind from the “oppression of anarchy and elements,” but its terrible ruin, impoverishment, and extinction. We agree with them (not always and not on all matters), when they criticize and castigate rapacious European capitalism as predatory European imperialism; we agree with them when they speak of the reactionary nature of modern European capitalist culture and the need to fight it...but we nevertheless completely disagree with the recipes they have offered as conclusions from their reasoning on all this. We believe that the recipe proposing the replacement of the dictatorship over the world of one class of the European public (the bourgeoisie) by its antipode (proletariat), i.e., its opposing class, will bring about no particularly great change in the social life of the oppressed part of mankind. In any case, if any change occurs, it will not be for the better, but for the worse. This will only be a replacement with a less powerful and less organized dictatorship (a centralized dictatorship of forces united on a European scale) of the same capitalist Europe (here also including America) over the rest of the world. In contrast, we put forward a different proposition – the concept that the material prerequisites for the social reorganization of mankind can be created only by establishing the dictatorship of colonies and semi-colonies over the metropolises, because only this method is capable of creating real guarantees for the liberation and emancipation of the productive forces of the globe, chained by Western imperialism.

Proceeding from this methodology, we establish a certain system of questions, the answer to which must give the most correct solution to our main task. We consider the issues through the following topics:

What is the Turkic world as a socio-productive organism in the present-day world economy and politics?

What conditions are lacking (internal and external) for the normal economic, political, and cultural development of the Turkic peoples (both in general and in their individual branches)?

In what ways can these conditions be achieved, whether through evolutionary development or through revolutionary changes?

Specific methods of work in one direction or another:

- a) strategy and tactics,
- b) forms of organization.

## II. The Turkic World in the System of the Modern World Economy and Politics as a Productive-Social Organism

The question of the place and role of the modern Turkic world in the system of the current international economy and politics is, in our opinion, the chief issue from which we can outline the correct solution to our main question about the fundamentals of the socio-political, economic, and cultural development of the Turkic peoples of Asia and Europe.

Not knowing exactly what we are within the system of existing international social and legal relations, and what kind of relations these are, we cannot determine what we should become and what we should transform ourselves into.

An analysis of this question can begin only from its second part, i.e., from the question regarding the nature of the modern system of international social and legal relations – economic, political, and cultural-domestic.

We consider the following factors as the distinguishing points that determine the features of this system:

### 1. The Slave (Colonial-Imperialist) Character of the Modern World Economy and Politics

An analysis of the social and legal relations between individual peoples of the world reveals that the nationalities from which modern mankind is formed are sharply divided into two camps that are hostile to each other and unequal in number according to their social and legal situation; in one camp there are peoples constituting only 20-25% of humanity, who have managed to take into their hands almost the entire globe, with all the “living” and dead riches contained on it and in it, and established the monopoly “right” to exploit them; in the other camp are the peoples who make up 4/5 of all mankind and fall under the economic, political, and cultural bondage and slavery of the peoples of the first camp, in other words, the “master” peoples.

In the “civil” language of the “masters,” the peoples of the first group are called “civilized” nations, called upon to save mankind “from slavery, ignorance, and poverty.” The peoples of the second group in their language are called “savages,” “natives,” etc., whose role it is, according to their “scientific” judgments, to serve the interests of the “master-nations.” The “natives” and “savages” have not yet invented special terms for the designation of “civilized” peoples and, whether due to the “poverty” of their

lexicon or lack of scientific understanding, refer to them simply as “dogs,” “thieves,” “executioners,” and other similar “indecent” and incomprehensible epithets.

The peoples of the first category include the “civilized” peoples of Europe and America, who have spread gradually to other parts of the world and are generally called “the peoples of the West.” The second group includes the peoples of Asia and Africa and the aborigines of Australia and America, colonized by Europeans.

Analysing the relations between the two groups of peoples, we state that the entire system of economic, political, and cultural relations of the peoples of the West (metropolitan countries) to the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies is a system of slaveholding relations.

A number of conditions of a historical and natural-geographical nature, which influenced the progress of technology and culture of the peoples of the West, conditioned the transition into their hands of the means of economic and cultural communication between the peoples of different parts of the world, in other words international communications and military-strategic points, thereby creating the prerequisites for the transition into their hands of the entire initiative in the development of the world’s political and economic relations between the peoples of Western and Eastern cultures.

By a certain moment in history, the technology and culture of the peoples of Europe proved to be more viable and rational, from the point of view of the struggle for existence, than that of the hegemon of the world, the Muslim peoples of Asia and Africa who were assailing them at that time, and allowed them to break up the latter and occupy the necessary bridgeheads to freely extend their influence to the rest of the Asian and African continent.

World trade routes, trade markets, and sources of raw materials, as well as military-strategic points, with few exceptions, were in the hands of the peoples of the West. And the peoples of the West extended their system of intra-national slavery (if serfdom in the epoch of feudalism was a form of slave-owning economy, then class oppression in the era of capitalism is also slave-owning – the exploitation of man by man, but only in another, altered form) entirely to their colonies – the “black” and “yellow” continents, thus giving it an international character and transforming it into an “international” system of slavery. The peoples of these continents actually became slaves deprived of the right to own the natural wealth of their countries, working for the benefit of their “civilised” masters – the peoples of the metropolises.

## 2. The Parasitic and Reactionary Character of the Material Culture of Metropolises as the Main Factor of World Development in this Epoch

The colonial-slave-owning character of the modern system of world economy determines entirely its next feature – the deep parasitism and the highly reactionary nature of the entire present culture of the peoples of the West as the main factor in the development of mankind in this epoch. These properties of the material culture of the metropolitan countries are expressed in the following two points:

A) The static moment – the monopolistic concentration of the means of production and circulation (the market), and the commodities necessary for humanity, in the hands of the peoples of the metropolises.

Accumulated in the hands of the metropolitan countries, populated by some 300–350 million people, are all the main means of production (manufacturing industry), means of circulation (financial capital and its apparatus), ways and means of transportation and communication (sea routes, railway lines, air communication, telegraph and radio); as well as sources of raw materials (oil, coal, ore, animals, and plant products) and markets for industrial products. In this respect, the West seems like a giant octopus, embracing with its tentacles four-fifths of humanity and sucking from it all its vital juices. To this we must add that the octopus is not an ordinary octopus from under the waters of the ocean, but an octopus-warrior, an octopus-destroyer, armed with the latest military techniques and “inventions” of the West. True, these gains have not increased the courage and bravery of this octopus. But its cowardly cruelty and bloodthirstiness has increased: the octopus now sucks the lifeblood from the living organism of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, enriching one, smaller, part of the world’s population at the expense of the exhaustion, pauperization, degeneration, and extinction of the other, majority part.

B) The dynamic moment – the parasitic and reactionary character of the material culture of the metropolises with regard to the maximum development of the productive forces of mankind.

This moment is closely connected with the first, and complements and develops upon it.

In fact, it is the basis for what the modern culture of metropolitan countries seeks as a regulator of the development of mankind in the current epoch.

If the essence of the material culture of the peoples of the West consisted solely in the monopolistic nature of the modern system of their economy (monopoly capitalism or imperialism), then this as a form of organization of the world economy would be only half bad. But the whole point is that the essence of the material culture of the metropolitan countries, the main internal content of it, thus the true content of all these “monopoly capitalisms,” “imperialisms” and other social categories of the public of the West is not to be found in this static form, but in its dynamics, in the specific tendency of its development.

This trend is that the existence and development of the modern material culture of the peoples of the West is based not only on the preservation of slave-owning and bonded relations towards the peoples of the East, in other words on the exploitation of the natural forces and resources of colonies and semi-colonies, but also on delaying the development of the domestic productive forces of these latter, on the suppression of the growth of their material culture.

What is the basis for the modern culture of the West?

The monopoly production and sale of goods for the metropolitan countries and colonies, in other words as a monopolist in the world economic and production process.

What is it based on?

On retarding the development of the domestic economy, in the absence of a national industry of colonies and semi-colonies, in other words on preserving the agrarian, purely peasant character of these countries, when they, because of the absence or underdevelopment of national industry, are forced to resort in their economic life to the “help” of the metropolitan countries, in other words world monopoly industry.

Specifically, this process consists of the following elements:

A) **The provision of the main element of the economy of metropolises – industry – with cheap raw materials**, hence the predatory policy of the peoples of the West towards the countries of Asia and Africa as sources of raw materials, with all that accompanies this policy and the resulting phenomena: firstly the ruthless struggle with the remnants of independence of the semi-colonies and the brutal suppression of the slightest manifestation of political independence on the part of the colonies, and secondly constant competitive wars due to colonial possessions between individual national metropolitan groups. In other words, the development of social contradictions between colonies and metropolises on the one hand, and national conflicts between individual national groups of dictatorial metropolises on the other.

B) **The provision of cheap production costs for the factories of industry**, by improving the technology of production and exploitation of the labour of industrial workers in the metropolitan areas and subsidiary workers from the colonies. Hence, the existence of class contradictions in metropolitan areas and the emergence of class based political parties on the basis of these contradictions.

C) **The provision of cheap (profitable) markets** for the products of the industry of the metropolises. Hence, the deepening of the colonial-predatory policy of the metropolitan countries, directed not only at keeping the colonies and semi-colonies in their own hands and under their own yoke, but also at keeping them precisely as permanent markets for the sale of industrial fabrics in metropolises.

The result of this policy is only an even greater aggravation of social contradictions between the colonies and metropolises, and these contradictions assume the importance of a factor of paramount international significance.

The last element in the process of the dynamics of the material culture of metropolitan countries occupies a particularly important place in the system of established relationships between the metropolitan countries and colonies. This element, as the main active spring of the modern culture of the peoples of the West, simultaneously

acts as the main cause of all those social abnormalities that are revealed in the development of modern mankind as a whole.

These abnormalities are obvious, and they can only be denied by the blind and the politically degenerate. They are the following:

A) The predatory and unproductive exploitation of the natural wealth of the earth, in particular of the resources of colonies and semi colonies, from the point of view of the general interests of humanity.

This truth hardly requires proof, it is enough to observe the management of the metropolises both “at home,” and in the colonies, to be immediately convinced of this.

B) The irrational organization of the global process of production and distribution as a whole and the subsequent unproductive waste of mass human energy.

The means of production, concentrated mainly in the hands of the metropolitan countries, are far from the main sources of raw materials and world markets, and thus necessitate the transfer first of raw materials to the means of production, and second the products of its processing (goods) to the markets. For example, wool or leather raw materials from Tibet, India or Afghanistan must be transported to the UK, turned into cloth, shoes, or other goods and then make their way back to their “homeland.” Or, for example, Turkestan or Transcaucasian cotton (together with, by the way, Baku oil) must first make the journey to the country of the “civilized” – somewhere in Moscow or Ivanovo-Voznesensk and, once processed into fabric or something else, to make the opposite (secondary) journey to the same Turkestan or Transcaucasia, and sometimes further – to Persia, Afghanistan, etc. As regards economy of means and human energy, it would be more expedient to act in precisely the opposite way: to process raw materials into what is necessary for people in their “homeland,” in other words in the colonies and semi-colonies themselves where, incidentally, with the exception of the means of production (which can be moved there from metropolitan areas or organized again), there is a combination of all the necessary conditions for this: raw materials, liquid fuels, unused human energy going to waste, the need for appropriate products from the population of the colonies, and committing it to “foreign travel” only as is necessary, in other words conforming to the corresponding natural consumer demand from there, not as a “wild” raw material, but as a “civic” commodity.

C) The waste of mass human energy for the constant and regular “protection” of the existing order of things and the corresponding regime, in other words the existing irrationality in the organization of the world economy and the attendant social negligence (injustice).

This expresses itself in the rabid militarism of the West, in the monstrous growth of its land, sea and air armaments and the corps of internal and external guards. The peo-

ples of the West protect and are protected not only from the oppressed peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies, and from all sorts of “yellow,” “black,” and other “perils” and “panisms,” but also “from each other.”

D) The delay in the natural development of the productive forces of the colonies and semi-colonies, thus the majority of the world population. On this ground social inequality emerges between the peoples of the colonies and the metropolises, and an obstacle to the cultural development of all modern mankind as a whole is created.

It is advantageous for Western predatory imperialism to maintain backward forms of economy and social relations in colonial countries. Only on the basis of this backwardness can the predatory culture of the metropolises breathe and develop. To keep the colonial peoples in darkness and oppression and not give them the opportunity to revive culturally is the most real and vital need of the peoples of the West, who have their historical development become the jailers of mankind. Hence the social inequality that we see in the position of the peoples of the metropolitan countries on the one hand, and the peoples of the colonies oppressed by them on the other. While the peoples of the metropolitan countries enjoy all the benefits of culture and all the fruits of technology and science, the peoples of the colonial countries, in their mass, are forced to drag out their existence as half-starved slaves and beggars. We see steel and granite skyscrapers on one side and pitiful huts and shacks on the other; cars, trams, buses, trains, steamships, and airplanes on one side, pathetic nags and antediluvian carts and wagons on the other; electric ploughs, tractors, steam threshers, melioration, artificial fertilizer fields, etc., on one side and a wooden plough, a shovel, a pickaxe and a pitchfork on the other; electricity, telephone, telegraph, and radio on one side, a beam and a kerosene oil lamp and the absence of everything else on the other; fine arts, literature, games, and laughter on one side, hopelessness and darkness, constant suffering, and tears on the other; satiety, contentment, and a secure life on one side, hunger, cold, poverty, disease, death, and degeneration on the other.

Can we justify this state of affairs? Can we call it a normal state of affairs, a normal order? No, and again no! From the point of view of any morality, this is an expression of the greatest social abnormality and glaring international social injustice.

### 3. The Desire of the National Cultures of the Metropolises for Consolidation

We would be incomplete in our analysis of the material culture of metropolitan countries if we left unanswered yet another question, namely: where is the modern material culture of the peoples of the metropolitan countries headed and what does it want to become? This question is closely connected to the dynamics of the development of this culture, and reveals one of the most characteristic and significant features of it, determining the prospects for the development of the world for the entire immediate era. We define this line as the desire for consolidation, in other words for the central-



ized unification of the disparate national-material cultures (capital) of the peoples of the metropolises.

Does this desire exist?

Yes, it does. The recent international imperialist war, revolutionary cataclysms in Russia and other countries after the war, today's "diplomatic" struggle between certain groups of "victorious" countries and the feverish work of the separate political parties of the peoples of the West are all diverse manifestations of this desire.

This aspiration derives from the following two contradictions:

1) The discrepancy between the existing structure of the material culture of the peoples of the metropolitan countries (nationally scattered, often proprietary or anarchic capitalism) and its internal essence, in other words the needs of these peoples within the process of a more organized and improved robbery and exploitation of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies;

2) In connection with this, the emergence in the colonies of the material and political prerequisites for national independence and social emancipation from the yoke of the metropolitan countries; strengthening the so-called national liberation movement of the colonies.

Let us take the first contradiction. What is it specifically expressed in? It expresses itself in the fact that the existing order, the existing foundations of the material culture of the peoples of the metropolitan countries can no longer with impunity ensure them the regular and, most importantly, full exploitation of the peoples of the colonies. The material needs of the peoples of the metropolitan countries have outgrown the existing form of their material culture. The robbery and sucking of juices from the body of enslaved humanity, carried out individually, without a single plan and a centralized will, are not effective enough in terms of productivity and not only do not produce the maximum expected results, but even contrary to the will of the plunderers, are fraught with all sorts of surprises. It turns out that such a system of exploitation of colonies and semi-colonies and the rest of the oppressed part of mankind cannot stop the complete circulation of blood in their bodies. They continue to maintain their vitality, continue to live, breathe, and sometimes, when their enslavers are engaged in a fight among themselves over the wealth of others, they even dare to oppose them. Can the peoples of the West afford such a "luxury" on the part of the peoples of the colonies? Of course not. Whether they want to confront it or not, the question of changing the internal structure of their material culture, the question of the transition to new, higher, more organized and perfect forms of management, rises up before them and it cannot be otherwise.

What is the essence of the internal structure of the material culture of the metropolitan countries in the present era? Its essence lies in two conditions: private property within nations and private property between nations, in other words the relative disparity in the means of production and circulation of the accumulated wealth, both within the nations themselves and between individual nations.

Let us take the first condition – private property within nations. What results does it produce in the course of developing the material culture of the peoples of the West? Firstly, competition between individual owners (capitalists) and their associations (trusts, syndicates, cartels, etc.), or even among whole industries themselves. In pursuit of profit and bigger profit shares they mutually battle among themselves, and a significant part of their energy goes into managing this struggle and this competition. True, this competition, being the only and necessary part of capitalism based on private property in general, plays a generally progressive role in the concentration and centralisation of capital. Nevertheless, on a social scale, under the conditions of the existence of colonies aspiring for independent development, for metropolitan countries this represents a factor that weakens their exploitative power over the former. If, for example, a capitalist enterprise of England is sent to work in India, then it must spend a part of its capital competing with a similar British enterprise or joint-stock company and lose a certain percentage of its resources and capabilities on this. Due to non-centralization and disunity on a national scale, the plundering of British capital in India does not fully and completely bring about the effect and results that it could produce in the case of centralization.

The principle of private ownership inevitably gives birth to another factor that is negative from the point of view of the power of the peoples of the metropolitan countries, namely, the class struggle based on intra-national class inequality. Against the backdrop of the class struggle in the West, three main political trends reflecting the ideology of the respective main classes of the metropolitan countries have appeared: conservatism, the political ideology of the big bourgeoisie; liberalism as a political ideology of the middle and petty bourgeoisie and socialism as the ideology of the working class. The struggle of these classes among themselves, reflecting in fact to a certain extent their desire for political power, cannot help but weaken at some moments the offensive strength of the peoples of the metropolitan countries in relation to the colonies. Here we can give the example of the defeat of Russia during the Russo-Japanese War of 1904, when the presence of a rather pronounced class struggle within Russia (the liberal Russian commercial and industrial bourgeoisie presented a number of political demands with respect to the feudal landlord bourgeoisie, Russian workers presented political demands in relation to both the former and the latter) provided the main background for the defeat of Russian troops in the theatre of military operations.

A classic example of the opposite can be provided by the victory of the revitalised Turkey over the gangs of international imperialism in 1922, largely conditioned by the fact that if the insurgent Turkey of the Kemalists was a monolithic national whole, uniting all classes of the Turkish people in one fiery impulse of the struggle for national independence, then the camp of opponents – Europe – was a bubbling volcano of national and class contradictions.

And here we have to state that the [fight of classes inside metropolises within the modern conditions of their development is again a factor weakening the future offensive force of the western hegemony.](#)

Another similar factor is the second condition – private property between the metropolitan nations, in other words, the national fragmentation of their material culture, giving rise to the strongest national competition and national struggle between them. The presence of this factor greatly hinders the position of the peoples of the metropolitan countries as the hegemon of the world. It weakens their general pressure on the colonies and allows the latter the possibility of movement and manoeuvre. What is the basis of the preservation of Turkey's independence, the restoration of Afghanistan's independence, the strengthening of elements of Egypt's independence? What is the basis for the strengthening of the national liberation movements in India, Morocco, China, etc.? What is the basis for the revival of some old (Poland) and the emergence of new state formations (Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ireland) within Europe itself? What is the basis, finally, for strengthening the national liberation movements of non-Russian nationalities in Russia?

All this is, to a large extent, based precisely on the national disunity of the material culture of the West. The struggle of the peoples of the metropolises among themselves for primacy and for hegemony over the world contributes only to easing their combined pressure on the colonies, and opens up the possibility for the latter to struggle for political independence.

Let us proceed to an analysis of the second contradiction, i.e., [the liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies](#). Is there really such a movement and if so, is it really growing and progressing? We will answer this with the language of facts.

### Japan

Half a century ago, Japan was a small semi-colonial country, which could not even think about participating in international politics. But when it came to her awakening, how she crushed the peoples of Asia and the gendarme of Europe, the hardened feudal imperialist, tsarist Russia. Not ten years have passed and Japan now participates in the beating of Germany, Europe's next imperialist power after Russia. For the time being, at least, Germany has been knocked off kilter. And now Japan is forming a bloc with France, China, and Russia against England. The combination may change, but the fact remains. If these plans succeed, then the next day she will participate in the formation of a bloc against the transatlantic power – America. And this is quite natural. Japan cannot remain forever on its islands. The future of the Japanese people requires the opening of doors to Siberia for resettlement and the doors of China and other countries for the allotment of Japanese commercial and industrial capital. It is in her interest to smash the giants of European imperialism by parts.

### Turkey

Even for the notorious enemies of the long-suffering Turkish people, it is now clear what is happening in this country: a healthy process of national revival. Those who doubted, or did not believe it, have experienced it for themselves. The bayonets of the Turkish

workers and peasants and the Turkish progressive intelligentsia, dedicated to the cause of the national revival of Turkey, have taught those who needed it to think realistically. Four hundred years ago, the Russian tsars had to defeat the Kazan Khanate, this citadel of the northern Turks, and over the corpses of the Tatar fighters, step further East. Later, the Western European imperialists had to defeat the southern Ottoman Turks to open their way to the same East. Did not the desperate attack of Turkey on their side precede the advance of the peoples of the West to the East? To become the real masters of the situation in Asia and Africa, the peoples of Europe had to step over the corpses of the Ottoman fighters. The fall of Kazan under the onslaught of the Russians did not occur in a day. Dozens of times they attacked it, and the conquest of Tatarstan was preceded by dozens of years of struggle between the then two northern titans: Kazan and Moscow. The winners did not immediately manage to consolidate their gain. It took several decades of uninterrupted guerrilla warfare between the victors and the vanquished, with all the horrors of extermination and slaughter, until the will of the vanquished was finally broken. Europe needed hundreds of years of struggle against the southern Turks to weaken them and dispossess them of the Balkans, Egypt, Arabia, Mesopotamia, etc. The rulers of Europe have failed, and they will not be able to break Turkey. She is alive and will survive. We believe that she will not only live, but will also breathe life into those former parts that were torn away from her by the violence of Europe, to the rest of the Middle East.

### China

China, this oldest nation of all the old peoples of the world, slumbered for a long time, but has finally opened its eyes. It is awakening now, from centuries of hibernation. For the time being China lies recumbent and flexes its numb joints. But it will soon rise to its feet. No power can keep it down now. What has been happening in recent years in China is a deep indication of the revival of this people. The Chinese people managed to make a revolution in 1911. They will also be able to complete the next revolution, after which the unified parts of China will merge into a mighty steel fist, from the impact of whose punch the peoples of the West will struggle to recover. The periodic outbreaks of the civil war in China are only a prelude to the great concert of the revival of the four hundred million Chinese people. Let tens and hundreds of thousands of victims perish in this bloody struggle of the Chinese people among themselves, but these sacrifices are unavoidable and they will not be wasted for nothing. Civil wars in China are only a manifestation of the great process of consolidating the Chinese nation, which will require more than a decade for its completion.

### India

India is also awakening. The process of rebuilding India is more painful than the process of China's rebirth. And this is quite understandable: after all, India is a colony of the most powerful of European bandits – England. But no matter how terrible the old sea

pirate is, it cannot resist the liberation movement of India. Through repression, bribery, provocations and diplomatic tricks, England will be able, perhaps, to delay the process of emancipation of India, but it cannot completely stop it.

The liberation movement of India comes in waves. The rise of revolutionary sentiments alternates with their subsidence. But one thing is clear: any such temporary “subsidence” in the revolutionary mood of the Indian people is merely a shift, followed by a new upsurge and a new wave of revolutionary sentiments, stronger and more formidable. We have no doubt that eventually the day will come when the revolutionary wave of the liberation movement of India will break through all the artificial dams that Britain has barred it with, and will flood the whole world.

### Egypt, Morocco, and the Colonies of Russia

These adds to the general chorus of revolutionary efforts for liberation from the oppression of the West, and is no different from the revolutionary liberation movement of China, India, Turkey, etc. All of them take place under the slogan of emancipation from imperialism, or rather, the hegemony of the peoples of the West. It differs only in its shape and pace: it is stronger or weaker, faster or slower, more turbulent or calmer, greater or smaller than the movement of the former, depending on which country, under what historical conditions and with what kind of driving forces it occurs.

We will not dwell in more detail on the movements of Egypt, Morocco, and other African or Asian colonies of the West, because these are well known in their basic features. Here we will highlight the movements of the colonial peoples of Russia. We note that the liberation movements in the colonies of Russia (Turkestan, the Caucasus, Ukraine, the Crimea, Belarus, the Turkic-Finnish, and Mongolian peoples) is evident. If the defeat of tsarist Russia by Japan in 1904, which caused the revolution of 1905, contributed to the awakening of national self-consciousness of the colonial, oppressed peoples of this country, its defeat on the Western and Caucasian fronts in the World War that caused the Revolution of 1917 only deepened the process of the liberation movements of these peoples. The facts of the separation of Poland, Finland, and the small Baltic states from Russia; the facts of the emergence of the Tatar, Bashkir, Kirghiz, Central Asian, Transcaucasian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, and other republics, as well as a dozen autonomous national regions, systematically fighting for the expansion of sovereignty rights, eloquently confirm this position. And no matter how much the pan-Russians and their supporters (under whatever guise they may be: whether “democrats” or “communists”) seek to weaken or eliminate this movement, no matter how much they try to reduce their role to that of ordinary Russian provinces, they have not yet succeeded in doing so, and will not be able to, no matter how clever the frauds they invent with the aim of combating the growing activity of the “nationalists” in their struggle for national independence. So far, all this has produced only the opposite results.

By establishing the USSR, the pan-Russians wanted in fact to restore a single, indivisible Russia, the hegemony of the Great Russians over other peoples, but not a year

later all the nations declared their vociferous protest against the centralistic tendencies of pan-Russian Moscow (the session of the Council of Nationalities at the last session of the Central Executive Committee of the USSR).

In its attempt to weaken Turkestan economically and politically, Moscow is dismembering the Turanian peoples today into small, separate tribes, but in less than two years the dismembered parts of Turan<sup>28</sup> will talk of restoring unity and unite into a stronger, more powerful and organized state unit. Today Russia separates Mongolia from China. She wants to “tame” this country to herself. And Mongolia, seemingly, does not mind succumbing to Moscow’s embrace. But what Mongolia will say tomorrow, when it rises to its feet and strengthens its “Khuruldan,”<sup>29</sup> is still unknown. From the experience of the last revolution in Russia, we have come to the conclusion that no matter what class in Russia comes to power, none of them will be able to restore the former “greatness” and power of this country. Russia as a multinational state and the state of the Russians inevitably tends towards disintegration and to dismemberment. One of two things: either it (Russia) will be dismembered into its constituent national parts and form a number of new and independent state organisms, or **Russian sovereignty in Russia will be replaced by the collective sovereignty of the “nations,” in other words, the dictatorship of the Russian people over all other peoples will be replaced with the dictatorship of the these latter peoples over the Russian people.** This is a historical inevitability as a derivative of a combination. More likely the former will happen, and if the latter happens, it will still merely be a transition to the former. The former Russia, which was restored under the present form of the USSR, will not last long. It is transitory and temporary.

These are merely the last gasps, the last convulsions of the dying. Against the backdrop of the disintegration of Russia, the figures of the following national state entities are quite distinct: **Ukraine** (with Crimea and Belarus), the **Caucasus** can exist as a union of the North Caucasus with Transcaucasia, **Turan** (as an alliance of Tatarstan, Bashkiria, Kyrgyzstan, and a federation of Turkestan republics), Siberia, and Great Russia. We do not consider Finland, Poland, and the small Baltic states that have already separated from Russia.

Thus, the facts of the liberation movement of the colonies and semi-colonies are evident. It exists and it is real, it progresses and develops.

What are the reasons and the material basis of this movement? From what does it arise and what is its real essence and sum of international social and legal mutual relations?<sup>30</sup>

**Archive of the KGB of the Republic of Tatarstan. F.4. Op.1. T.2. L.245-248.**

<sup>28</sup> Turan is a geographical term for the Turkestan-Turanian region. “Turanian” is an outdated term denoting the inhabitants of this region and, by extension, Turkic peoples in general.

<sup>29</sup> Khuruldan (Khural) – the name of the highest central and local governing bodies of state power in the MPR.

<sup>30</sup> This sentence ends the article.