



# THE REVOLUTION IN AFGHANISTAN

Emine Engin

İŞÇİNİN SESİ  
PUBLICATIONS



ENGLISH  
SERIES 16

Workers of the world unite!

## The Revolution in Afghanistan

The red flag to the left on the cover was adopted after the April Revolution. The adoption of the red flag was celebrated with the largest meetings in the history of the country. The flag with the green panel on the right, however, was adopted by the Babrak Karmal government to replace the red flag.

# The Revolution in Afghanistan

EMİNE ENGİN

Translated from the Turkish edition, January 1982

İşçinin Sesi Publications  
English Series: 16

November 1982

Printed by Morning Litho Printers Ltd. (TU)

# Contents

|  | page |
|--|------|
| <b>Introduction</b>  | 9    |
| <b>I. Brief background information on Afghanistan</b>                            | 11   |
| 1. A brief history of the country  | 11   |
| 2. The socio-economic structure of Afghanistan                                   | 15   |
| <b>II. The April Revolution</b>  | 21   |
| 1. The PDPA and the April Revolution   | 21   |
| 2. The April Revolution was not a coup   | 28   |
| <b>III. Developments in the post-revolutionary period</b>                        | 35   |
| 1. Opportunism greatly harmed the revolution                                     | 36   |
| 2. Amin was the true leader of the revolution                                    | 38   |
| 3. Opportunist coups — Tarakki and Babrak Karmal                                 | 40   |
| <b>IV. “The new stage of the revolution”</b>                                     | 43   |
| 1. The political identity of Babrak Karmal                                       | 43   |
| 2. What happened in the new stage?   | 45   |
| 3. Is it the April Revolution or the October Revolution<br>which is in question? | 48   |
| 4. Reverberations of the “new stage of the<br>revolution” in Turkey              | 49   |
| <b>V. On Hafizullah Amin</b>   | 53   |
| 1. Amin’s correct positions  | 54   |
| 2. Amin’s policies were not sectarian  | 60   |
| 3. The situation in September 1979   | 66   |
| 4. Can there be a proletarian dictatorship<br>in Afghanistan?                    | 71   |
| 5. Those who call Amin an agent provide no<br>evidence                           | 78   |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>VI. Proletarian internationalism and the lessons of Afghanistan</b>  | 81  |
| 1. The world communist movement must derive a lesson  | 81  |
| 2. The role of the Red Army   | 83  |
| 3. Conclusion   | 87  |
| <b>References</b>   | 91  |
| <b>Appendices</b>   | 95  |
| <b>Appendix I. A short biography of Hafizullah Amin</b>   | 99  |
| <b>Appendix II. Selections from the speeches of Hafizullah Amin</b>   | 103 |
| From the speech made on the occasion of the 61st Anniversary of the Great October Revolution                        | 103 |
| From a speech made at a science seminar   | 109 |
| From a speech made at a seminar on education  | 114 |
| From a speech made on the 14th anniversary of the PDPA's First Congress   | 121 |
| From a speech made at the opening ceremony of the Academy of Sciences of Afghanistan                                | 133 |
| <i>Khalqi</i> message   | 143 |
| From the speech to KAM employees  | 143 |
| <b>Appendix III. From the accusations brought against Amin and "evidence" cited in regard to his being an agent</b> | 161 |

## Introduction

Various aspects of the revolution in Afghanistan have been the subject of extensive discussions both in Turkey and in the international arena. Were the events of April 1978 a coup or a revolution? Was Hafizullah Amin an agent, or the leader of the revolution? Did the entry of Soviet troops into Afghanistan constitute an act of proletarian internationalist solidarity, the export of revolution, or an occupation?

In his pamphlet *Socialism Will Win* comrade Yürükoğlu gave the following brief answers to these questions:

“We recognise Hafizullah Amin, not as a CIA agent, but as the genuine leader of the Afghanistan revolution. The evidence supplied to show that Amin was an ‘agent’ is not convincing. The present leaders, however, who cannot open their mouths or begin a speech without saying, ‘In the name of god, the compassionate and merciful’, are representatives of opportunism. It is a requirement of proletarian internationalism that the Red Army protect the Afghanistan revolution, but what was done to Amin and to 97 leaders of the party is an historical injustice.

There are important lessons for us to derive from the Afghanistan events.”<sup>1</sup>

This is, in brief, the assessment of *İşçinin Sesi (Worker's Voice)*. Namely, April 1978 was a revolution, not a coup. There is not a single piece of evidence to prove that Amin was an agent. On the contrary, all the evidence confirms that Amin was the genuine leader of the revolution, not an agent. As for the Red Army's entry into Afghanistan, that was an event of a contradictory nature, both being a requirement of proletarian internationalism and being based on a grave injustice.

In this work we will attempt to help illuminate the important lessons referred to by comrade Yürükoğlu by taking a closer look at the questions posed above.



# I. Brief background information on Afghanistan

In order to arrive at a better understanding of our topic let us now take a brief look at the history and the socio-economic structure of Afghanistan, one of the world's twenty most backward countries.

## 1. A brief history of the country

Afghanistan is a very old country with a deep-rooted history. It is one of the countries where feudalism survived the longest.

The British occupied Afghanistan for the first time in 1838, when it was a feudal emirate. The Afghan people smashed this occupation. However, Afghanistan held an important position for British imperialism from the point of view of both Tsarist Russia and India. Therefore, the British reoccupied the country between 1878-1880. The people fought against this occupation as well but, as a consequence of a treaty signed between the occupying forces and Emir Yakup Khan, the country became a de facto British colony and remained so for 40 years.

At the beginning of the 20th century, a movement called the Afghan Brotherhood, similar to the Young Turks, started in

Afghanistan. This movement, which also included some Turkish intellectuals, demanded constitutional government and independence. As the movement gained strength with the effects of the 1905 revolution, British imperialism strove to suppress it. On the other hand, German imperialism and the Ottomans supported it against the British.

The victory of the Great October Revolution, as everywhere else throughout the world, had a revolutionising effect on the Afghan people. When the leading members of the Afghan Brotherhood were arrested in 1919, an armed uprising broke out in Afghanistan. Members of the Afghan Brotherhood were released from prison, independence was secured and Emir Amanullah Khan, who took sides with the Afghan Brotherhood, was brought to power.

The bourgeois-democratic reforms of Amanullah Khan, imposed from above, aggravated class contradictions in the country and angered the feudal lords. With the support of British imperialism, reactionaries once again seized power as the result of an uprising in 1929 and the Nadir family took power.

The Nadir family was the representative of the feudal lords. Nevertheless, in order to be able to keep pace with the 20th century, and to avoid a revolutionary outburst, it had to take certain steps towards a bourgeois monarchy. Under the revolutionary impact of the great victory won by the Soviet Union against fascism in the Second World War, Afghanistan saw a period of reforms which lasted from 1946 until 1952. Political parties were formed, elections were held (under the condition that the king had the final say), and a certain degree of press freedom was granted. However, as the logic of these reforms started to bring about changes unforeseen by reaction, 'Mad Daoud', who came to power in 1953, took back many of the reforms and attempted to turn back the clock.

Between 1953-1963, Afghanistan once again experienced a period of severe repression. However, in the meantime, capitalism was developing and intensifying the bourgeois-democratic potential in society. In accordance also with changes in the international arena, this potential began to assert itself

forcefully in the 1960's. In this situation, the monarchy was once again obliged to grant certain reforms. In 1964, some limited liberties were recognised and an electoral system, etc., was adopted.

These limited rights, which were granted as a result of the social pressures mentioned above, at the same time brought about an upsurge of social activity. In 1965, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) was founded. Between 1964-1973, worker, peasant and student movements were born.

The year that the PDPA was founded it participated in the elections and gained 4 seats in the parliament. The party organised a mass demonstration to observe opening of parliament. However, the government banned this and three demonstrators were killed when government forces fired on the demonstrators. This event had a profound impact and became known in the history of the revolutionary struggle as the 'Three Scorpions' (named after the old calendar) demonstrations. There were subsequent demonstrations on the same day every year, attended by thousands, and many more were martyred. For example, during the 'Three Scorpions' demonstrations in 1970, the young party member Abdur Rahman was murdered by reactionaries.

After 1965 there was a clear upsurge in the mass movement. There were student boycotts, workers' strikes, strikes at the Afghan Airlines, resistance by mining and electrical engineers, and the Paghman peasant movements. In these years, many were killed, hundreds wounded and thousands arrested. There was widespread discontent in the army. The rulers were in a panic. In Afghanistan, where technology is not widespread at all, spies with small cassette recorders and microphones were all over the place. Bribery and corruption were rife. Rumour had it that the royal family was spending foreign aid on itself.

In the years 1946-1953, Afghanistan had seen some activity in the political sphere. However, this was mostly on an intellectual level and in the form of the defence of certain bourgeois views by liberal methods. Whereas what was observed

after 1965 was altogether different; it was a deep-rooted movement, embracing vast masses of people.

It is quite clear that a revolutionary situation began in Afghanistan in the years 1965-1973. The founding of the PDPA was in itself an indicator of social pressures in the country before the revolutionary situation. The coup led by Daoud in 1973 was also a direct consequence of the revolutionary situation. The inability of the rulers to rule, discontent among the masses, restlessness within the army, attempts by the ruling circles to suppress the mass movement and head off a social explosion, all these found expression in the coup of 1973.

Daoud was a close relative of the king. The monarch was overthrown but replaced by a constitutional monarchy. The essence of the coup was to avoid a revolution, and to open the way for the development of capitalism in an evolutionary way. Within this framework, Daoud came forward with many promises. He even promised socialism! But these promises did not and could not go any further than being mere demagoguery.

Promises such as the distribution of land, etc., could have been fulfilled only by revolutionary means, through the active participation of the masses. But the point of departure of the coup was to delude the masses, to prevent revolution, and to guarantee evolutionary capitalist development within limits agreed upon by the alliance of the bourgeoisie and landowners. The coup reflected the fact that, in order for these to be accomplished, there had been a change in the balance of forces in this alliance. No revolutionary initiatives could possibly be expected from this coup.

Daoud's coup was unable to satisfy the people's demands by mere demagoguery. On the contrary, as the promises failed to be realised, the contradictions within society deepened still further. The coup d'état government was sharply split in two within a year. One section united with notoriously reactionary forces to form a front against the other. As the bankruptcy of the government became more apparent, repression increased. Between the years 1973-1977, more than 100 members of the PDPA were arrested. Censorship of the press and prohibitions of

strikes became more frequent. Scores of progressives and revolutionaries were gunned down.

After Daoud's coup the mass movements had slowed down for a while. As the real character of the coup d'etat government became clearer, a tendency towards a far more powerful explosion was born. But this time too there were attempts to halt it by means of bans and the like. For example, when the workers at the Prefabricated House Factory went on strike, this was banned as an "activity against the existing order". In the same period, many peasant, student and teachers' movements were suppressed in a sanguinary manner.

The increasing demand for action among the masses was reaching such dimensions that it could not be stopped by bans. In the army too, the mood was changing even among those sections which supported Daoud's coup.

At this time, the party member and trade union leader, Ahbar Hayber, was murdered. His funeral turned into a huge mass demonstration. Thousands of people poured into the streets. The demonstration was marked by speeches by leading members of the PDPA. Due to these speeches, the decision was taken to arrest 6 PDPA leaders, including Tarakki, Amin and Karmal. The government lived in fear. Tarakki was arrested on 25th April 1978. Immediately afterwards, Amin was arrested. There existed a strong party organisation within the army under the direction of Amin. Before being taken to prison, Amin issued an order to this party organisation. The next morning, on 27th April, the insurrection began. After 10 hours of fighting, the revolution ended in victory.

In order to arrive at a better understanding of this revolution, let us now take a brief look at the socio-economic structure of Afghanistan, the situation of the various classes, and the position of the army.

## 2. The socio-economic structure of Afghanistan

Afghanistan is a country which usually occupies a bottom place

in various international statistics. It is one of the poorest countries in the world. This is closely linked with its socio-economic structure.

The first factory in Afghanistan was an arms factory built in Kabul in 1886. For a long time, this was the only factory in the country. That is, the setting up of the first factory was not in fact the beginning of a continuous process of industrialisation.

After the insurrection of 1919, King Amanullah's bourgeois-democratic reforms did not immediately accelerate capitalist development as they were carried out by a feudal establishment. The seizure of power once again by the reactionaries in 1929 and the consequent abolition of the few superstructural reforms that had been made, prolonged the life of the old relations of production and slowed down the development of capitalist forces of production.

For a long time, the feudal lords formed the main part of the class structure of small producer-artisans and broad peasant masses. The first bourgeois ideas emerged, not from any class base in the country, but from bourgeois intellectuals under the intellectual influence of world capitalism.

In order to be able to keep pace with the times, the monarchy made certain economic investments via direct intervention by the state. In 1930 the National Bank, and in 1936 the Cotton Company were founded. They too were instrumental in the gradual development of a bourgeois class.

After 1946, the 'interest' of imperialism in Afghanistan increased. Various contracts were signed with the Morrison Company in such fields as irrigation networks, mining research, road and canal construction, etc. Afghanistan had such a backward infrastructure that, in order to be able to render investments profitable, and to extend the market, imperialism laid its hands on these fields first. At the same time, with Marshall 'aid', imperialism paid due regard to capitalist development in agriculture through the evolution of the feudal landowners, and thus to precautions against any revolutionary outburst as well.

After the Second World War, the comprador commercial

bourgeoisie gained strength in Afghanistan. A tiny industrial bourgeoisie was formed. The overwhelming majority of small producer-artisans moved in the direction of becoming the middle strata of capitalism. At the same time, with the opening of every workplace, be it public or private, domestic or foreign, the working class developed.

Prior to 1960, the main industries of Afghanistan were the textile, sugar and shoe industries, and yet they were able to meet only 15% of domestic demand. There was only one factory in the metallurgy sector. In 1953, the total number of workers in the construction industry, transport and mining was about 15,000.

After 1960, the development of capitalism in Afghanistan accelerated. There was also a rapid change in the class structure of the country. But still, as the 1970's began, Afghanistan was a country in which capitalist relations of production had not yet become dominant.

Out of a population of 17 million, 3 million were living as nomads raising their own livestock. Nearly half the land was held by feudal landowners who made up 5% of the population. 36% of the entire rural population was made up of landless peasants who were subject to compulsory labour, rent-in-kind, etc.

Seventy-five per cent of the working population was engaged in agriculture. Agriculture was the country's main sector of production, but it was very backward. The backwardness of the technical level of agriculture is reflected in the determining role played by weather conditions. For example, the drought of 1970-1972 created a great food shortage and famine. The production of wheat and cotton declined. There was also a drop of millions in the number of livestock.

That part of the economy which was called modern industry was developing quickly. Still, the total number of workers before the revolution did not exceed 90,000. On the other hand, 300,000 people were working in small-scale industry which still contained remnants of guild traditions. For example, the tradition of apprenticeship and masters was still alive. Anyone wanting to open a business in the field of copperworks or shoemaking, had to give a feast for all his colleagues and obtain permission from

the elders of that profession in order to be approved by the town council.<sup>2</sup>

This backward structure could be observed at every level. 90% of the population was illiterate. Traditions such as bride-money and marriage to four women were still living social phenomena. There were only 1027 doctors and 71 hospitals with a total of 3600 beds in the whole country and a total of 3371 primary schools, 139 secondary schools and 199 high schools.

In short, Afghanistan was really a very backward, dependent country where capitalist production relations, closely bound up with widespread feudal forms, were newly developing in the direction of becoming the dominant mode of production. In agriculture, the development of capitalism was a process which followed a very slow evolutionary path, and which had still advanced very little even from the point of view of the feudal landowners becoming capitalist. The class differentiation of capitalism was at a very backward level among the vast peasant masses. The traditions of the guilds were still alive among small producers in the towns.

As capitalist production forces developed, however slowly, they aggravated the contradictions in society and, with ever growing force, imposed the necessity of a democratic revolution which would sweep away the obstructions in their way. The unrest which started in the 1960's was a consequence of this.

As for the position of the classes in the revolution that was to come, in our epoch, one in which the working class is at the centre, a working class, however, small, was born in Afghanistan. Because of its fear of the epoch and of its representative in Afghanistan, the bourgeoisie had long abandoned any revolutionary tradition. The development of the bourgeoisie had at any rate been realised under the wing of the landowners and of their state, which was taking steps towards becoming bourgeois. Due to its fear of revolution, the bourgeoisie never broke this alliance. However, in time the balance of forces within this alliance changed.

In spite of its small size, the working class was the



revolutionary vanguard of Afghan society. The peasantry was also a revolutionary force. Peasant insurrections in certain regions demonstrated this in practice. However, due to its generally scattered and unorganised nature, the discontent and revolutionary potential of the peasantry was reflected in its most organised fashion within the army.

As the state was not an established, experienced bourgeois state, the army too had a contradictory character, different from that of its counterparts in many capitalist countries. The state was becoming a bourgeois state to the extent that the feudal landowners were becoming bourgeois and the bourgeoisie gained in strength, in a process which unfolded according to the balance of forces within the alliance of feudal landowners and bourgeoisie. This situation imparted to the army a contradictory character which was concretely reflected in the coup of 1973.

It had become imperative to clear the way for capitalism in the society. This necessity reflected itself in two ways. One was the demand for democratic revolution, a demand which emanated from the peasant masses. The other, chosen by the bourgeoisie, was evolutionary development in alliance with the feudal landowners. The army embodied contradictions which stemmed both from the fact that the state was not in any one set of hands and also from the contradiction between the evolutionary and revolutionary ways of becoming bourgeois.

Thus the revolutionary potential of the peasantry was reflected even among the officer ranks in a manner which could never be met with in the army of an established capitalist country. What the PDPA did was to develop this revolutionary potential reflected in the army through intensive ideological education and to direct it towards the position of the working class. With this ideological education it led the revolutionary democratic officers and soldiers to adopt more consistent revolutionary positions.

Afghanistan set out from the demand for a democratic revolution which would clear the way for capitalist development but went on to a revolution which could lead the country to socialism. The creative revolutionary approach of the *Khalq*

wing, which may be regarded as the only representative of the PDPA, played a vital role in this.

## II. The April Revolution

The April Revolution was a very important event in several respects. The reason for this has to do with the exemplary initiative and creativity shown by the PDPA.

While the question of whether or not this was a coup or a revolution is being discussed in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectual circles, the revolutionary impact of the April Revolution had a share, for example, in the revolution in Iran.

Now let us look at the April Revolution in connection with the history of the PDPA and touch upon the question of coup or revolution.

### 1. The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the April Revolution

The PDPA was founded in 1965, under the leadership of Tarakki. On its founding, it was announced that the party was "the party of the working class armed with the ideology of the working class". However, any party founded as the party of the working class in a country like Afghanistan could not be expected to be a fully working class party, without a struggle and

splits among various tendencies showing themselves almost immediately. And, in fact, such was the case in a very short time.

In 1966 began the publication of the party weekly, *Khalq (The People)*. Babrak Karmal opposed its views and began to organise an anti-party faction. The *Khalq* was banned with its 6th issue. In contrast, the Babrak Karmal group started to publish a legal organ, called *Parcham (Flag)*. In this organ, even worse than bourgeois tailism, this group defended some of the reforms which had been put into effect by the monarchy in 1964. (Reforms which are implemented by reactionary establishments or forces, and which provide social process via the evolutionary path of reaction, can absolutely not be supported.) It attacked the revolutionary trend in its legal organ which was permitted by the monarchy. For this reason, Amin used the expression "aristocratic kids" for the *Parcham* group.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, in 1967, the party split along two main lines: one revolutionary and one reformist. The revolutionary wing passed into party history as the *Khalq*, the reformist as the *Parcham*. The people's revolution in Afghanistan was a *popular* revolution which also confirmed in practice the revolutionary character of the *Khalq*.

Following the split in 1967, the coup in 1973 rendered the differences between the two lines even clearer, and became a turning point in the development of both.

After Daoud's coup, the *Parcham* group directly supported the government. As different views emerged within the government, the *Parcham* became the tail of the right wing of the government. In the face of the left-sounding promises of the government, the *Khalq* came forward initially with the proposal for a united front. When the government failed to keep its promises, it drew the necessary lessons. Realising that, due to its very nature, this government would not be able to keep its promises, it took a stand against the government. The *Khalq* argued that the republic declared by Daoud was "royal property", that this government represented the bourgeois-aristocratic partnership and would be incapable of giving anything at all to the masses, that the country's problems could be solved only by a radical revolution, and that this was

what the government feared most. As the true face of the government began to appear before the masses, the *Khalq* became stronger.

Daoud's coup caused the *Khalq* line to develop. The inclusion of spokesmen of the "national" bourgeoisie in the government showed the *Khalq* the true nature of the national bourgeoisie. Panjehri, who was most likely among the comrades shot together with Amin, counted among the lessons of the coup the fact that the national bourgeoisie can only support half-baked reforms.<sup>4</sup> He points out that, in general, the national bourgeoisie "is terribly frightened of the complete democratisation of the social and political system and of radical revolutionary changes in the society."<sup>5</sup> He also states that the party cadres were warned not to forget the lessons of experiences such as those in the Sudan, in Egypt and India.

In a country like Afghanistan the main element in the revolutionary development of any movement is not to fall into the error of placing hope in the "national" bourgeoisie. The *Khalq* wing of the PDPA was initially about to fall into this error, but exactly at the right time drew the necessary lessons from life, and, by doing so, opened the way for its full-scale revolutionary development. Henceforth it moved forward without confining its tactics to attempts to win over or "advance" the "national" bourgeoisie. This stance in turn served to develop the line itself.

Another lesson drawn by the *Khalq* wing of the PDPA from the coup was the special importance, in a backward country like Afghanistan, of working in the army. In doing this, the *Khalq* wing did not reject the general principles of Marxism in regard to the army. These general principles were stated, as was their correctness, but it was emphasised that, in Afghanistan, these principles would be put into practice in a somewhat different order.

In general, as the class struggle develops, the army is used as a means of suppressing the revolutionary forces; but as the class struggle develops further, it inevitably splits the army. Party work within the army is always necessary. Taking the social structure of Afghanistan into consideration, these general

principles were put into practice, with emphasis right from the beginning on the party's work within the army. But the task of smashing the state apparatus was not rejected. Speaking of general principles, Amin said the following in a speech he delivered after the revolution:

“The first and most fundamental proletarian revolutionary task... is to smash the old state apparatus and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat.”<sup>6</sup>

After the 1973 coup, Tarakki gave Amin the task of work in the army. Under the command of Amin, intensive ideological education was started within the main body of the army. At the same time, the *Khalq* wing carried out practices of its own during official military manoeuvres. Amin used to see Tarakki once a week and gave reports twice a year. In 1976, Amin reported that a reliable, *Khalq* section in the army was ready.

In 1977, Daoud became very frightened of the development of the PDPA along the path of its *Khalq* wing. Comparing the two wings, the *Khalq* and the *Parcham*, he said that the former was dangerous. It soon became clear that he would take action if there was no reconciliation. Consequently, on the initiative of Tarakki, the *Khalq* and *Parcham* were united and given equal rights in the leadership irrespective of the difference in strength. All the party organisations followed suit. The situation in the army, however, did not change.

In the book introducing the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, it is said that rumours that a similar unification in the army was prevented by Amin are groundless, and that it was Tarakki who gave the order not to unite.<sup>7</sup> But in a debate that soldiers belonging to the party had with Tarakki, they asked questions which showed that they were against uniting with the opportunist *Parcham* wing, not only in the army, but also in general. From this it becomes clear that the *Khalq* organisation under Amin's leadership within the army was generally against uniting with the opportunists. In these circumstances, Tarakki,

who was a skilled politician, may have given an order against unification within the army, but the real source of the whole idea was Amin. It seems that, while Amin was against "unity" with the opportunists in general, he was able to prevent this "unity" only within the army, and by doing so, ensured the revolution to come.

If the party units within the army had united, revolution would have been dropped from the agenda. Soldiers belonging to the *Parcham* wing were being educated in how to defend Daoud, while those belonging to the *Khalq* wing were being educated in how to overthrow him. Unification would have meant obscuring the aim of revolution.

Amin continued to educate the *Khalq* organisation in the army as before even after the unification in the party. The situation in the country was becoming tense. As activity among the masses increased, and as the PDPA stretched out to townships, villages and nomads' tents, the repressive nature of the Daoud regime was becoming clearer. The revolutionary situation was maturing. In accordance with this, Amin began to turn education in the army into practical planning.

In the January 1979 issue of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, Comrade Zeray from the PDPA describes the situation in the pre-revolution period as follows:

"The masses were ready to revolt. Living conditions were rapidly deteriorating... More than one million Afghans emigrated to Iran alone. The legitimacy of the official authorities had been greatly shaken in the eyes of the people... orders were not being followed... A most significant fact is that we have worked actively among the people for 13-14 years, we have led the popular movement. Before the revolution our party was a significant force with 50,000 members and close sympathisers and this frightened the regime."

It was obvious that the leadership of the PDPA would soon

be arrested. Tarakki and Amin decided that, in the event of such an arrest, party members and sympathisers within the army should immediately launch an insurrection. Amin saw to it that various plans devised for this purpose were rehearsed 10 times. These drills were skillfully concealed under the cover of general military manoeuvres. Among soldiers and officers belonging to the party, a list was prepared of those who would be commanders during the insurrection. The party's military chain of command was determined.

At midnight on 25th April 1978, Tarakki and Karmal were arrested by police. Amin was also taken under house arrest the same night and, having learned about the arrest of Tarakki, issued the order for the insurrection through his child. The insurrection began on the morning of 27th April, exactly one day after the morning Amin had been taken to prison.

On 26th April, party members working at the State radio secured the announcement of the arrests. Tarakki was a leader known to vast masses. Amin too, was known both in the country at large and in the army. The arrests created a storm. The *Khalq* members within the army launched the insurrection with insurmountable energy.

The insurrection started at 9 o'clock in the morning. The commanders appointed by the party went into action in all units. Anti-aircraft missiles put the pro-Daoud 7th and 8th divisions of the airforce out of action. Pilot members of the party attacked appointed targets with their aircraft. Tanks surrounded the military air-base. The greatest resistance came from the commando units and the palace guard. There were bloody clashes. At about 5.30 in the evening, Daoud's Palace and the State Radio House were under control. Meanwhile Tarakki, Karmal and Amin were released from prison. During the battles which continued into the evening, Daoud was killed by soldiers belonging to the *Khalq* wing as he opened fire against them.

By 7 o'clock the insurrection was successful. Tarakki, Amin, and one of the "equal rights" leaders of the PDPA, Babrak Karmal, were at the State Radio House. In those moments, historic events encompassing the experience of twenty years



took place.<sup>8</sup>

Amin wanted Tarakki to read the message announcing the victory of the revolution. Karmal objected to this. Amin was holding his revolver. Tarakki managed to calm down the situation, and he proposed that one of the officers from the *Khalq* wing who was present should read the message.

While Amin, Tarakki and Karmal were seated, many young soldiers from the *Khalq* wing returned from the fighting. They started to relate with great enthusiasm how they had fought. They told how they had had to deal with the soldiers belonging to the *Parcham* wing as much as they had with Daoud's soldiers. In the meantime, one of the questions that they showered on Tarakki was why a person like Babrak Karmal was in the ranks of the leadership. Tarakki calmed down the soldiers and told them to keep quiet for the sake of party unity.

At that moment, Babrak Karmal was in a state of panic. He advanced the view that they would be arrested, and that the party's leaders should go into hiding in the villages. Tarakki rejected this but, on the insistence of Karmal, agreed to go with him to a secure airbase. Karmal wanted Amin to come too, but Tarakki told him that Amin had work to do.

Tarakki and Karmal went to the airbase. They were surrounded by many young soldiers who had participated in the fighting that day.

During the discussion, Karmal said that Daoud should not have been killed. He started to defend Daoud. The young soldiers were about to kill Karmal, but Tarakki managed to calm them down as well.

These events reveal a number of facts. They confirm that the backbone of the revolutionary trend within the party was Amin. They show that Tarakki's revolutionarism had a petty-bourgeois, intellectual essence, and this was reflected at the most critical moments as reconciliationism. As for Karmal, they clearly reveal that he is a downright opportunist, who was able to insinuate himself back into the party due to Tarakki's 'softness'. Another lesson to be drawn is that unprincipled party unity bears counter-revolution within itself.

## 2. The April Revolution was not a coup

As we mentioned above, one of the discussions to which the revolution in Afghanistan gave rise is that as to whether it constituted a coup or a revolution. For example, in Turkey *Revolutionary Path, Liberation and Accumulation (Dev Yol, Kurtuluş and Birikim)* all say that it was a coup. Those who call it a coup put forward such views as that the revolution was effected through an uprising in the army, that a section of the counter-revolutionary Muslim guerillas had found a base among the peasantry, and that the revolution was announced to the country over the radio.

Let us too touch briefly upon the question of coup or revolution.

While explaining the term "putsch", which is the exact equivalent in German of the word coup, Lenin said the following:

"The term 'putsch', in its scientific sense, may be employed only when the attempt at insurrection has revealed nothing but a circle of conspirators or stupid maniacs, and has aroused no sympathy among the masses."<sup>9</sup>

This explanation generalises efforts to seize power through a plot isolated from the masses under the concept of putsch.

The concept of *coup d'état* or "blow against the state" is also included in Lenin's generalisation. A *coup d'état* also involves a plot isolated from the masses, but here it originates from within the state itself, e.g., military coup, palace coup, etc.

While talking about the *coup d'états* of Bonaparte and Bismarck, Engels said:

"In politics there are only two determining forces, the organised force of the state, the army, and the disorganised natural force of the popular masses."<sup>10</sup>

In connection with the coups of Bonaparte and Bismarck, we see that Engels' explanation reflects the understanding that a coup rests on a certain support within the state, not on the masses, and that it has the character of a plot isolated from the masses.

When we look at history we see that in general this type of coup reflects a struggle for power within the ruling class which controls the state. The decisive factor in such a struggle is the balance of forces within the state mechanism. The consequences of the coup for the country as a whole can vary according to the particular situation within which the country finds itself.

Again, when we look at history, we also see revolutions which have the *appearance* of coups. However, the only way in which revolutionary views which take the side of the oppressed classes, and defend radical changes that can be implemented through broad mass participation, can gain strength within the old state apparatus is as a reflection within the state of the mood and revolutionary potential of the masses. Revolutionary views cannot gain strength within the old state apparatus in isolation from the masses and then, resting on this strength, carry out a coup "in isolation from the masses." For this reason, *revolutionary* coups are either the unsuccessful and easily crushed attempt of a small group, or a revolution which, even if in form it resembles a military coup, for example, has in reality created a genuinely organised vanguard from the petty-bourgeois revolutionary military cadres in the army. In history, such examples have led the potential which they themselves objectively represent to explode the day after the coup by bringing the masses out onto the streets. Just as in Iran the revolution found its subjective factor in the mullahs, it may also find it among revolutionary officers in the army. In such cases, the seizure of power appears in form as a coup, but in essence it is a revolution under the leadership of petty-bourgeois military cadres. (The future of a revolution led by petty-bourgeois revolutionaries is another question.)

If we look at the events in Afghanistan from this point of view, again it is a revolution. Nevertheless, the Afghanistan

revolution was not this type of revolution. We will return to this below. What we want to emphasize here is that if, without looking at the essence of the matter, we call every revolution which appears to be a military one a coup, and if we then label it to be “isolated from the masses” because counter-revolutionary attempts have intensified — as they would naturally be expected to do — we would be in a situation where “the finger points at the moon while the fools are looking at the finger”. This logic would lead to calling the October Revolution a coup.

In Russia as well, soldiers made up an important section of the striking force. Clashes were brief and power was seized with relatively few losses. What did last for a long time were the sharp and bloody clashes throughout the civil war. And in the civil war certain backward sections of the people took the side of counter-revolution. Was the October Revolution a “coup”?

Before the October Revolution, Lenin said that if, in a peasant country, matters have come to a peasant uprising, it is sufficient even if there are no other symptoms of a nationwide crisis. Then he enumerates the other symptoms as well, referring to a heating up of the national question, the situation in the army and “the mood of the whole nation”.<sup>11</sup>

Lenin enumerated the following as the guarantee of the Bolsheviks’ success in an uprising: 1. We can launch a surprise attack from three points; 2. We have slogans that guarantee us support among the peasants; 3. We have a majority in the country; 4. The disorganisation among the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries is complete; 5. We are technically in a position to take power in Moscow; 6. We have thousands of armed workers and soldiers in Petrograd who could at once seize the Winter Palace, the General Staff building, the telephone exchange and the large printing presses.<sup>12</sup>

After enumerating these conditions for an uprising, Lenin said that, given these conditions, it would be treachery not to treat insurrection as an art.<sup>13</sup>

Let us now return to Afghanistan in the light of these

comments of Lenin. We have mentioned the existence of a revolutionary situation in the country. The situation prior to the April Revolution was developing in the direction of a nationwide crisis.

Firstly, the stirrings of a peasant uprising were felt in the rural areas just as in 1970-72. In 1978 *The Times* wrote as follows: The acute food shortage led to widescale discontent and dissatisfaction in the first months of this year.<sup>14</sup>

Then the murder of Akhbar Hayber, one of the leaders of the PDPA, on 17th April 1978 sparked off broad reaction, including a 50,000-strong funeral march as well as other demonstrations.

Impatience with the Daoud regime had been mounting within the army for a long time. Daoud's increasing number of prohibitions were creating widespread resentment among the people. The problem of national minorities in Afghanistan was becoming acute and was giving rise to sharp contradictions, both among the various states in the region and within the government itself.

The conditions for an uprising were maturing. It was not for nothing that the order for the uprising was connected with the arrest of the PDPA leaders. It is very obvious that this was to serve as the "turning point" mentioned by Lenin. And so it was.

Using criteria similar to those Lenin cited for Russia we may say that the PDPA had: 1. slogans which guaranteed the support of the discontented peasants; 2. from the social-psychological point of view, a majority in the country (and this is what Lenin was referring to when he spoke of a majority in regard to Russia); 3. a situation which made it difficult for even luke-warm friends to support Daoud and in which a clear injustice had been perpetrated; 4. the possibility of a surprise attack; 5. technical ability and thousands of armed soldiers which would enable the seizure of various centres. More factors could be enumerated.

Once the conditions for an uprising have appeared, the rest is a matter of art. This is one point on which the question of coup or revolution has been confused. In regard to the art aspect of the

uprising, the *Khalq* organisation and its sympathisers within the army were chosen as the striking force. Lenin said: "The exploiters can be defeated at one stroke in the event of a successful uprising at the centre, or of a revolt in the army."<sup>15</sup>

By succeeding in carrying out a revolution, the PDPA succeeded in passing a test.

It drew up a definite policy taking into account the mood of the masses, the position of its enemies and luke-warm friends, etc. The *revolutionary army* which it formed within the army was loyal to this policy. In this respect, the revolution in Afghanistan was not a revolutionary explosion of a type which created its subjective factor in revolutionary soldiers within the army. The revolutionaries in the army did not fill a vacuum in the political sphere; rather they formed a revolutionary army under the political leadership of the PDPA, they performed a military function.

When the revolution was announced over the radio hundreds of thousands of people poured into the streets all over Afghanistan. The Trotskyists have siezed on this notwithstanding the fact that, although the Bolsheviks too were in the majority before the October Revolution, the overwhelming majority of the population of Russia learned of the revolution via the telegraph or over the radio where there was one! This is something related to the art aspect of the matter. To understand revolution as something in which the absolute majority of the people, organised in regular armies, strikes as one, would be nothing but the other side of a parliamentarist understanding replacing the number of votes by a head count.

Immediately following the revolution, a Revolutionary Council in which the PDPA was in the majority was formed. It took revolutionary decisions on vital topics, decisions which further increased the revolutionary enthusiasm of the masses. This enthusiasm is reflected in photographs taken after the revolution. Thousands of working people on horses and on foot, with red banners in their hands, poured into the streets ... These photographs document the treachery of calling what was a revolution, a 'coup'.

Coming to the operations of counter-revolutionary forces after the revolution, to expect anything else would again reflect a bourgeois parliamentarist understanding or the same understanding turned inside out.



Lenin ridiculed those who find a revolution complicated:

“Even if a revolution has started in a situation that seemed to be not very complicated, the development of the revolution itself *always* creates an *exceptionally* complicated situation. ... Revolution is a most intense, furious, desperate class struggle and civil war. Not a single great revolution in history has taken place without civil war.”<sup>18</sup>

Again, Lenin said that the most stubborn resistance on the part of the exploiters after a revolution is a “law”. He stressed that, when overthrown, their efforts would increase manyfold,

that they would strive to bring back the old, and that in these strivings they would inevitably win over certain unreliable elements.<sup>19</sup>

Those who look at counter-revolutionary operations in Afghanistan and at the fact that some backward sections of the people have participated as well, and take this as a reason to speak of a "coup" are in fact deluding themselves with a vision of revolution that is to be as smooth and clear-cut as a coup.



### III. Developments in the post-revolutionary period

We have looked briefly at the question of coup-revolution. Let us emphasize immediately, however, that the real difference of views as regards the Afghanistan revolution is not between those who call it a coup and those who call it a revolution. There is a close similarity in understanding between those who call it a coup and a certain section of those who call it a revolution. The real difference emerges in the understanding of revolution.

A section of those who call it a revolution, as well as those who call it a coup, have, in fact, the same opportunist understanding of revolution.

Those who talk of a coup are mostly those looking at the situation from the outside. The opportunist understanding which seems to talk of a revolution, however, had a strangling effect from within.

This view continuously tried to push the revolution onto a reformist course. We shall consider the developments in the period following the revolution from this point of view.

## 1. Opportunism did great harm to the revolution in Afghanistan

Every revolution also creates a strong counter-revolutionary reaction. The exploiting classes do not donate either their political power or their property to the revolution! A fact observed in Afghanistan is that the counter-revolution turned out to be stronger than expected. Now this is either blamed on "sectarianism", "the raging terror of Amin", etc., or is considered non-existent. In fact, the source of this extra strength gained by the counter-revolution is opportunism.

Before the revolution, "equal rights unity" (!) was established between the *Khalq* and *Parcham* wings of the PDPA. This "unity" was reflected also in the Revolutionary Council set up after the revolution and in which the party was in the majority. Tarakki became the president, Babrak Karmal his deputy and minister of state. Amin was given the posts of minister of state and of foreign affairs.

This structure, which for the sake of party "unity", appeared in the administration of both the party and the state had very harmful consequences from the point of view of the revolution. There are many examples of this, but the crucial example is that of agriculture.

After the revolution, on 9th May, Tarakki read on the radio a 30-point programme regarding the fundamental tasks of the revolution. Two points of this programme consisted of a general formulation of the radical changes to be brought about in agriculture in favour of the working peasants. It was received with great enthusiasm among the peasant masses.

On 12th July, the Revolutionary Council adopted Decree No. 6, which was the first decree regarding the peasants. With this decree some measures were taken in connection with the peasants' debts, interest payments, etc. Once again, it was enthusiastically welcomed by the peasants. However, from the point of view of the expectations created by the general promises in the programme of the revolution, Decree No.6 did not amount to much; it was not enough.

Decree No. 6 was not enough for the peasants, but during its implementation *Parcham* supporters created such a furor about "sectarianism" that it was sufficient to keep *Khalq* members very busy. Following the decision, the *Parcham* became paranoid about being "isolated from the people". At this time Babrak Karmal and two leading opportunists were sent as ambassadors to socialist countries, the United Nations, etc. Otherwise, the Revolutionary Council would not have been able to deal with the work of the revolution!

Still, Karmal and the *Parcham* members did not remain idle. With assertions of "isolation from the people", they organised an attempted coup on 20th August. The conspirators were caught and their *handwritten* statements were published in both the Afghan and foreign press. <sup>20</sup>

As the role played by Karmal in the attempted coup became evident, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan recalled those who had been sent abroad as ambassadors and stripped them of their ambassadorial status. But they did not come. Four persons in responsible positions on the Revolutionary Council or in the party were arrested in connection with the attempted coup.

The Political Bureau of the PDPA could vote on the draft resolution regarding the distribution of land only on 19th November, during the period of calm that emerged after these arrests. On 28th November, a Plenum of the PDPA was convened and Babrak Karmal, together with six leading opportunists, was expelled from the party. On 30th November the Revolutionary Council published Decree No. 8, which was the truly important resolution on land. According to it, holdings larger than a certain size would be confiscated and be distributed to poor peasants and nomads. <sup>21</sup>

The eight months' delay, from April to November, in passing this decree, meant the possibility of vacillation among the vast peasant masses, and in practice, leaving them exposed to the propaganda of the counter-revolution. And so it was. Afterwards, as the decree was implemented, the landowners whose land was confiscated, rich clergy and others, naturally intensified their counter-revolutionary activities. In 1979, the

counter-revolution became more aggressive and, taking advantage of the vacillation created by that 8 months' delay, to a certain extent managed to find support among the peasants.

Nevertheless, the implementation of this decree was an important step. The sooner the decree was implemented, the sooner would the vacillation that had appeared among the peasants be eradicated. However, this time it was the vacillations of Tarakki which came to the fore. For example, in June 1979 the fact that Tarakki was in favour of slowing down the implementation of the land decree even started to appear in the press.<sup>22</sup>

Actually, it is not necessary to find evidence in order to understand that this was the case. Above we have given examples which show that at the most critical moment the conciliatory tendencies of Tarakki became more insistent. This is an instance of the same examples at a higher level. Faced with the conflict between revolution and counter-revolution on the one hand, and advice such as "do not frighten them" coming from within the world communist movement on the other, Tarakki's conciliationism was natural. While this tendency met with enthusiasm (!) among the *Parcham* supporters, it also found some advocates within the *Khalq*. And, in order to be able to advance the revolution, it became necessary to deal with this wavering as well.

The conclusion to be drawn from what we have said up to now can be summarised as follows: In Afghanistan, opportunism helped counter-revolution by slowing down, delaying resolute revolutionary measures. The conciliationist trend which defended unity with opportunism for the sake of party "unity", and which became frightened and deceitful as the confrontation between revolution and counter-revolution became sharper, followed the same path one step behind.

## 2. Amin was the true leader of the revolution

By the stance that he took against party "unity" before the

revolution, and by at least preventing unity with the opportunists within the army; by his unswerving, determined leadership during the revolution; and by being the main resolute defender of full-scale revolutionary measures, Amin proved that he was the backbone, the real leader of the Afghanistan revolution.

The opportunist reasoning, which talked about the Afghanistan revolution, but by that understood a series of graduated reforms from above, helped the counter-revolution by its attempts to strangle the revolution with reforms. And, with its bankrupt reasoning, it accused Amin, who tried to block these attempts, first of "sectarianism" and then more openly of being an "agent"(!)

In fact, far from being sectarian, Amin had certain centrist shortcomings. Tarakki wore a fez and every now and then started speeches by saying "In the name of God...". Amin too paid unnecessary compliments to the Islamic religion. Tarakki said that the party was not a Marxist-Leninist party, but it adopted(?) the ideology of the working class. To those who asked about the nature of the party, Amin gave inconsistent and evasive answers in most cases. In connection with all these, he excessively praised Tarakki as the "glorious leader".

As Amin rid himself of these mistakes the difference between him and Tarakki developed correspondingly. Differences over practical revolutionary measures led to a change in emphasis in what Amin said on the topics mentioned above. For example, he gave up praising the Islamic religion, and said that religion and state are separate matters.<sup>23</sup> In reply to a question about Iran and Pakistan, he said that the ideology of the exploiters would not solve the problems of the exploited.<sup>24</sup> These and other changes in Amin were observed in 1979.

Immediately following the death of Tarakki in 1979, a slight faltering could be observed in Amin. While in some matters he adopted somewhat more correct positions, in others he seemed to persist and even go further in applying former mistaken tactics. However, in our opinion, this period should not be considered as part of Amin's normal process of development. It was a period in which Amin confronted dilemmas far beyond his

own strength. We will return to this again below. Here we will leave it aside.

If we look at the divisions within the PDPA bearing in mind the conditions in Afghanistan, these developments were to be expected in a workers' party set up in such a country. First came the split between a revolutionary and a reformist wing broadly speaking, then a split appeared in the revolutionary wing between the proletarian line and unreliable petty-bourgeois revolutionism.

Many aspects of Amin's views may be regarded as incomplete, incorrect or "could have been put better". (We have tried to present Amin's views as fully as possible in an appendix. We shall also evaluate them separately further on.) But when his views in general, and the direction of his development as well as his deeds are considered together, Amin was a Marxist-Leninist leader. In other words, with all its correct and incorrect aspects, the proletarian line within the PDPA was manifested in Amin.

Even if that were not the case, there remains one stubborn fact: From the pre-revolutionary period to the day of his murder, Amin was the backbone, the true leader of the revolution. This fact has long remained hidden behind Tarakki's shadow. But the concept of the "true leader of the revolution" depends, not on who appears to be in the lead, but on who is the main source of resolute revolutionary policy and measures. It is thus Amin who was this main source in the Afghan Saur (April) revolution.

### 3. Opportunist Coups — Tarakki and Babrak Karmal

As we have said above, in 1979 the differences between Amin and Tarakki were becoming more evident. The traditional conciliationism of Tarakki had started to exceed the level of acceptability, to block off the revolution in practice, and his image as the "glorious leader" had begun to crumble.

In August 1979, Tarakki and Amin went to the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Havana. Serious arguments are

reported to have started between the two there.<sup>25</sup> On his way home from Havana, Tarakki stopped off in Moscow. W.Pomeroy explains what happened there:

“There he (Tarakki — E.E.) met Babrak Karmal. In the course of their talks, Karmal impressed upon him the mistakes being committed by the revolutionary government under Amin’s influence. Tarakki admitted the errors and admitted that it was wrong to place such trust in Amin. He reportedly offered to dismiss Amin and bring Karmal back into the government.”<sup>26</sup>

Tarakki was killed shortly after his return to Kabul. This event was reflected in various ways. According to one view, Amin, learning of the meetings between Tarakki and Karmal, killed Tarakki by “concocting a new coup”<sup>27</sup>. According to another view, as Amin was an agent (!), he simply sent over three people to strangle Tarakki with a towel.<sup>28</sup> Yet another view claims that Tarakki called Amin to his office. There Amin and several others accompanying him were faced with an armed attack. There was a clash and a close comrade of Amin died while Tarakki was seriously wounded. Soon after, Amin surrounded the house with troops. Tarakki was taken under house arrest for two days. He died on 16th September, either of his wounds or he was killed.

There is no doubt that in the future, history will bring this event out into the open. However, *firstly*, theses or “documents” put forward by the first two views in many respects strengthen the third view. For example, in his statement one witness says that there was an armed confrontation in front of Tarakki’s office. Moreover, from what W. Pomeroy reports, one cannot help thinking that it was not Amin who wanted to kill Tarakki, but vice versa. If, as Pomeroy says, Amin could influence the revolutionary government, then he was not the type of “enemy” of which Tarakki could rid himself by a simple denunciation. In this respect, Tarakki’s agreement at the meeting in Moscow to

“expel” Amin, could be interpreted as plotting assassination in practice. *Secondly*, the coup in December and the murder of Amin shows what had in fact been planned.

On 26-27th December 1979, Babrak Karmal seized power by a coup which was, regrettably, supported physically by the Red Army. Amin and 97 of his comrades were killed.



## IV. The “new stage of the revolution”

On 27th December, people who had been sending congratulatory messages to Amin up until 26th December started to shout in chorus that he was an agent! While, before December 1979, Afghanistan had appeared in the communist press only in the context of international politics, all of a sudden there was a great furore about the “new stage of the revolution”. For example on 29th December 1979, Í.Bilen sent a message of congratulations to “esteemed comrade Babrak Karmal”.

Now let us look briefly at Babrak Karmal’s political identity and the events of the new stage, and also at what is said to have happened.

### 1. The political identity of Babrak Karmal

Babrak Karmal started a speech he made on 27th August with the words “In the name of God” and went on to curse Amin in the following terms:

“I present to you my most profound regrets and sympathy, my greatest respects and warmest

greetings because of your infinite sufferings and blood-stained tears caused by imprisonment, banishment, forced exiles, inhumane and even barbaric tortures, martyrdoms and massacre of tens of thousands of our mothers and fathers, brothers and sisters, daughters, sons and children under the direct orders of Hangman Hafizullah Amin.”<sup>29</sup>

In this speech dominated throughout by this deplorable manner, Babrak Karmal accused Amin of being a “treacherous foe of God”, a “scheming spy of American imperialism”, “traitor to party and government unity”, “despot”, “blood-thirsty” and “beast-like fascist”, of working for “dark reaction and the CIA”.<sup>30</sup>

In a speech he made on 1 January 1980, Babrak Karmal said:

“Now imperialism... due to the fall of the fascist regime of Hafizullah Amin, ... is shedding tears and mourns... Mr. Carter has called the blood-stained apparatus of Amin, that scheming exposed CIA agent as the ‘official and legitimate government’ and his person as ‘President of Afghanistan’, defending Hafizullah Amin as a loyal son of American imperialism. The situation is entirely clear.”<sup>31</sup>

It is indeed clear!

In a speech on 25th January Karmal, starting “in the name of God”, went on to say that the religion of Islam was “a valuable heritage of our people and nobody is entitled to oppose or turn away from these”. Amin and his gang, he said, “perpetrated great crimes... against our religion.”<sup>32</sup>

On 30th January, Karmal spoke as follows:

“We are grateful to God Almighty that He has helped us with sufficient precipitation this year which

will lead to abundance and consequent lower prices. ...

*"You are aware that a number of big land-owners have left various parts of the country and left their estates untilled. They have resorted to this action under the influence of demagogic propaganda by reaction and imperialism or to save their skins from the persecution, oppression and tyranny under Hafizullah Amin that operative of US imperialism and his criminal band. Likewise, a number of big land-holders were butchered by Amin and his hangmen."* (Our italics) <sup>33</sup>

These words splendidly explain why Amin was a deadly enemy of Babrak Karmal. Amin had not included the *big landowners* (!) in the "revolutionary" (!) front during the struggle against a *reaction* (?) which is devoid of them! What is more, he slaughtered them!

Babrak Karmal's hostility towards Amin is rooted in his lack of a revolutionary attitude. Lenin said:

"In the period immediately following the proletarian revolution, it is absolutely necessary, not only to confiscate the estates of the big landowners at once, but also to deport or to intern them all as leaders of counter-revolution and ruthless oppressors of the entire rural population." <sup>34</sup>

What Karmal called tyranny is this correct attitude expressed above by Lenin.

The events of December 1979 were complex indeed! It has become increasingly more difficult to distinguish between the acts of opportunism and those of counter-revolution!

## 2. What happened in the new stage?

In this new stage, the maximum amount of land that the big landowners could hold was increased from 5 hectares to 15 hectares. The flag of the Afghanistan Democratic Republic was changed from red to red-green-black. However, the *Wall Street Journal*, in its issue of 16th January 1979, had reported that the red flag was welcomed with great enthusiasm, and that in Kabul alone a 150,000-strong giant meeting had been held. By changing the red flag, including green in it, religion was virtually turned into the ideology of the state. The counter-revolutionaries in prison were released, etc.

Many guests from the world communist press took part in "ceremonies" of the release of imprisoned counter-revolutionaries. Regrettably, these comrades explained this event to the world in articles couched in such terms as "Freedom — I love you." They told how Babrak Karmal prayed in the mosque for the victims of Amin! <sup>35</sup>

All these reports are very instructive. Articles written by the guests invited from the world communist press contain contradictions and gaps on certain topics.

For example, a comrade from India wrote that it was said that Soviet troops had not been requested by Amin; as he was an agent he could not have done so. <sup>36</sup> However, in the 22nd April 1980 issue of *Soviet News*, it is stated that before December 1979 Amin and Tarakki had asked 14 times for "urgent military assistance". In the same articles it is said that Amin scared everybody away with oppression and tyranny, <sup>37</sup> but it also said that those who fled to Pakistan were counter-revolutionaries. <sup>38</sup> These are just a few examples of the contradictions.

A point which is clarified in the articles in question is the staggering idea of "sectarianism". The articles state that Amin had put the revolutionary programme into action with an unnatural speed. <sup>39</sup> The facts are there for all to see. A single resolution on the distribution of land could not be finalised for 8 months. Once the bill had been passed, its implementation could not be completed even after one year. This being the case, the

charge that Amin had acted unnaturally quickly exposes the connection between Amin's "sectarianism" and the world communist movement's shift to the right.

Other articles about the new stage of the revolution appeared in the collection *The Truth about Afghanistan*. These articles too were extremely instructive. They exposed the essence of the views about the Afghanistan revolution. Those who raised their voices to accuse Amin of being an agent turned around and reevaluated April 1978. And, in fact, they accused Amin of having overthrown the Daoud regime. This is the real source of the differences.

For example, the 11th January 1980 issue of the *New Worker*, the organ of the "New" Communist Party, accuses the *Khalq* wing of having opposed Daoud after the 1973 coup. But Daoud, it says, was "strongly pro-Soviet", and he needed support against the right. It goes on to say that Daoud shifted to the right because the *Khalq* did not give this support or listen to what the *Parcham* was saying. As for the April 1978 revolution, it is assessed as follows:

"Amin has already ordered his own Army supporters to seize power, not in support of Daoud and the 'lefts' around him but in what Amin himself is later to call the 'Great Saur Revolution'."

Such is the root of the resentment against Amin which had been building up for years. That is, while the authors of these articles were in fact demanding the continuation of the Daoud regime, and that help should be given for this purpose, a revolution took place in Afghanistan. Thanks to the "self-sacrificing efforts" of Babrak Karmal who received overt and covert support for years in the face of this "sectarian" event in December 1979 the "revolution leapt to a new stage"!

### 3. Is it the April Revolution or the October Revolution which is in question?

Another example of the mentality which found the revolution "sectarian" is another article which appeared in the *New Worker*. On 25th April 1980 the *New Worker* published a summary of an article written by a Soviet comrade. However, the article was "summarised" in such a way that it both to a certain extent distorted the views of its author and also quite blatantly exposed the mentality of those making the summary. We will present this example with a view to demonstrating this mentality.

The article written by Alexander Bovin and published in the 22nd April 1980 issue of *Soviet News* said that, " 'War communism' in the Soviet Union and China's 'Great Leap', for all their differences, have a similar psychological basis." The article continues as follows: "Psychologically understandable impatience and lack of experience led to the scope and rate of reforms going beyond what was possible. It is a mistake to erase an age-old way of life by force and in a few weeks or so and to disregard national, nomadic and religious traditions." After that, a few paragraphs follow and then, under a new sub-heading, there comes this sentence: "Leftist extremists divorced part of the masses of peasants from the new line and pushed them into the arms of the feudal lords". (We do not agree with some of these views, but that is another matter.)

The same article was "summarised" in the *New Worker* in such a way that, only two sentences after the sentence, " 'War communism' in the Soviet Union and China's 'Great Leap', for all their differences, have a similar psychological basis", follows the sentence starting "Leftist extremists...". In other words, the *New Worker* is hitting out, not only at Afghanistan, but also at war communism in the Soviet Union and distorts comrade Bovin's article in this respect.

In regard to war communism, Lenin wrote as follows:

"But for that, we would not have beaten the landowners and capitalists in a ruined small-peasant

country. The fact that we did (in spite of the help our exploiters got from the most powerful countries of the world) shows not only the miracles of heroism the workers and peasants can perform in the struggle for their emancipation; it also shows that when the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Kautsky and Co. *blamed* us for this War Communism they were acting as lackeys of the bourgeoisie.”<sup>40</sup>

The Mensheviks, Kautsky, etc., blamed the Bolsheviks for war communism. Now the likes of the *New Worker* are continuing this heritage. Finding the revolution “sectarian”, this line proceeds from “sectarianism” in Afghanistan and at the first opportunity directs itself against the October Revolution.

Let us finally point out here that, at the beginning, all the international publicity that went on about the “new stage in the revolution” misled many movements and revolutionaries who approached some publications with a natural trust. As the *İşçinin Sesi* movement, we too were misled. At any rate the question is not one of being a movement which “never makes mistakes”, but of being one that can correct a mistake when it sees one.

#### 4. Reverberations of the “new stage of the revolution” in Turkey

*Politika* and *Savaş Yolu* (Road of Struggle) did not fail to join in the chorus about the “new stage of the revolution”. In its 28th issue, *Savaş Yolu* introduced the *Parcham* group as “loyal to the revolution and proletarian internationalism”, and gave a distorted biography of Babrak Karmal, not mentioning either that he had been expelled from the party or that he had been exiled from the country. These did not take place!

While polishing up Karmal’s biography, *Savaş Yolu* talked about Amin’s counter-revolutionary terror and his having been an agent. Before the revolution leapt to a *new* stage with Babrak Karmal, there was Amin’s counter-revolutionary terror. If this is

the case, then the *old* stage of the revolution must have been the Daoud period! Daoud, a feudal-bourgeois mixture, was loyal to proletarian internationalism and the revolution! Amin organised a counter-revolution on 28th April, and used counter-revolutionary terror. Karmal, however, revitalised the revolution in December 1979, and the “revolution leapt to a new stage”. Now the revolution (!) follows the course set by comrade (!) Daoud.

There is no doubt that, during the pre-revolutionary period, an evolution was taking place in Afghanistan towards a bourgeois society. Social progress was pursuing this course. But a revolutionary situation existed. It was not necessary at all that social progress should follow the evolutionary path of reaction, a path full of suffering for the people. Under the leadership of the *Khalq*, the people changed the course of social progress to a popular and revolutionary one. This disturbed all those sunk deep into reformism, those who hang onto the slogan of social progress without questioning what kind of social progress it is. In December 1979 Afghanistan was turned back to its old evolutionary path again, and this was called the “new stage of the revolution”.

In consequence of this new stage, Aydın Engin of *Politika* went to Afghanistan and wrote a series of articles in the manner of Bab-ı Ali journalism (Bab-ı Ali in Istanbul is comparable to London’s Fleet Street — trans.). The only apparently serious criticism of the Amin period which was made in this series was that the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Afghanistan is sectarian.

This criticism has two aspects. Firstly, considering its *appearance*, the criticism at least touches upon a question which can be discussed. We will come to this below and attempt to present Lenin’s views on the matter. However, the second and most important aspect of the criticism has to do with its *essence*. The essence of this criticism is against, not only the proletarian dictatorship, but against revolutionary methods and the revolutionary dictatorship in general.

When we consider what Aydın Engin says together with the



views of *Savaş Yolu*, a logic which is reformist to the extreme appears. The starting point of this logic is that revolution and revolutionary slogans, methods, etc., are all frightening. With this logic, *Savaş Yolu* talks about Amin's counter-revolutionary terror. For the same reason, Aydın Engin too appears to find the dictatorship of the proletariat sectarian. In essence, however, he finds every manner of revolutionary dictatorship sectarian.

## V. On Hafizullah Amin

We have accorded a separate section to Hafizullah Amin.

In doing so, our point of departure is not Amin's personality but the aim of throwing light on his ideological-political identity. To this end we have tried to present as broad as possible a selection from Amin's speeches in the appendix.

First let us say a few words about the speeches in the appendix. We have taken them from a 1,500-page book in English published by the DRA in 1979. The publication in a foreign language of such a comprehensive book including many documents of and much information about the *Khalq* leadership in the first year of the revolution is significant confirmation of its tendency towards openness. However, and this is a problem which we too will undoubtedly confront after the revolution, the translation of the speeches from the Afghan is poor and leads one to assume that their essence has suffered. In this section, we will refer to the above-mentioned book, not to the appendix.

Now let us also touch briefly upon the question of approach.

As can be seen in the appended speeches, Amin had ideas and attitudes to which we do not subscribe. The subject of religion heads the list. In one place he even begins with the words, "in the name of God". How can we put these into their proper context?

If we are to make a scientific evaluation, we must never lose sight of the essence, the whole, the process of development, and the relevant conditions.

If we proceed from the example of religion, Amin had a profound knowledge of philosophy and conducted propaganda of materialism at every opportunity; even the first two paragraphs of the speech which he began with the words "in the name of God" are materialist propaganda. This is the essence of the matter. His praise of the Islamic religion was a tactical error.

Within the context of Amin's views and attitudes as a whole, this mistake does not obscure the general. It is necessary to keep all this in mind when criticising, to consider the mistakes in their context and not to forget the whole.

We must also not forget the direction in which the whole was developing. Particularly in the political sphere, Amin's extreme personal faith in Tarakki may be taken as the key to his mistakes. When Tarakki declared a *jihad* (holy war - trans.) Amin too poured praises on the Islamic religion. It seems that, as practice destroyed Amin's personal faith in Tarakki prior to the latter's death, there began a positive development overall.

However, Amin began the speech he made on the day after Tarakki's death with the words "in the name of God". In our opinion, this was a practical mistake engendered by various national and international conditions, the situation in the past and the confusion created when the idol was seen to have feet of clay. We shall consider this period separately and expand on what we have said here.

## 1. Amin's correct positions

Amin had a profound philosophical knowledge and was conscious of the importance of the "scientific ideology which opens the epoch of the working class". On the theoretical level, Amin was a Marxist-Leninist leader. For the most part, his politics and tactics were in accordance with this as well.

In one of his speeches, Amin said as follows:

“Lenin says... the real moving force of history is the revolutionary class struggle. According to the theory of bourgeois philosophers, the moving force behind progress is unity among all elements of society which realise its definite shortcomings and institutions. The first theory is materialist, the second is idealist. The first is revolutionary and the second reformist. The first serves the proletarian tactics in the contemporary capitalist countries as a cornerstone, the second is used as the foundation of bourgeois tactics.”<sup>41</sup>

Amin’s approach to the concrete class struggle also was in line with these words, i.e., was revolutionary.

In the previous section we quoted an article from the *New Worker*. In the article Daoud is praised as strongly pro-Soviet and in need of support against the right. Let us make a note of this.

In many of his speeches, Amin explained what he thought must be done in a society in which feudalism was dominant and where there was a very weak working class. In his thoughts, the scientific ideology of the working class and conditions in Afghanistan were always considered in relation to the aim of revolution. And, in the end, revolution achieved victory through a genuinely creative approach. Amin called the economic programme which was implemented after the revolution a non-capitalist way of development.

Here there is an obvious difference. According to the understanding which is widespread in the world communist movement, what should have been done in Afghanistan was to support Daoud, under whom a “non-capitalist” (?) road of development should have been followed.

Amin, however, considered the by-passing of capitalism as an historical stage as something connected with revolution, not with Daoud. (We will discuss this below in connection with the topic of the proletarian dictatorship.) In this respect, the Afghanistan revolution was also a surprise for very broad sections of the world communist movement.

Amin stated this openly many times. The April Revolution, he said, was realised “without the slightest participation of even

one other country of the world”<sup>42</sup> Moreover, he said, no one had had prior knowledge of the revolution, “Even countries that had spent millions of dollars for espionage purposes in Afghanistan (USA-E.E.) could not get any information in this connection”.<sup>43</sup>

Amin’s understanding of such topics as revolution and revolutionary situation have a profound Marxist-Leninist character. The phrases he used when defining the revolutionary situation in his own words reflect a deep understanding. He explained the symptom cited by Lenin of the growing activity of the masses in the words, “the broad attraction of the people to independent historical action”. Here Amin is neither changing nor developing Lenin, but rather only showing that he correctly understood Lenin’s concept of “activity”.

Unlike the mensheviks, Amin does not reduce the activity of the masses to mere physical activity, nor that to numbers. The essence of the concept of “activity” is the inclination, the attraction of the masses towards independent historical action. Undoubtedly, the most obvious manifestation of this will be concrete mass actions. However, to reduce mass activity only to this or that concrete action would, in the political sphere, be like looking at one’s finger rather than the moon when pointing to the moon. On the philosophical level, it would be to see the form rather than the essence of the class struggle.

Amin’s profound philosophical knowledge determined his approach towards revolution and the revolutionary situation. In this connection it will be useful to give an extract from a conversation between Amin and a West German correspondent on the issue of coup-revolution.

The West German correspondent “politely” characterised the Afghan revolution as a coup and asked the following question:

“Q: The term revolution is usually associated with involvement of masses as in the Russian and Chinese revolutions. In your case the masses were not involved. You have called it a ‘short cut’ accomplished by the armed forces. What do you mean by this short cut?...

“Answer: Our revolution was undoubtedly a

khalqi revolution. Our people were involved enthusiastically in one way or another. If they were not involved why did the people and large military regiments in various parts of the country actively support the Revolution? When people in the Kabul city and all over the country found out that khalqis rose against the despot Daoud in the very day-light, they gave their support without any hesitation to the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan to the extent that the class enemies of the Saur Revolution throughout the country could not resist. Could we have won such a victory in the day-light without the support and effective participation of our toiling people?"<sup>44</sup>

Amin's words constitute a good answer to the discussion of coup-revolution. It is a question of the revolution coinciding with the masses' attraction to revolution as a general phenomenon of the period as well as coinciding with that particular moment when this tendency reaches its highest point. It is not a question of the concrete seizure of power being effected by regular armies of the masses. This would be just another form of the bourgeois parliamentarist understanding.

Amin's profound philosophical knowledge is also reflected on topics such as the role of force in connection with the revolution, etc. He gave the following answer to an American correspondent who asked what role force would play in the revolution:

"In every system, force has a role but in almost every instance it has a class modality. By nature the state is power, backing the interests of one class against another. In exploiting societies, the state safeguards the interests of the exploiters against the exploited. In workers' and revolutionary societies which are advancing towards a classless society, the state is a force against the exploiters and anti-revolutionary elements."<sup>45</sup>

A *Wall Street Journal* correspondent, intending to cleverly

trip up Amin, asked why it was necessary to have security forces in Kabul. Amin gave the following answer to this:

“This is a revolution and revolution means that the parasitic and exploiting classes are abolished and replaced by the toiling class or classes of the society. In Afghanistan the exploiting classes have been toppled and power has been concentrated in the hands of the working class. The exploiting classes with the help of their colleagues outside the country hatch conspiracy and plot. For the purpose of protecting our glorious revolution against foreign interference and agents of imperialism and international reaction we deem such precautions necessary.”<sup>46</sup>

Amin’s answers to the correspondents’ questions both reflect his own understanding and also serve as an example of his courageous politics which did not collapse when confronted by foreign correspondents or bend over backwards to avoid frightening them.

Amin constantly and sincerely defended proletarian internationalism against nationalism. Even in his conversations with foreign journalists, he showed not the slightest tendency to water-down these terms.

In answer to a question put by an Iraqi journalist, Amin said:

“Our revolution is part of the world revolution. With the victory of our revolution the world revolution triumphed and a hard blow was dealt to imperialism.”<sup>47</sup>

Amin answered the question of a Canadian correspondent, “what do you mean by proletarian internationalism?” as follows:

“In Afghanistan the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the vanguard of the working class, possesses the political power and we want to establish fraternal and friendly relations with the workers of the world and defend their rights because our class

nature dictates so and we are enormously loyal to it. We have a common front with all the workers of the world against all the enemies of the working class.”<sup>48</sup>

In various speeches, Amin spoke of the world socialist system in such terms as “led by the Soviet Union” or “worker-regime states”. When a reporter from the *Wall Street Journal* asked “are you wary of your northern neighbour?”, Amin answered, “just the opposite, because our relations are based on complete equality, fraternity and mutual respect.”

A Canadian journalist stated that Afghanistan was not independent on international matters as it adopted the same attitude as the Soviets; for example, it has severed relations with South Korea. Amin countered this by saying, “we support what is right and just and the fact that the Soviet Union is pursuing the same policy indicates that it too seeks justice and peace.”<sup>49</sup>

Amin answered another question about the Soviet Union asked by a *Der Spiegel* correspondent as follows:

“There is a popular regime in power in Afghanistan and the PDPA, the vanguard of the working class, is wielding political power and the stands of the peoples of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union overlap from the viewpoint of class struggle.”<sup>50</sup>

On another occasion Amin explained the relationship between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan as follows:

“Both have identical views for the betterment and prosperity of mankind and believe in the scientific ideology of the working class and struggle together in the same fortress against imperialism, colonialism and apartheid...”<sup>51</sup>

From everything that Amin said about the Soviet Union, it is apparent that he correctly understood its objective role and felt for it great love and respect.

In many speeches Amin spoke of solidarity with the other



socialist countries and liberation struggles, referring to each one by one. As for the establishment of fraternal relations with China, this, he said, required that China abandon its policies which benefitted imperialism and, until then, normal, peaceful relations with China would continue.

Amin considered the basis of proletarian internationalism to be Marxism-Leninism, not the peace struggle. In regard to peace, he said, "the working class can render the best service for the sake of world peace by attaining power".<sup>53</sup> Amin propagated this view at many international conferences.

At the Havana (May 1978) and Belgrade (July 1978) meetings of the non-aligned countries, Amin stressed that non-alignment did not mean non-alignment with the socialist countries and that such an understanding served imperialism. He also expressed his views on the topic of peace. In Havana, he said "We of the non-aligned are keenly aware that so long as there are exploiters and exploited, masters and slaves, oppressors and oppressed, conflict will prevail."<sup>54</sup> His remarks in Belgrade concluded with a call for unity for a world where there will be no exploitation of man by man.

## 2. Amin's policies were not sectarian

Amin's policies were not sectarian. In fact, they were very flexible and intelligent. But, as we mentioned above, sometimes he was too flexible. On several topics he formulated a correct essence in an incorrect manner.

Such was the case in regard to religion. In a society like Afghanistan, a revolutionary government must, at one and the same time, show that it respects the religious beliefs of the people, conduct patient materialist propaganda, and suitably punish reactionaries who are inevitably linked with religion. Amin used praise as a way of showing that he respected religion but did not conduct constant propaganda of materialism and science. He showed not the slightest hesitation in punishing reactionaries.

Moreover, there was the same extreme flexibility in formulations of the attitude towards private capital:

“We have allowed private enterprises. Not only do we encourage our national capitalists to use their capital for the development of the economy of the country, but practically provide them with all facilities and for securing their nationalistic hopes, we provide them all satisfactory means and possibilities.”

“Private enterprises are not only limited to trade alone, but also have extensive possibilities for the development of production forces.”<sup>55</sup>

This attitude is essentially correct and necessary for Afghanistan. However, it is necessary, not for “securing their nationalistic hopes”, but essentially in order to develop the productive forces, as Amin said at the end of this passage.

In a country like Afghanistan, a government wanting to arrive at socialism must, on the one hand, adhere strictly to the state and to proletarian ideology and, on the other hand, make use of everything, including capitalism, in order that the material basis of socialism may rapidly take shape. In this respect, it must make concessions. This was the case in Russia after the revolution, on a somewhat different level, but in the same direction.

In a country like Afghanistan, making the utmost use of capitalists does not contradict the Leninist understanding of the non-capitalist path of development. This means to by-pass capitalism as a separate historical stage, not to experience it as a socio-economic formation. It does not mean you will have to strangle capitalism wherever you see it.

In this respect, Amin’s understanding was very correct in essence. He showed the same flexible attitude on the question of foreign aid. However, there may be mistakes in his formulations. These mistakes reflect mistakes in tactics such as taking advantage of religious and national sentiments. In connection

with this, in some places there is also an excess of patriotic outpourings.

Another example of a mixture of correct and incorrect is Amin's evaluation of the Afghan revolution. On many occasions Amin greatly exaggerated the revolution, constantly comparing it with the October Revolution and sometimes putting it in second place after the October Revolution.

Amin himself knew very well the reason for and the degree of significance of the Afghanistan revolution. When he was presenting his views to foreign journalists whom he did not expect to convert with propaganda, two points came very clearly to the fore in Amin's views. These were, first, the revolutionary initiative that the party showed in seizing power and the direct seizure of power itself; second, the importance of work within the army. In regard to the first, Amin stressed the similarity with the October Revolution; in regard to both, he emphasized that the October Revolution is an example for countries like Afghanistan.

These are very correct.

For the first time since the October Revolution, a working class party seized power *directly*, completely through its own initiative and creativity, without the collective support of the world communist movement *during* the revolution, and even despite unfavourable winds from that quarter.

The concrete role played by the Red Army in the Eastern European revolutions was great. First the Comintern and then the CPSU played an active guiding role in the Chinese Revolution. Vietnam too enjoyed support, at least as far as the existence of favourable conditions was concerned. *At first*, it was not a working class party which seized power in Cuba. There was no revolutionary political party during the revolution in Ethiopia.

The world has seen several glorious revolutions, and Amin too recognised this, but the special similarity between the Afghanistan Revolution and the October Revolution is the *direct* seizure of power despite the right-wing atmosphere in the world communist movement, solely though the revolutionary

initiative, creativity and leadership of the working class party itself.

Amin emphasized this truth to the extreme and, again, in some incorrect formulations in his propaganda speeches. In this there was an effort to impart a feeling of pride to the people and to propagate a revolutionary political line. But, whatever the intentions, this extreme exaggeration is a mistake which can develop into the disease encountered after every revolution in Asia of absolutising the model.

The majority of Amin's mistakes were reflected in connection with his attitude towards Tarakki. For example, after Tarakki launched a holy war against reaction, this was reflected in Amin's speeches as well. Speaking of the martyrs who fell in the revolutionary struggle, Amin said:

“The revolutionary leader of our heroes, Comrade Noor Mohammad Tarakki, has declared a holy war against all corrupt elements who serve the enemies of Islam and the toiling people of their own country, using Islam as a cover for their true alien identity, these real enemies of the toiling Moslems, these real lackies of imperialism and these Moslem looking ‘sarangis’ known as Ikhwanis.”<sup>56</sup>

Amin said these in his speech of 26th October 1978. At a meeting held on 19th October 1978 in honour of Afghanistan's new red flag and in which hundreds of thousands of working people actively participated, Tarakki began his speech with the words “in the name of God”, and, speaking of the Ikhwanis, said, “they accuse us, God protect us, of being against Islam”, and called the people to a “holy war” against them.

On matters such as the character of the party, etc., first Tarakki declared his attitude and then Amin strove to adapt to it. At a press conference on 6th May 1978, the following exchange took place between a journalist and Tarakki:

“*Question:* Won't the establishment of a materialist

or Marxist regime in a country like Afghanistan clash with Islamic laws?

“*Answer:* In what we intend in our programme which was devised 13 years ago and, unfortunately, I have not brought with me here, and we still follow it, Marxism and Leninism do not enter, but nonetheless it is a very progressive and democratic programme.

“*Question:* Do you consider your party a Marxist or non-Marxist Party?

“*Answer:* You can study our programme and find out what kind of party our Party is. Our Party is the party of workers, peasants, intelligentsia, craftsmen and the small and middle class bourgeoisie and its official name is the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan. Now if you interpret it differently it is up to you.

“*Question:* What do you say about the interpretation of your Party?

“*Answer:* Our Party is the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan but the propaganda of your country introduces it as a communist party.

“*Question:* Is this not a communist party?

“*Answer:*No, we have no communist party or party by the name of communist party. We have no such thing in Afghanistan. The name of our party is the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan.” <sup>57</sup>

In our opinion, these remarks suffice to show that Tarakki was not a communist. Amin, on the other hand, was mistaken as a communist in trying to remain within the boundaries set by Tarakki. In October 1978, a *Readers’ Digest* correspondent asked Amin the following question:

“*Question:* Esteemed Tarakki has refuted that the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan is a communist party. On what basis specially can the party be separated from the communist organisation

and theory?"

Amin gave the following answer:

*“Answer: Our glorious leader Noor Mohammad Tarakki, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has on many occasions repeated that no party existed or exists under the name of ‘communist party’ in Afghanistan and the philosophy and theory of our party is embodied in the ‘Basic Lines of Revolutionary Duties of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan’ and is reflected in our statements and deeds.”* <sup>58</sup>

The difference in Amin’s reply to the question about the party is obvious. In other places as well he said words to the effect that it is the party of the working class and adopts its ideology, but our great leader says there is no Marxist-Leninist party.

In our opinion, there are two aspects to this type of answer given by Amin. First, is the fact that he remained within the boundaries set down by Tarakki. Second, is his belief that the party did not yet have a fully communist character, notwithstanding that he thought it was a working class party. This too is correct. Amin’s mistake was to place too much hope in Tarakki, in regard to both the revolution and the party becoming a communist party.

Amin said that he saw Tarakki as an important focal point of the party and the revolution. <sup>59</sup> In November 1978 he gave the following answer to a journalist’s question as to whether there was a “danger of a personality cult”:

“It would be a great honour if I could introduce the effective role and creative leadership of our beloved leader... All our toilers could be inspired by it.

During my revolutionary activities, I realised this fact that my motives were guided best by such inspiration. While there is no danger of developing a personality cult such a source of inspiration is necessary and useful." <sup>60</sup>

The events which accelerated in September 1979 made this mistake clear to Amin. In the speech he made immediately after the death of Tarakki, Amin said that henceforth no one person will be able to come to the forefront. He said that those who see their own greatness in the smallness of others, their own rise over others' corpses, would not voluntarily submit to the truth.

However, this change took place at such a conjuncture from the point of view of internal and international conditions, that Amin could not escape either completely from his own mistakes, or from the clutches of those who were defending those mistakes.

### 3. The situation in September 1979

We have said that the period following the death of Tarakki was of a different character. In fact, while Amin was moving in the correct direction in 1979, he started his speech the day after Tarakki's death with the words, "in the name of God".

In this speech Amin announced that he had changed the former intelligence organisation. In the first place, if a conspiracy against himself had not originated in this organisation, if, as has been charged, Amin had just employed "his men" from this organisation to kill Tarakki, the need for this would not have arisen.

Secondly, in our opinion the mistakes reflected in this speech and another speech made on the following day, are directly connected with a series of dilemmas which confronted Amin. First, let us look briefly at the speeches, then at the aforementioned dilemmas.

Despite the fact that it began "in the name of God", as we have mentioned above the first two paragraphs of the first speech

contained materialist propaganda. The speech included proletarian internationalism and fraternity with the Soviet Union. One of the finest aspects of the speech was the statement that the real power of the working people depends on their consciousness. Another is the idea, contained in the whole logic, of the people participating much more in the affairs of the state.

If we look at some incorrect points in this first speech, the first are expressions such as the "heroism that the armed forces inherited from their ancestors", etc. The second is again the incorrect emphasis placed on some views, correct in themselves, on the matter of religion. The third is the reference to the patriotism and honour of national capitalists. At first glance the statements that no one would be imprisoned unnecessarily and that former mistakes would be corrected may be associated with Babrak Karmal's attitude when he came to power, but they are profoundly different.

Amin's understanding of force did not involve only crude violence. However, Tarakki's fear as the revolutionary struggle became more intense was natural as was his shift to unnecessary violence because of this fear and the lack of any other source which could have provided him with self-confidence. Amin spoke the truth. When Babrak Karmal however came to power, three months after Amin had said this, he distorted Amin's correct evaluation for his own demagogic purposes.

The other speech was made to those working in the newly-established intelligence organisation. In it Amin explained very well the kind of working methods that were needed. Reference is made to winning the support of the people, the fact that the revolution belongs to the people, etc. In our opinion, the things said in this speech about methods of work are very instructive. They reflect Amin's profound philosophical knowledge and confirm that he was not the unprincipled despot Karmal tries to make him out to be.

What strikes one in this speech are the calls for god's protection which are sprinkled throughout. Thus we see displayed in both of the speeches we mentioned those of Amin's tactics applied in relation to religion, patriotism, etc. which we



have been criticising. However, in our opinion this period is to be distinguished by a feature which necessitated such tactics due to a number of various dilemmas. Now let us look at these dilemmas.

The first dilemma is connected with the mistake which Amin made in trusting Tarakki to the extreme on a personal level and in creating a similar great trust among others. Life confronted Amin with this mistake in the form of a deadlock at the most critical moment of the process of revolution.

Starting in January 1979, the distribution of land was accelerated. This had the effect of broadening the revolutionary forces' base and popular committees were formed. At the same time it also had the effect of enraging the counter-revolutionary forces and counter-revolutionary efforts intensified. Moreover, these efforts received concrete support from the USA, Pakistan and several other such countries. They even harboured the possibility of war.

Under these conditions, Amin could not take the risk of changing the "in the name of God" style on which rested the ties between the people and Tarakki. The past mistake pushed Amin into the dilemma of being compelled to persist in mistakes.

If Tarakki had at least been criticised openly within the party and had had to change the style of his relations with the people such a dilemma would never have arisen. This was not the case. Moreover, one of the reasons Tarakki was able to win the support of Amin was the fact that he adopted a stance against the opportunists in the party, even if only in a conciliatory manner and with different aims. While Amin was counting on Tarakki to purge the opportunists once and for all, Tarakki went and the opportunists remained. Only a very few ringleaders were expelled from the party. Unfortunately, the support which they received from the socialist countries allowed them to preserve their positions of influence within the party. This was another aspect of the same dilemma.

Nevertheless, the fact that Amin moved towards strengthening his ties with the people in his own style is reflected in his speeches. He called on the people to participate more actively in

the administration of the state, and reminded them that they could criticise and demand an account from the state and the authorities. The following question comes to mind: were the mistakes we have said he made really necessary? Would the people not have understood if he had said that state and religion were separate, rather than to be told “in the name of God”?

Undoubtedly they would have understood but in order to do so they would need time, and the regime would need to be strong enough to remain on its feet in the time given. At this point we come to the second series of dilemmas confronted by Amin, one which is closely connected with the first.

It was an obvious fact that Afghanistan has only a very weak proletariat. The party, the state, and the revolution very concretely needed the support of the world working class. As it was, succour was given to the opportunists in the party. The state, however, was not given the required support at the required time.

After Tarakki had ensured “party unity”, Babrak Karmal and his group went to such extremes that even Tarakki now supported their expulsion. However, their having settled in the socialist countries and continued their “self-sacrificing work” allowed their influence within the party to persist. That is the reason why Tarakki did not take any decisive step towards completely purging opportunism.

As the revolution progressed, this section’s cries of “sectarianism” and “isolation from the masses” began to rise from within and without. Their proposal was not to apply revolutionary measures swiftly. Amin’s proposal, on the other hand, was that there had already been too much delay, and that if these measures were not applied rapidly the revolution would not achieve victory, counter-revolution would be more powerful. They would have to be applied quickly and the temporary problems this would create would have to be overcome by other means. Tarakki took his position according to the balance of power between these two views. As counter-revolution strengthened, Tarakki’s views drew closer to those of Karmal. The result, as is known, is that Tarakki submitted to Karmal in

Moscow.

Due to the fact that the concrete international support for counter-revolution had a negative effect on the internal balance of the country, as well as to the fact that in Afghanistan the consistent revolutionary class, the proletariat, was very young and very weak, the temporary negative aspects of the deepening of the revolutionary process were reflected in the absence of a strong social basis which could have been relied upon to counteract these negative influences.

In a society like Afghanistan it was very likely that the army too would be affected in a period when the battle between revolution and counter-revolution experienced such critical moments. Iran and Pakistan were continuously infiltrating soldiers across the Afghan border. In other words, the army was inadequate in the physical sense as well in the face of combined attacks from within and without. It could not be expected that Afghanistan would succeed in carrying out another revolution in a single country. This applies to other countries as well.

It was for this reason that Tarakki and Amin, just as the Soviet comrades themselves have said, asked for help from the Red Army exactly 14 times. It was a question of the Red Army standing guard, playing big brother, in the name of the world working class, as the fate of the revolution was hanging in the balance. If such a thing were impossible, articles to this effect would never have been included in the Soviet-Afghan friendship treaty. Moreover, practice showed that it was not impossible.

At that time, the Soviet Union did not agree to this request. This thoroughly shook Tarakki, he was persuaded to meet with Babrak Karmal in Moscow and, in our opinion the only possible logical result of this, to plan to kill Amin. His plans backfired, however: Tarakki died and praises were showered on Amin. However, these praises were meaningless.

Afghanistan was not Russia, neither in respect to the proletariat's experience nor to the fact that Russia covers one-sixth of the world. The PDPA was not the Bolshevik Party and Amin was not Lenin. Nevertheless, Amin was confronted with conditions such as revolution in a single country. Under these conditions,

Amin cannot be the primary object of our criticism, even if we hear that he knelt and prayed to Mecca.

Instead of receiving support, of being corrected through comradely criticism, the most consistent revolutionary line in the PDPA, for all its mistakes, the only proletarian line, was pushed onto a mistaken course. As if this did not suffice, it was strangled.

Amin was a communist who made mistakes. But the understanding which led to the strangulation of this line in the world communist movement and then to Karmal's coming to power was a mistake which merely poses as "communism".

#### 4. Can there be a proletarian dictatorship in Afghanistan?

The only criticism advanced by those who consider Amin sectarian that can be dealt with seriously has to do with the matter of the proletarian dictatorship. For this reason, we too will touch upon the question of whether or not there can be a dictatorship of the proletariat in a country like Afghanistan.

In order to throw some light on the question we will give a quotation from Lenin which is rather long so as to enable us to better present his logic.

In 1920, Lenin said as follows:

"The imperialist war has drawn the dependent peoples into world history. And one of the most important tasks now confronting us is to consider how the foundation-stone of the organisation of the Soviet movement can be laid in the *non-capitalist* countries. Soviets are possible there; they will not be workers' Soviets, but peasants' Soviets, or Soviets of working people.

"Much work will have to be done; errors will be inevitable; many difficulties will be encountered along this road. It is the fundamental task of the Second Congress to elaborate or indicate the

practical principles that will enable the work, till now carried on in an unorganised fashion among hundreds of millions of people, to be carried on in an organised, coherent and systematic fashion.

“Now, a year or a little more after the First Congress of the Communist International, we have emerged victors over the Second International; it is not only among the workers of the civilised countries that the ideas of the Soviets have spread; ... A recognition of the role and significance of the Soviets has now also spread to the lands of the East.

“The groundwork has been laid for the Soviet movement all over the East, all over Asia, among all the colonial peoples.

“The proposition that the exploited must rise up against the exploiters and establish their Soviets is not a very complex one. ...”<sup>61</sup>

Again in 1920 Lenin threw further light on some of the above views:

“Next, I would like to make a remark on the subject of peasants’ Soviets. The Russian Communists’ practical activities in the former tsarist colonies, in such backward countries as Turkestan, etc., have confronted us with the question of how to apply the communist tactics and policy in pre-capitalist conditions. The preponderance of pre-capitalist relationships is still the main determining feature in these countries, so that there can be no question of a purely proletarian movement in them. There is practically no industrial proletariat in these countries. Nevertheless, we have assumed, we must assume, the role of leader even there. Experience has shown us that tremendous difficulties have to be surmounted in these countries. However, the practical results of our work have also shown that

despite these difficulties, we are in a position to inspire in the masses an urge for independent political thinking and independent political action, even where a proletariat is practically non-existent. This work has been more difficult for us than it will be for comrades in the West-European countries, because in Russia the proletariat is engrossed in the work of state administration. It will readily be understood that peasants living in conditions of semi-feudal dependence can easily assimilate and give effect to the idea of Soviet organisation. It is also clear that the oppressed masses, those who are exploited, not only by merchant capital but also by the feudalists, and by a state based on feudalism, can apply this weapon, this type of organisation, in their conditions too. The idea of Soviet organisation is a simple one and is applicable, not only to proletarian, but also to peasant feudal and semi-feudal relations. Our experience in this respect is not as yet very considerable. However, the debate in the commission in which several representatives from colonial countries participated, demonstrated convincingly that the Communist International's theses should point out that peasants' Soviets, Soviets of the exploited, are a weapon which can be employed, not only in capitalist countries but also in countries with pre-capitalist relations and that it is the absolute duty of Communist parties and of elements prepared to form Communist parties, everywhere to conduct propaganda in favour of peasants' Soviets or of working people's Soviets, this to include backward and colonial countries. Wherever conditions permit, they should at once make attempts to set up Soviets of the working people.

“This opens up a very interesting and very important field for our practical work. So far our joint experience in this respect has not been extensive,

but more and more data will gradually accumulate. It is unquestionable that the proletariat of the advanced countries can and should give help to the working masses of the backward countries, and that the backward countries can emerge from their present stage of development when the victorious proletariat of the Soviet Republics extends a helping hand to these masses and is in a position to give them support.

“There was quite a lively debate on this question in the commission, not only in connection with the theses I signed, but still more in connection with Comrade Roy’s theses, which he will defend here, and certain amendments which were unanimously adopted.

“The question was posed as follows: are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative. If the victorious revolutionary proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them, and the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal — in that event it will be mistaken to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development. Not only should we create independent contingents of fighters and party organisations in the colonies and the backward countries, not only at once launch propaganda for the organisation of peasants’ Soviets and strive to adapt them to the pre-capitalist conditions, but the Communist International should advance the proposition, with the appropriate theoretical grounding, that with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to

communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage.

“The necessary means for this cannot be indicated in advance. These will be prompted by practical experience. It has, however, been definitely established that the idea of the Soviets is understood by the mass of the working people in even the most remote nations, that the Soviets should be adapted to the conditions of a pre-capitalist social system, and that the Communist parties should immediately begin work in this direction in all parts of the world.”<sup>62</sup>

Speaking on the same topic, Lenin said the following about the tasks of the Party in Turkestan:

“The general task to be, not communism, but the overthrow of feudalism.”<sup>63</sup>

Among his “Remarks on the Report of A. Sultan-Zade Concerning the Prospects of a Social Revolution in the East”, Lenin said the following, again in 1920:

“1) Disintegration of the propertied exploiter classes; 2) a large part of the population are *peasants* under *medieval exploitation*; 3) *small* artisans — in industry; 4) deduction: *adjust* both Soviet institutions and the Communist Party (its membership, special tasks) to the level of the *peasant* countries of the colonial East.

“This is the crux of the matter. This needs thinking about and *seeking* concrete answers.”<sup>64</sup>

Lenin’s approach on the matter of countries where capitalism is not yet dominant stands forth clearly in these long quotations. In these countries it is a question of passing to communism through certain stages of development by adjusting their soviets and communist parties to the conditions and by-



passing capitalism with the aid of all means at the disposal of the soviet republics and the world working class, and through systematic propaganda.

Here let us first touch briefly upon the non-capitalist path of development. The above quotations are cited in many books but two such "small" points as revolution and the leadership of the communist party are left out. However, as can be seen from the quotations, Lenin assumes these two points as given, not even deeming it necessary to place special emphasis on them.

Lenin did not say anything directly as to whether or not there could be a proletarian dictatorship in these countries. However, the logic of what he did say leads to the conclusion that there can be and that one must work towards it.

*Firstly*, it is unlikely that Lenin is suggesting that the transition to socialism by bypassing capitalism could be realised under any other state than the dictatorship of the proletariat. For this reason the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship at a certain stage is inevitable. Moreover, this must take place at an initial stage in which the conditions for bypassing capitalism have been fulfilled. For the resolute initiatives directed towards bypassing capitalism can be undertaken only under the proletarian dictatorship.

*Secondly*, despite the fact that there was no working class in these countries, Lenin proposed that the communist party adopt itself to the conditions. It means that, by the same logic, the proletarian dictatorship too may be established from the very beginning and its tasks may be adapted to the conditions. Certainly, the objective foundations for socialism must be laid in the country before it is attempted to pass over to socialism. This is what the Soviet communists did under the dictatorship of the proletariat in Turkestan and even in broad sections of Russia.

*Thirdly*, in answer to the lack of a proletariat in these countries Lenin constantly stressed all manner of aid from the world working class, its victorious detachments, the Soviet governments. Lenin's words clearly reflect the fact that, in our epoch, the understanding that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only a phenomenon within narrow state boundaries, that it

is connected with the universal position of the proletariat in this epoch.

*Fourthly*, today the objective power of real socialism is much greater than it was when Lenin said the above. For this reason, all that he said is possible to a much greater extent today.

Undoubtedly, the dictatorship of the proletariat in a backward country involves many difficulties. For this reason, Lenin did not give any final answer to this question, leaving it to practical experience. He did assign one task to the future generation of communists: he said, try, look, act. Those who consider the dictatorship of the proletariat sectarian, however, say that it is “impossible”, and thus act in a way to obstruct its emergence and distort its experience.

If we return to Afghanistan in the light of what has been said up to this point, theoretically Amin’s talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat is not something that can be discounted with a stroke of the pen as sectarianism. Amin talked about the dictatorship of the proletariat but declared that the immediate tasks of the proletarian dictatorship were democratic transformations, the economic programme of which was the non-capitalist path of development. Had socialism been imposed immediately, this would indeed be sectarianism. Moreover, Amin did not consider that the proletarian dictatorship could be ensured by relying solely on conditions within the country. It must not be forgotten that, during the Tarakki and Amin administrations, help had been requested from the Soviet Union, the Red Army, 14 times.

The Red Army gave support to Afghanistan when a government was in power which considered the proletarian dictatorship as sectarian. Now the proletarian dictatorship is not mentioned, but the presence of the Red Army in Afghanistan confirms, albeit in a somewhat complicated manner, that a proletarian dictatorship can be established with the support of the revolutionary centre. If this support had been given when a government which defended the proletarian dictatorship was in power, practice would have confirmed more directly that a proletarian dictatorship in Afghanistan was not at all sectarian.

Afghanistan would have been a fine experience in regard to the tasks set by Lenin.

In our opinion, Amin's greatness lay in his adherence to Lenin's words to look, think, act.

## 5. Those who call Amin an agent provide no evidence

In the 19th century, Marx was called a Jewish agent! In 1917, the same kind of accusation was made against Lenin, and he was called a German agent! In other words, this accusation was made against even the founders of the ideology of the working class and its revolutionary policy. But what happened? Besides having left no trace at all, today even opportunists who have turned their backs on Marxism-Leninism are constantly dropping these names!

Since those names cannot be directly attacked, all those who today defend Marxism-Leninism, not only in words, but in its essence, are subjected to the same kind of cheap accusation of being an agent.

In its 28th issue, *Problems of Communism*, an anti-communist journal published in the United States, considered the fact that Amin had received his Ph.D. degree from Columbia University in New York "suspect"! <sup>65</sup>

We have noted in a speech of Babrak Karmal: Carter called Amin, after he was overthrown the "official and legal president"! From this the conclusion is drawn that imperialism is in mourning for Amin! There is no logic at all! Imperialism is reacting not to the overthrow of Amin, but to the intervention of the Red Army in Afghanistan. While doing so, it will naturally speak of the "official and legal government", whoever that may be.

"Many Afghans who were trained in the United States in 1962-1964 can confirm that Amin, during his period of residence there maintained close contacts with known American CIA agents and

officials. We now know *for sure* who recruited Amin and guided his spying activities inside our Party and we can say exactly which CIA agents Amin met, and where, in 1973-1978, when he received the assignments to blow up the Party.” <sup>66</sup>

Firstly, anyone who is claiming to expose the fact that a head of state is an agent is obliged to explain what he means when he says “we now know” and “we can say”! Secondly, those who claim to have seen Amin speaking with CIA agents in America have to explain how they themselves know those agents. Much more could be said, but it is not necessary.

Another “proof” was provided by the Afghan Minister for Internal Affairs: “The CIA stated that the Amin regime, taking into consideration its internal evolution, could meet the long-term interests of the United States.” <sup>67</sup> Where is this stated?

The following quotation is given, again from an interview with Babrak Karmal: “Babrak Karmal reaffirmed that the leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had indisputable documented evidence...” <sup>68</sup> Fine, but why is this evidence not published?

No aspect of this matter holds water. Everyone is shouting at the top of their lungs that Amin was an agent, using Babrak Karmal’s words as a reference. The “furthest” proof that Karmal has given is merely to say, “we have indisputable evidence”. But the proof itself is nowhere to be seen!

In our opinion, such inconsistency and lack of seriousness are the strongest proof that Amin was not an agent.

## VI. Proletarian internationalism and the lessons to be drawn from Afghanistan

The revolution in Afghanistan was an experience full of valuable lessons, including many bitter aspects. They are such that it would be impossible to find under the heading "lessons of the April Revolution" any points which would not directly concern the world communist movement.

Now let us look at some aspects of this.

### 1. The world communist movement must draw a lesson

All the lessons to be drawn from the Afghanistan revolution centre around the present position of the world communist movement. They show in practice how correct comrade Yürükoğlu was in what he said in *Socialism Will Win*. The fact that the world communist movement has shifted to the right; that its ideological unity has disintegrated; how, with a meaningless organisational unity, the concept of non-interference in internal matters leads in fact to much worse than interference... all these are verified by the lessons of Afghanistan.

The world communist movement gave support to a line

which is not revolutionary. In contrast with the advantages that this provides for counter-revolution, the demands for urgent military assistance that the revolutionary leadership made to the Soviet Union 14 times were rejected. Instead, a Karmal-type government was the prerequisite for military assistance. When the military assistance was finally given, and the Red Army helped Afghanistan, an opportunist, reformist line was brought to power. Today in Afghanistan both revolution and internationalism have been turned upside-down.

In Afghanistan, Amin and 97 of his comrades were killed. Every day thousands of people are unjustly killed in the world, but this event is one which, because of its ideological and political content, is of universal significance. In a country like Afghanistan, to kill Amin and 97 of his comrades indicates how intense was the desire to dry up, eliminate a certain line.

In this respect, the year 1979 appears to have been a turning-point in a definite process of accumulation in other countries as well as Afghanistan. In 1979, the General Secretary of the Tudeh Party in Iran changed. We do not know what type of person went and what type came. But the policy which has been followed to date has not shown any consistent revolutionary aspect of Kianuri.

In the same year, I. Bilen made an important turn. In order not to be changed, he changed rapidly it seems. At the 3rd June Politburo meeting, and on the direct initiative of Bilen, an open attack was launched against the Leninists in the TKP and, in a manner contrary to the rules, comrade Veli Dursun was expelled from the Central Committee. I. Bilen openly took the side of the opportunists.

In the same year, and in approximately the same month, Tarakki met with Babrak Karmal in Moscow and "was persuaded". Karmal and Tarakki were to join forces but their plans went awry. Then followed events which are well known and Karmal came to power.

It is clear that there are parallels in these events, but they took place in different countries and under different circumstances. Thus, there are important differences as well. The working class learns and advances from every event.

Proletarian internationalism is not merely a season's greeting. The working class movement is genuinely internationalist. The experience of every country, with all its rights and wrongs, is an international gain. In this respect, the events in Afghanistan, for example, were very instructive for our movement in Turkey.

Amin and 97 of his comrades were killed, but this movement, with its mistakes criticised and its good points developed, is alive and gaining strength in the treasure-house of proletarian internationalism.

## 2. The role of the Red Army

In connection with everything that has been said above the role of the Red Army in Afghanistan has a contradictory appearance. On the one hand, it is a security objectively provided by the revolutionary centre. Objectively, the Red Army is doing its expected internationalist duty against imperialism. On the other hand, it provided support for the elimination of revolutionary cadres, and to a reformist leadership. With its own hands, it is weakening the revolution.

By sending the Red Army to Afghanistan, the Soviet Union assumed an important responsibility, and made a sacrifice. However, the leadership for which it made this sacrifice, is of such a quality as to increase the burden that falls upon the Soviet Union. In a country like Afghanistan, reformist "solutions" lead, in the long run, to losing what gains were made, to insoluble problems. If the Red Army had entered to give support to a revolutionary leadership, it would have been much more of a solution from the point of view of both the revolutionary centre, as well as the Afghanistan revolution. Through the support it is providing, the Red Army is fulfilling an internationalist duty, but because the line for which this support is provided is wrong, it is weakening the revolution with its own hands. The *Parcham* group is breaking the backbone of the revolution and, not regardless of its own wishes, the Red Army is

acting as a crutch for a crippled revolution. This is one of the most bitter lessons of Afghanistan.

Here let us expand on two points. The first is the fact that, *not at all regardless of its own wishes*, the Red Army is acting as a crutch for a crippled revolution. The second is the fact that, as practice has shown, today it is no longer acting merely as a crutch, but as a wheel-chair.

Let us begin from the first point. As soon as Karmal came to power, the Soviet Union too took part in the clamour about the "new stage of the revolution" that was rising in the world communist press. For example, it published a book called *The Truth About Afghanistan*. On the cover is written: "Documents, facts, eye-witness reports". The book includes a special 14-page section about Amin being an agent of imperialism, but the only document in the section is Karmal's words, "we have indisputable evidence." At the very least, the book is an example of lack of seriousness.

In 1981 a second edition of the same book appeared. It was expected that the second edition of this book, which had accused a revolutionary head of state of being an agent without presenting any evidence, would at last publish some evidence. However, the second edition of *The Truth About Afghanistan* refers to Amin only six times. He is referred to three times as an agent and three times in connection with his having made mistakes. It is obvious that the accusation of being an agent is gradually becoming obsolete. In our opinion, this is an example of a double lack of seriousness. The name of a communist leader must not be sullied in such an irresponsible manner. If it has been sullied then it must be cleared openly. This question is still on the agenda and it cannot be removed by surreptitiously withdrawing the accusations.

Moreover, the treatment of Afghanistan at the 26th Congress was also ugly. While discussing this matter, comrade Yürükoğlu first gave the relevant quotation from the Congress Report, then expressed his own views:

“ ‘Imperialism launched a real undeclared war



against the Afghan revolution. This also created a *direct threat to the security of our southern frontier*. In the circumstances, we are compelled to render the military aid asked for by that friendly country.' (Our italics.)

"As can be seen, two reasons of equal consequence are given for the Red Army intervention in Afghanistan: the undeclared war launched by imperialism and the security of the southern Soviet frontier. The former we accept. How utterly meaningless is the principle of 'non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries'. So-called 'international law' consists in general of a number of unenforceable rules which change according to the balance of power. So too with the principle of non-interference.

"However, the second reason is totally unacceptable. What sort of logic would this be? Who was in power before the Afghan revolution? Which countries are on the other Soviet frontiers? Sweden, Finland, the USA, Japan, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey. Do these not constitute a threat to Soviet frontiers? Does the fascist dictatorship in Turkey not represent a far greater threat on a frontier of far more vital significance? What is the criterion of a 'threat to frontier security'? It is possible with such a generalisation to become the most aggressive country in the world." <sup>69</sup>

In fact, the criterion of border security in the 26th Congress Report is rather complicated. If it is a question of imperialist aggression, then this was present during the Amin period as well and, again according to Soviet sources, the Red Army was requested 14 times. The "military aid requested by a friendly country" was not granted at that time, but was granted only with the coming to power of Karmal. According to the same logic then, the fascist dictatorship which has suppressed the

revolutionary situation in Turkey has probably increased the security of the Soviet Union's south-western borders.

It is obvious that there is something seriously wrong with the criterion of border security. As was pointed out in resolutions of the TKP Coordinating Committee and the Second Conference of the Leninists:

“The Leninist cadres of the TKP will work for the correction of incorrect views without forgetting for a moment that the Soviet Union is the world revolutionary centre.”

This is one of the aims of this booklet. However, at the same time, practice too is thankfully working in the same direction. It is showing the direction in which affairs have developed and exposing the mistakes very clearly. Here let us pass to a second point.

What is the situation in Afghanistan today?

A civil war is still continuing in Afghanistan. This has two aspects which we have emphasized from the beginning. One is very natural: the civil war will continue, imperialism will support the counter-revolutionaries, socialism the revolutionaries. The other aspect is connected with the contradictory character of the Afghan revolution. On the one hand, opportunism is obstructing the revolution's rapid advancement, on the other, the Red Army is gradually being compelled to exert ever greater efforts.

The opportunist press cannot say this openly within the context of official optimism, for the causes of this would touch directly upon itself. However, reports about attacks being carried out against schools in Kabul reflect the truth to a certain extent.

For example, in the April issue of *Atılım\** there are references to “bands passing as Muslims”, and the Afghan revolution is “defended” in a defeatist spirit. *Atılım* asks: “Is distributing land to landless, hungry and poor peasants contrary

---

\* Official organ of the TKP's opportunist wing.

to Islam, and organising attacks against schools in accordance with Islam?"

From these pathetic gestures of defence it is clear that the activities of counter-revolutionary bands in Afghanistan are intensifying. The imperialists are openly and unashamedly declaring that they are aiding these bands and the Red Army is in the position of taking part in the day-to-day struggle.

As everyone is aware of this, in the 26th Congress Report there is an attempt to conduct a defence with the excuse of the "security of our southern borders". When such an excuse is advanced the imperialists naturally seize the opportunity to advance one step further and, totally disregarding Afghanistan itself, propose negotiations with the "occupiers" of Afghanistan.

### 3. Conclusion

In regard to Afghanistan, a vicious circle is drawing tighter on both the international level and within the country itself. This is not necessarily in the sense of a physical victory for counter-revolution. For the moment the question turns on whether the Red Army is defending revolution in Afghanistan or whether the Red Army is going to win on its own, since it is supporting a government which has strangled the revolution. If the Red Army wins on its own, this will be a temporary victory which will suppress the problems rather than solve them, and lead to many new problems.

A striking phenomenon being observed in Afghanistan is the fact that this truth is imposing itself. Now let us look at this briefly.

An interview with Esat Muhsinzade, a representative of the Afghanistan Youth League, was published in the *Roja Nu* journal published in Sweden. In the interview, *Roja Nu* asks a question about Amin. In replying to the question, Muhsinzade said the following along with the well-known accusation of being an "agent"(!):

“By presenting the struggle for a democratic land reform and the struggle against illiteracy, two of the most advanced aims of the party, as unnecessary, (Amin) prevented the people from understanding their great importance. He ordered villages to be bombed and thousands to be massacred. Declaring our country to be an advanced socialist country, he said that we were at the stage of transition to communism. Our people, the great majority of whom are illiterate, thus began to see socialism as representing murder, massacre and banditry, and to see the Soviet Union as the root of all these evils. This is exactly what the imperialists wanted.”

Firstly, those making this accusation are the very same people who delayed the implementation of the land reform for months and accused Amin of implementing it too quickly. Now, however, Amin is being accused of presenting the struggle for land reform as unnecessary and of saying that the country was at the stage of transition to communism. These are outright lies but there is one phenomenon which is causing them to be told.

The vicious circle that is drawing tighter is confronting experienced politicians with the vital importance of land reform in a country like Afghanistan. The truth is that land reform has shown that, rather than frighten the people, it serves to attract them to the revolutionary front. Today such a process dictated by life itself, is advancing in Afghanistan. Those who repudiate Amin are being compelled to take steps along the road he defended. In connection with this, there are rumours to the effect that Babrak Karmal is no longer wanted.

Secondly, if steps are not taken along the road of revolutionary measures which are dictated by life in Afghanistan, what is happening and will happen is exactly the kind of thing for which Amin is blamed in the quotation above: the bombing of villages.. the presentation of socialism as representing murder and massacre and seeing the Soviet Union as being behind all these evils... that is, to push the Red Army into

the position of being a foreign occupier. As even the young opportunist has said, this is exactly what imperialism wants.

There is no clash between the revolutionary centre and revolutions in individual countries in terms of their fundamental and long-term interests. The Afghanistan experience confirms this once again in a very complicated, roundabout and contradictory manner.

The key to everything — defeating imperialism, the security of the Soviet Union's borders, protecting the gains of the Afghan Saur Revolution, setting the Iranian revolution on a correct course, the victory of all revolutions, bringing the revolution in Turkey to victory, peace, security — is, in the words of Amin, the scientific ideology and the revolutionary class struggle of the working class which will usher in a new epoch.

Long live communism!

## References

1. R. Yürükoğlu, *Socialism Will Win*, İşçinin Sesi Publications, English Series 7, p.24.
2. *Afghanistan Democratic Republic, Annual*, 7 Saur (April) 1358 (1979), Editor: A.M.Baryalai, Government Publishing House, p.1383.
3. *Ibid.*, p.788.
4. *Ibid.*, p.1450.
5. *Ibid.*, p.1454.
6. *Ibid.*, p.745.
7. *Ibid.*, p.24.
8. *Ibid.*, pp.24-40.
9. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, vol. 22, p.355.
10. Engels, *The Role of Force in History*, International Publishers, New York, 1968, p.62.
11. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 26, pp.79-80.
12. *Ibid.*, pp.83-84.
13. *Ibid.*, pp.22-23.
14. *The Times*, 2 May 1978.
15. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol.28, p.252.
16. *World Marxist Review*, January 1979, p.76.

17. *Birikim*, January 1980, p.7 (in Turkish).
18. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol.26, pp.118-119.
19. *Ibid.*, vol. 28, pp.253-254.
20. *ADR Annual*, pp.1325-1367.
21. *Ibid.*, pp.80-85 and pp.88-96.
22. *Far Eastern Digest*, 23-30 September 1979.
23. *ADR Annual*, p.933.
24. *Ibid.*, p.913.
25. *The Truth About Afghanistan*, Novosty Press, first edition, Moscow 1980, p.86.
26. W. Pomeroy, *Why Soviet Troops are in Afghanistan*, an American-Soviet Friendship Society publication, March 1980, p.25.
27. *Ibid.*
28. *The Truth About Afghanistan*, pp.86-87.
29. *Ibid.*, p.86.
30. *Babrak Karmal's Speeches*, December 1979 — April 1980, DRA Ministry of Information and Culture Publications Department, pp.5-15.
31. *Ibid.*, p.22.
32. *Ibid.*, p.30.
33. *Ibid.*, p.38.
34. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, p.161.
35. *The Truth About Afghanistan*, pp.97-128.
36. *Ibid.*, p.103.
37. *Ibid.*, p.113.
38. *Ibid.*, p.101.
39. *Ibid.*, p.112.
40. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 32, pp.342-343.
41. *ADR Annual*, p.715.
42. *Ibid.*, p.792.
43. *Ibid.*, p.888.
44. *Ibid.*, p.833.
45. *Ibid.*, p.858.
46. *Ibid.*, pp.849-850.
47. *Ibid.*, pp.778-779.
48. *Ibid.*, p.855.

49. *Ibid.*, p.852.
50. *Ibid.*, p.907.
51. *Ibid.*, p.867.
52. *Ibid.*, p.648.
53. *Ibid.*, p.752.
54. *Ibid.*, p.945.
55. *Ibid.*, p.825.
56. *Ibid.*, pp.642-643.
57. *Ibid.*, pp.385-386.
58. *Ibid.*, p.800.
59. *Ibid.*, p.708.
60. *Ibid.*, p.863.
61. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 31, pp.232-233.
62. *Ibid.*, pp.242-244.
63. *Ibid.*, vol. 42, p.198.
64. *Ibid.*, p.202.
65. Pomeroy, p.25.
66. *The Truth About Afghanistan*, p.85.
67. *Ibid.*, p.91.
68. *Ibid.*, p.92.
69. R.Yürükoğlu, *Living Socialism*, İşçinin Sesi Publications, English Series 15, pp.19-20.



# APPENDICES

*Hafizullah Amin (1921-1979)*

# Appendix I.

## A Short Biography of Hafizullah Amin

Hafizullah Amin came into the world in 1921 as the child of a low-income civil-servant family in the Paghman district of Kabul.

While Amin was still young, his father died. After his death, Hafizullah Amin was looked after by his elder brother, Abdullah Amin, who was a primary school teacher.

After primary school, Amin entered the Education Institute in Kabul as a boarder. From here he went on to the Mathematics and Physics section in the Science Faculty at the University of Kabul. After finishing here, Amin began to teach at the Kabul Education Institute. Later he became the institute's director and then the director of the Ibni Sina school. In 1957 he went to the USA in order to further his higher education. There he took a masters degree in the field of education.

After returning from America, Amin joined the teaching staff of the Education Faculty of Kabul University. From here he was appointed the director of first, the Ibni Sina school and then the Kabul Education Institute. At this time, he established close relations with Tarakki.

After a short period at the Kabul Education Institute, Amin was appointed to the newly-established Teachers' Training

Institute. Passing a competitive exam in 1962, he won a bursary to do a doctorate in the USA and went there once more.

In 1963 Amin was elected as the chairman of the Afghan Students' Union in the USA. His political activities increased. In the same year, he and some friends established a progressive association in New York. In 1963 he learned that, under the leadership of Tarakki, preparations were being made to found a progressive workers' party and he informed Tarakki that activities were being conducted in close association with the workers' movement in New York as well, and that they considered themselves part of the vanguard party of the workers of their country.

Hafizullah Amin's activities in the USA caused him to be expelled from the country at a time when, although he had completed all the lessons for his doctorate, he was still working to finish his thesis.

Amin returned to Afghanistan in 1965 and immediately became associated with the Party. Following a Party directive, he became a candidate for Paghman in the elections to the 12th session of the National Assembly. He lost the election and spent the next year teaching at the Rabia Balki school. Then he worked at the Primary Education Department for three years. During these four years he developed his ties with the people as a member of the PDPA. In the elections for the thirteenth National Assembly he was elected as the Paghman representative to the *Wolesi Jirgah*.

During the four years in which Amin was a PDPA deputy, he fought against imperialism, feudalism and reaction, exposing the decadence and treachery of the Zahir Shah palace and the brutality of the corrupt regime. He used his position as an MP to the advantage of the people, the movement and the party. He constantly took part in demonstrations, meetings and other actions.

Adhering to Party directives, in 1973 Amin further intensified and extended his activities. He was charged with leading the PDPA's work of organising within the army and propagating working class ideology. And he fulfilled this task

successfully; it was he who gave the command to begin the revolution.

Immediately after the April 1978 revolution, Amin was appointed Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Later he was elected to the Political Bureau of the PDPA Central Committee. Then he became Secretary of the Secretariat of the Party Central Committee.

In 1979 Amin was appointed deputy chairman of the Supreme Defence Council which was established because of the intensification of counter-revolution. At the same time, on 31st March 1979, he became Prime Minister. After the death of Tarakki in September 1979 he became Chairman of the Revolutionary Council.

Amin was married and was the father of seven children — four girls and three boys. He was killed together with 97 comrades on the night of 26-27th December 1979 as a result of an opportunist coup.

Amin played the decisive role in the realisation, the course and the advance of the April Revolution. In a really very backward country like Afghanistan, the proletarian line — with all its rights and wrongs, shortcomings and excesses — was manifested in Amin and his comrades. The murder of this cadre harmed the world communist movement both in respect to the Afghanistan revolution and because it was party to such an event.

## Appendix II. Selections from the speeches of Hafizullah Amin

From the speech made on the occasion of the  
61st anniversary of the Great October Revolution

This speech was made on 7th  
November 1978 at a commemora-  
tive meeting organised by the Kabul  
Party Committee. We have abrid-  
ged it from the *Afghanistan Demo-  
cratic Republic, Annual*.

Today throughout the world, the peoples of the USSR, the brotherly socialist countries and all progressive humanity are celebrating the 61st anniversary of the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution of Russia.

In the world history various events have occurred which have left their impact on the social life of mankind. The importance of these events is proportional to the magnitude of the impact they have left upon the material and moral life of human society. The larger the scope of influence of the events the greater the attention of the people drawn to them.

(...)

The Great October Revolution is the glorious victory of the theory of scientific socialism which has been achieved by the political party of the Soviet Union as a result of profound

perception, and all-sided analysis. The party of Bolsheviks was able to put into practice the epoch-making theory of the working class under the difficult and complex circumstances prevailing in Russia. Bolsheviks creatively translated into action the theory of scientific socialism under the genius leadership of Great Lenin according to the conditions of Russia. They never accepted this theory as unchangeable dogma nor did they bring any change in its political principles relying on revisionism.

With the victory of this revolutionary theory they were able to topple the regime of exploiters and oppressors in Russia and establish the most successful proletarian regime for the first time in the world and open the way for delivery of all humanity from the domination of oppressive exploiters.

The Great October Revolution has been the first revolution in the history of mankind which put into effect the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin in the world's largest country that is the Soviet Union and smashed the dreams of imperialist and capitalist theorists and dealt a fatal blow to chauvinism and narrow-minded, and reactionary nationalism. It is for this reason that we should say that the Great October Revolution has great historical importance in the world.

(...)

The honour and pride of celebrating the Great October Revolution are not confined particularly to one country or people but it is a celebration for all the revolutionaries and conscious toilers. Internationalism and the theory of Marxism and Leninism are inseparable. It was for this reason that the October Revolution was imbued from its very inception with internationalism and that the victorious waves of socialism which rose from Petrograd did not end at the Russian borders. Instead they influenced the entire world like sunrays, and its shining light became a torch for all the world revolutionary movements.

(...)

The Great October Revolution with its internationalistic character is the fullest and most comprehensive indicator of the great needs of social progress throughout the world. It is truly

the start of all the world socialist revolutions and a good support for their growth and expansion.

(...)

Today's world proletarian movement consists of socialist countries and proletarian movements of other countries of the world which continue in the path of the October Revolution and in struggle against exploitation and imperialism in order to ensure the fundamental aspirations of our era. ...

The national liberation movements of the people of the world has been changed into a strong force which along with the world proletarian movement struggles against the stronghold of imperialism and plays an important role towards the victory of the October Revolution.

Discussing the pursuance of the path of October does not mean that whatever happened as a result of the Great October Revolution in Russia would be repeated. The purpose of pursuance of the path of October is that in following the ideas of October and realising its teachings we ought to start with the path of the October Revolution for the sake of implementing the internationalist duties in the world and seek means and ways, in accordance with the specific conditions, of each country.

(...)

— Internationalism is the most important condition for the defence of peace and conscious struggle against war and the danger emanating from imperialism.

— Internationalism is a compulsory condition for building a socialist society in countries which have proletarian orders.

— Internationalism reflects the reality of solidarity of the peoples of the socialist countries, of world proletarians with national liberation movements of the peoples of the world.

— Internationalism is the most important principle in the ideological education of the peoples of all countries.

— Finally, internationalism is the vital condition for the victory of proletarians in the complete elimination of imperialism.

(...)

The Great October Revolution was different from all past



revolutions which merely replaced the political power of one exploiting class with that of another exploiting class. In human history this revolution for the first time transferred political power from the exploiting to the exploited. ...

As a result of the Great Saur Revolution, contrary to all previous political changes in Afghanistan, the government was not transferred from a stratum or group or element of the ruling class to another stratum, group or element, but from the exploiting strata and classes to the working class represented by the PDPA, the vanguard of the working class of the country, defender of all the interests of the toilers of Afghanistan.

(...)

The Great Saur Revolution triumphed in our dear country Afghanistan at a time when the feudalistic economic and social order was totally predominant and our people with the establishment of the Khalqi state left behind the feudalistic era without passing through the miserable period of capitalism, and moved forward towards building of a socialist society.

The Soviet Union, with the victory of the Great October Revolution, became a strong support and centre of gravity for all forces who were struggling against the capitalist order and the best example for organising the proletariat and ways of achieving the establishment of proletarian dictatorships in the whole capitalist world.

The victorious Saur Revolution inspired the freedom movement of peoples of those countries which have similar conditions as in Afghanistan and the establishment of a workers regime in Afghanistan and the victory of the workers' revolution are the best model for those who fight against exploitation, the tyranny of despotic feudal lords, the lackeys of imperialism and reaction in these countries and thus plays its role in this part of the world in accordance with the aspirations of the Great Lenin.

After the victory of the Great October Revolution one of the most important duties of Lenin's Party and the Soviet State was confident defence of the gains of the October Revolution. Lenin always said that in Russia the start of the revolution is far easier than defending the revolution, fulfilling its aim and building

socialism. The Soviet Union was the first and only country in which, with the victory of the socialist revolution, the proletarian dictatorship was established and was subjected to the aggression of the greatest imperialist states, directly and indirectly of all reactionary forces of the world. ... Lenin's party always educated the communists and all people of the Soviet Union with high revolutionary spirit and made them ready to defend the gains of the October Revolution.

(...)

Today in our dear country the most important duty of the PDPA and our Khalqi state is confident defence of the gains of the victorious Saur Revolution and its evolution on the basis of scientific socialism, building of a society free from exploitation of man by man and realisation of the slogan "From everybody in accordance with his talent and to everybody according to his work". We, too of course will not remain content, along with the truthful followers of the path of the Great October Revolution, with implementing this slogan and we regard it as a transition period towards achieving the final goal and move forward towards the building of a society based on the principles of "From everybody according to his talent and to everybody according to his need". ...

A while after the victory of the Great October Revolution all forces and elements connected with imperialism, the Tsar's court, reaction, royalists, the petty bourgeoisie and the Mensheviks stood against the Bolsheviks and fought in one united front with the aggressor states against the proletarian state of Soviets. ...

Today, after six months and nine days have passed since the victorious Saur Revolution, it is totally clear that all elements related to imperialism, reaction and the royal court such as the Ikhwanis, remainders of the treacherous clique of Babrak Karmal, left extremists, narrow-minded and ambitious nationalists all stand against our Party and resort to subversive activities against our Khalqi state. The leadership of all these elements, as fugitives of anti-Saur Revolution and against interests of our people have found warmth in the arms of imperialism and fire

from there against the PDPA and DRA and obstruct the path of evolution of the Saur Revolution. ...

(...)

The process of world revolution is proceeding ahead without stop.

*ADR Annual*, pp.646-663

## From a speech made at a science seminar

This speech was delivered on 2nd December 1978 at a seminar organised by the Afghanistan Ministry of Higher Education, in which UNESCO participated and to which the World Bank sent an observer. We have abridged it from the *Afghanistan Democratic Republic, Annual*.

As a loyal student of the Science Department of the generous Science College of Kabul University I have the honour to take part in the ceremonies connected with the opening of a seminar on the spreading of the rays of science and the impact of knowledge in our country in collaboration with science teachers. I expect you to criticize and improve upon what I say here after kindly assessing it, expressing your scientific views to cooperate with me and guide me at the same time.

(...)

Though the laws of the evolution of nature and society are objective and beyond the will of the people, yet ensuring the

possibilities of learning these and utilisation thereof necessarily assume a class nature as far as the development of various societies is concerned.

(...)

Science which comprises the study of reflections of nature and society in the human mind or, in other words, describes the laws that govern nature and society, during the first stage of its development has met all scientific requirements of mankind mainly in the field of production. Astronomy, mathematics and mechanics have been developed owing to the needs of irrigation, navigation and public constructions such as the pyramids, the temples and so forth. According to Engels, the origin of the evolution of science is production.

(...)

In the second stage of the development of science which coincided with the later part of the 15th century A.D. due to the evolution of production forces, the development of natural empirical sciences was accompanied with the rapid growth of social, political and philosophic studies. The main reason for this rapid growth was the building of a new society or the birth of the bourgeoisie within feudalism.

The third stage of the development of science was marked by its social role. The increasing part played by science in social life was in accord with its rapid progress. ...

(...)

According to Marx, the scientific factor was consciously developed, applied and came into being for the first time simultaneously with capitalist production, while this was not realised in the least by the previous eras.

In the 19th century, the real laws of evolution of society were discovered scientifically and the working class epoch-making ideology came into being as a result of the creativity of great world geniuses. These laws were discovered at a time when the laws of change and the conservation of energy had been discovered in connection with natural sciences and the theory of cellular living organism had been formulated and the law of the evolution of nature well organised by Darwin.

(...)

Scientific theory includes different degrees of generalisation and the wider the degree of generalisation, the closer its theory to philosophy. Therefore, the most important synthetic theory of natural sciences has a concrete philosophic nature. It must be mentioned that in social sciences, the ideological factors play the same part in the interpretation of facts as theories do whereas in the natural sciences, these factors play their parts in the philosophic interpretation of facts like theories. For this reason, the absolute opposition of science with ideology which is the nature of the contemporary bourgeois philosophy has no foundation. The bourgeois ideologists are trying to purge science from ideology because they wish to gear scientific ideology of the working class in a way to bring it completely under the influence of the bourgeois ideology.

... The various classes in society interested in the development of production apply the laws of natural sciences and technological systems in the same way.

Therefore the essential contents of these sciences do not have any class nature as class war in conjunction with natural sciences is waged when philosophic matters are raised.

Conditions are entirely different in the field of social sciences. The subject matters of these sciences directly affect the interests of various classes as the essential contents thereof have a class nature. The development of social sciences is directly related not to the growth of production forces but to the evolution of production relationships and thus to the entire system of social production.

That is why class interests greatly influence social sciences.

Mention must be made here of the social role of science which has rapidly grown during the 20th century. As the 20th century is deservedly called the age of science, the latter has also been turned into a direct production force.

In the present stage, the specific aspect of the development of science, that is the scientific and technological revolution, is the vast application of science to production. A society having the means of production in contrast to another where these belong to

individuals can be better adapted to the scientific and technological revolution.

Under the exploitative systems, owners of the means of production employ the scientific workers, trying to deepen and intensify the exploitation of the toilers through the development of science and technology, adding to the exploitation of workers and other exploited elements in order to enhance their own wealth and further impoverish the toilers.

This unpleasant fact is a good example of the matter. In Britain, the sons of coal miners were shivering from cold because the owner of the colliery had sustained losses as the coal miners by using new technology had produced too much coal to be marketed. So the workers were to be laid off. Since they received no wages to buy coal, their sons were shivering from cold. This was the impact of the development of science and technology under a capitalist system. ...

However, under the regimes that have ended the exploitation of man by man, as there exist no conflicting classes, the situation is quite the reverse. Science and technology are at the service of the toiling people. The development of the means of production leads to the prosperity of the people and the preparing of the ground for the further development of science and technology. Abundant production is the prerequisite for the application of the principle of "to each according to his work and from each according to his ability".

... The policy of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in connection with science is based on the fact that an affluent society void of exploitation of man by man is not possible without the rapid development of science and technology. We believe that the growth of production forces encourages the development of science. This is why the numerous vast efforts being made by your *Khalqi* government to rapidly develop production forces are in complete accord with its policy on science. We do not want science merely as a means of development of technology but regard it with a working class attitude and its philosophic basis.

... We expect our people to look at the world from a

scientific attitude, destroy superstitions and the enemies of social progress through it.

(...)

The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the vanguard of the working class in the country which with the ingenious creativity and initiative of our great and honourable leader, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister, Comrade Noor Mohammad Tarakki, has been established according to progressive working class ideology. On the basis of the nature of this scientific ideology, it attaches a special attention to the growth and development of science and technology in the country...

(...)

One of the best ways of serving the people and the homeland is to utilise the best mental talents for the development of science and the intensification of the class struggle, the growth of production forces, participation of toilers in the building of the country and in shaping their own destinies.

*ADR, Annual, pp.664-675*



## From a speech made at a seminar on education

This speech was made on 12 December 1978 at a seminar on the education system in Afghanistan. We have abridged it from the *Afghanistan Democratic Republic, Annual*.

I have the honour of 20 years of service in the field of education and first of all I have the honour to see today a good number of the struggling members and remarkable party and state cadres including some members of the Politburo of the PDPA CC, and Council of Ministers who have been by pupils. ...

All the experiences of social life and the continuing class struggles make every sensitive individual aware that education and training is a very difficult, continuing and responsible task. ... It affects all the existence of man and places the pages of his life history before the young and future generation for judgement. It is for this reason that during the historical eras the best minds of world geniuses have been drawn towards the training affairs of the young generation. And the highest personalities who have been honoured in the course of history have always reflected the

various aspects of pedagogic and the philosophical attitude of knowledge.

In ancient Greece the famous philosophers such as Democritus, Plato, Aristotle and the like regarded the problems of the theory of knowledge and pedagogy as part of philosophy.

...  
 In the recent centuries Descartes, Bacon, Locke, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Feuerbach, Herzen, Chernishevsky, and other philosophers also made great contributions to the theory of knowledge and pedagogy.

(...)

Philosophical analyses have had and are having different aspects from the start of the period of slavery up to the zenith of capitalism, that is, its imperialistic stage.

The great leader of the world workers says: "The ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind and translated into forms of thought."

Therefore, in different eras of history philosophical thoughts have been a reflection of the method of production and of its social relations. ...

The belief in the inadequacy of man to perceive realities which remarkably developed during the slavery period also existed during feudalism, capitalism and its imperialistic stage. Agnosticism, that is, denying the possibility of knowing the world, was a dominant concept in the philosophy of education until the middle of the nineteenth century. ...

During the 18th century the British philosopher David Hume said that all the knowledge of man was not knowledge in its nature. ...

Kant, another philosopher of an exploiting regime, considered knowledge as separate from the actual world. ...

During the 19th and 20th centuries Agnosticism has preserved its stand specially in the philosophy of positivism and pragmatism on which in education the bourgeoisie relies.

In progressive thinking, the outside world is actually definite which is felt through our senses. In the reactionary thinking the sense is actually definite and the outside world is

considered a composition of senses. From the Agnostic point of view in the first stage there exists sense but it does not accept the perception of the outside world through senses. ...

In the mid-19th century the growth of new progressive philosophy defeated the school of philosophy which denies the ability of man to perceive the objective reality. The growth of this progressive philosophy in the 20th century had a vast impact on the equipment of the toilers with liberating theoretical arms. ...

The theory of knowledge is indebted to leaders of world workers in that they extended progressive dialectics to the realm of knowledge and introduced action in the theory of knowledge as the basis and criteria of real knowledge and as such they put an end to the isolation and separation of the world's objective laws from the laws of thinking.

Sense and wisdom are two basic elements of learning. But in the process of perception we can distinguish different levels which are qualitatively different in separate stages of totality of learning as far as depth and sequence go. For this reason we face two levels, practical and theoretical. The practical level is that level of learning the constant of which is attained from experience, observation and experiment and is subject to a definite quantity of rational action which is done in a definite time.

Theoretical learning is different from practical learning in level. On the theoretical level, matter is reflected in its internal relations and in accordance with definite laws... It is discovered not only by experience but by concrete thinking.

The levels of practical and theoretical learning have close relations with each other. Theoretical structure is obtained from dissemination of knowledge obtained previously including that achieved through observation and experience. Of course this does not mean that all theories are directly created from experiences. Some of them choose the existing concepts and theories as their starting points.

The level of learning is not only determined by means through which it is obtained but also from the manner in which matter is reflected. It is for this reason that learning is classified

as abstract and concrete.

Fundamentally, knowledge seeks to be definite, multi-sided and cover the matter as a whole. But practical knowledge consists of only outside relations. Therefore, due to this definitiveness knowledge cannot imagine the thing in its profound and deep relations neither can it understand its real entity. For promotion to a higher level of definitiveness first matter or matters should be looked at from a particular angle and its aspects should be understood through abstract thinking.

...

(...)

Action is the best criterion of fact. It reflects truth or falsehood of knowledge. Action is the active work of the people done for changing nature and society. The basic function of action is material production. Action also covers the political side of life, class struggles, liberation movement and practical experiences. Action in its character is a social phenomenon. Action is not the activity of isolated individuals but it is the activity of all toilers, and producers of material wealth.

(...)

The social life of man is extremely complicated.

Until the second half of the 19th century people thought that social forces blindly played with their destinies. Although a great number of thinkers talked of the lawfulness of history there was no scientific theory. It was said that society was not governed by any law. Some said that people were governed by a supernatural power and they were not aware of the laws of evolution of society or just denied them.

Others imagined that history was the product of the activities of kings, clergy, outstanding military leaders, champions and, learned men, etc. All these views and ideas were unscientific.

All these ideas and concepts considered the evolution of society a product of supernatural power or the will of private individuals and they charged the large masses of the toiling people with inactiveness and blind obedience.

In the middle of the 19th century the leaders of world workers

were the first geniuses who proved that society would evolve according to objective conditions free of the will of man and they realised the role of workers in history. They devoted all their talent, energy and life to the aspirations of workers and their training. In this way the scientific theory of social evolution, the ideology of the proletariat came into existence. A leader of the world workers describing the leaders of the world workers has said: "They taught the working class to know itself, and be conscious of itself and they substituted science for dreams."

The leaders of the world workers formulated their most important law as follows: during all historical eras the method of production of material wealth constituted the basis of the existence and evolution of human society. The leader of the world workers said: "The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general."

People are the basis and most important element of production. They have work experience, work skills and knowledge and they produce work tools. A machine, however perfect it may be, is made by man and it is man who puts it into operation. The leader of the world workers said: "The primary productive force of human society as a whole, are the workers, the working people." The means of production together with the people who use them constitute the productive forces of human society.

(...)

Production relations reflect the objective material relations existing free of human consciousness and they are formed between people in the process of social production, exchange and distribution of material wealth. The basis of production relations is the ownership of the means of production. The leader of the world workers with regard to relations between people and the production process says: "In order to produce, they (people — H.A.) enter into definite connections and relations with one another and only within these social connections and relations does their action on nature, does production, take place."

The method of production including the productive forces

and production relations are the requirements of life which can be determined historically. The society, ideas and political thoughts and institutions governing it are connected with the method of production. If the method of production is changed all the social system will change accordingly. ...

As one of the most effective social institutions, education has close relations with the method of production in each society. In the exploitative regimes the special attention of the exploiting ideologists and the ruling headquarters is drawn towards the system of education and they try to maintain capitalism as the inevitable, highest socio-economic system. They present the need for domination of an exploiting minority over the industrious majority as an unchangeable reality. ...

(...)

In revolutionary proletarian regimes love and affection, profound scientific treatment, objectivity and truthfulness, attention, and organisation constitute the important principles of education. The fundamental demand is to be explicit in work with the people and one should not conceal problems and shortcomings from the people. As the leader of the world workers has written "I must say at this point that our propaganda and agitation must be open and above-board."

(...)

... The General Secretary of the PDPA CC, this great teacher of the people, workers and other toilers of Afghanistan used to tell us that: whenever you take a new born in your arm, whisper in his ear the class struggle while performing the traditional services. This meaningful expression is the best demonstration of the need of rapid dissemination of the epoch-making ideology of the working class in our country. ...

Prior to the great Saur Revolution our country was in the clutches of despotism and tyranny of the treacherous Yahya dynasty. The treacherous Nader-Daoud family reigned over our toiling people for about fifty years.

(...)

With the victory of the great Saur Revolution power was transferred to the working class represented by the PDPA, the

vanguard of the working class of the country, which defends the interests of all the industrious people of the country and enjoys their support as well. ...

Prior to the Saur Revolution the treacherous Nader-Daoud family governed the country, as far as possible, by a policy of continuation of the feudalistic regime and its expansion to capitalism, confined to the compradors and devoted servants of imperialism, in the longest period of time possible, by creation of discord, between the toilers of Afghanistan and by a hostile attitude towards the enemies of imperialism and collaboration with its followers. ... The Nader-Daoud treacherous dynasty which was anti-national in its character spread national, local, regional and racial prejudices and the like among our industrious people. ...

... This treacherous ruling dynasty which refrained from no treacherous acts in the history of the country and made vast dealings with foreigners, clearly suppressed the clean patriotic feelings of our toilers. It beastly encountered with the patriots and first of all with the *Khalqis*. For instance, it put to jail thousands of the members of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan including members of the Central Committee, remarkable cadres and honest members and imprisoned tens of thousands of *Khalqis* ...

*ADR, Annual, pp.676-694*

## From a speech made on the 14th Anniversary of the PDPA's First Congress

This speech was made on 1st January 1979 at a meeting to mark the 14th anniversary of the founding congress of the PDPA. We have abridged it from the *Afghanistan Democratic Republic, Annual*.

I have the honour to attend one of the best and most prideful grand ceremonies of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the vanguard of the working class, that is the ceremony of the celebration of the 14th anniversary of the founding Congress of my prideful party. On the occasion of this historic day in the world revolutionary proletarian movement, I present the most sincere Khalqi congratulations to the founder of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Comrade Noor Mohammad Tarakki, General Secretary of PDPA CC, President of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan who has been the most prideful leader of the party since its establishment and its first Congress until now and led it as its General Secretary of the PDPA CC, members of the Politburo and CC of PDPA, cadres and



struggling ranks gallant, noble workers and other toilers.

The 14 years of struggle of this party carried on under the creative leadership of its great leader and the role of the Central Committee and members of its ranks with *Khalqi* tactics have all added to the enrichment of the epoch-making ideology of the working class and its scientific tactics which have been the source of inspiration for the world workers and the industrious people of the developing countries and can be best example after the Great October Revolution.

For an objective and scientific description of these facts we study them periodically in the light of the scientific theory of the working class when opportunity is made available. ...

Here I would like to discuss the following points: Politics, state, party, revolution.

Politics reflects class struggle and is brought about with the division of the society into hostile classes in the sense that in society with hostile classes the different interests of classes emerge, which cause politics to come into existence.

Therefore politics is a link between the classes of a society and exists only as long as there are classes.

But all the relations existing between elements related to different classes or between the classes themselves are not politics. For instance, the relation existing between a peasant and the landlord for whom he is busily working, is not politics though it is an exploitative relation.

(...)

Economic relations evolve into political relations when a peasant or a group of peasants struggles against the landlord not as his lord, against feudalism, against the feudalistic system and stands against all the feudal class and feudal state. Similarly, the struggle of a worker or group of anti-capitalist workers ... for increase in their wages is not politics. But struggle against capitalism and the domination of the capitalist class is politics. Therefore, the following two factors play an important role in identifying politics in relations between different classes.

First, the basic interests of a class can be explained in politics in their fullest and most profound form. For instance, for

workers the most profitable sale of their work power is not the most important thing but the most basic aim of the worker is the elimination of the slavery of the wage system which is expressed in political struggle. ...

Second, politics is a link between the classes which is formed in the minds of the people. For instance the uprising and battles of peasants, the national liberation struggles of the oppressed peoples and proletarian revolutions carry the wishes of the people for bringing social and national oppression to an end. It is for this reason that politics, contrary to economics, is a part of the superstructure of society.

... Politics not only reflects economics but also expresses its nature. In this regard the leader of the world workers has rightly said that, "Politics is the crystallised and concentrated expression of economics". But politics covers something more than economic issues.

In a class society all social relations, revolution, and reaction, war and peace, peoples' and nations' relations, ideological clashes and the like are linked with politics in one way or another. As such, politics are the active factor of social life. Classes and different social groups are carrying out their activities through various institutions and organisations such as political parties, press, radio, television and the like. The policy of the ruling class is first of all carried out by the state and is opposed by the opposing classes. State and political parties are placed together in the center of the political struggle.

A number of bourgeois ideologists and anarchist thinkers and petty bourgeois revolutionaries boil down politics to oppression which is a great mistake. There is a great number of political forms and methods of domination. Of course it is obvious that no ruling class can totally abandon oppression in carrying out its dictatorship. But oppression is not the only form for achieving the end. The force which in relation to revolutionary classes wants to create a new society is different from the reactionary force which wants to destroy new thing. Force is therefore determined by economics. Politics can have a great role when it is based on economics. Politics based against

historical laws will result in failure. Force is also realised through the state.

The state is the product of the internal evolution of society. ... It has not always existed. In primitive society where there was no private ownership or classes, there was no state and its further evolution was connected with the intensive class struggle. The state which is the product of class society will wither away with the elimination of classes and that also takes place in the highest classless society.

In a society where there are hostile classes, the state is a political tool. As the leader of the world workers says: "The state is the machinery of safeguarding the domination of one class over the other class", the state is means of suppressing the oppressed and exploited for those classes which are economically dominant and own the means of production. The state, which has a clear class character is the basic part of a superstructure on an economic base. It will employ all means to support and strengthen this base.

The existence of public power is a reason for the existence of the state. It represents not the interests of all the population but the interests of that class which is economically dominant and is based on the power of the armed forces, army and sarandoy so that it could resist against the public power.

The state in every exploitative slavery, feudalist and capitalist society has the duty to safeguard the interests of the ruling class within the country against other classes and outside the country against other countries. Therefore, every state has two duties, internal and external. The internal duty is the main duty of the state which determines all the foreign affairs and it is thus rightly said that the foreign policy of a country is the extension of its domestic policy.

States also differ from each other in accordance with the classes they serve and the economic foundation they are based on. Of the four types of states which are known to the history such as slavery, feudalist, capitalist, and socialist, the socialist state contrary to the first three types which defend the interests of the exploiters is the new type of real Khalqi state.

The proletarian dictatorship or the state of workers in its real sense is a state existing during the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. ... Lenin says: "The proletariat proceeds through dictatorship, without that they cannot forge ahead because the resistance of the capitalist exploiters cannot be broken by other persons or through any other way."

It is also clear that proletarian dictatorship cannot be possible without the workers' party equipped with the scientific ideology of the working class. A party is a part, a sector or an institution of a special class of society which unites the entire class. But it merely unites the most active elements of the class who lead their class struggle and defend their class interests.

(...)

Some of the non-proletarian parties are working with definite anti-reactionary policies and endeavour to improve the lot of their people. But only one party continually defends the interests of the working class and other toilers and that is the party of the working class equipped with the epoch making ideology. This party is generally the advanced and highly organised section of the working class which expounds its vital interests and is equipped with the scientific revolutionary ideology.

This party leads the struggle of the working class for the purpose of toppling the power of the exploiters, and for the consolidation and strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship and construction of a society void of exploitation of man by man, and free of classes.

Revolution is a qualitative and radical change in the life of a society. Lenin says: Every revolution brings about enormous and immediate changes in the life of the masses, of the people. For the victory of a revolution the existence of objective conditions in addition to the material circumstances is a must. These objective conditions comprise a profound crisis among the upper classes, the unusual intensification of demands and the deprivations of the oppressed and extensive attraction of the people towards an independent historical act.

The great Lenin has said: The total of all these objective

conditions is called a revolutionary situation.

With a social revolution the social and economic formation of a society is changed into another social and economic formation. The change from one social-economic and exploitative formation to another social-economic and exploitative formation of society, inevitably takes place as a result of the evolution of production powers. But a socialist revolution is a radical change of the social-economic and exploitative formation into a social-economic formation void of the exploitation of man by man, that is socialism.

Socialist revolution is not possible without the creation of revolutionary conditions and conscious struggle of the proletarian party equipped with the ideology of the working class ... led by its revolutionary leader.

Now in the light of the above scientific and philosophical facts we cast a short glance at the historical events of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan shortly before the great Saur Revolution. ...

In the course of the history of Afghanistan our brave people carried out a lot of struggle full of sacrifices against the tyranny of colonialism and imperialism. ...

The people of Afghanistan some times have carried out these heroic struggles clandestinely some times openly, sometimes with organised attacks, sometimes in the form of sporadic strikes, and sometimes in regular form, and sometimes in irregular form.

But the struggles of our sacrificing people were never steered by a party representing a special class until the fifth decade of the 20th century and even until then the word "party", was never used in its real sense in the history of their struggles.

At the end of the fifth decade and early sixth of the 20th century, for the first time the scientific concept of party was used in the political literature of our country, in which our great Noor Mohammad Taraki had the major role.

(...)

It was at this time that the concept of politics evolved in its real sense because struggles against the ruling circles in the

country and against the leadership of the ruling classes were growing, and our people consciously took increasing part in these struggles for the sake of rescuing themselves from the feudal oppressive rulers.

It was at this time that politics attracted public attention as a link between the different classes of the country. ...

At the end of the sixth and early seventh decade of the 20th century Comrade Noor Mohammad Tarakki, due to his profound understanding of the Afghan society and his full mastery of the ideology of the working class introduced special initiatives in this creative theory in the sense that feudalism was dominant in Afghanistan and with the relative growth of the productive forces and the existence of the small number of workers in the country, our great leader began to think of the application of the general laws of the scientific theory of working class with due consideration to the special characteristics of our society.

At this time when the role of the working class in the passage from capitalism to socialism could not be discussed, Comrade Noor Mohammad Tarakki founded the party of workers, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. ...

If we think realistically the perception of Noor Mohammad Tarakki was a source of inspiration to all the peoples of the world having almost similar conditions as Afghanistan. Noor Mohammad Tarakki realised that even under feudalistic circumstances it was possible to struggle against the exploitative regime with the workers' party of the country. He reacted against the suppressing conditions of the monarchy in such a manner that he made available the possibility of the meeting of the first congress of the new type party of the working class and held the first meeting of the founding Congress of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan in his residence at Karta-i-Char, Kabul, on Jaddi 11, 1343 corresponding to January 1, 1965.

(...)

Our distinguished Comrade had the decisive role in determining the name of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan due to its proletarian nature. Following the meeting of the congress our great leader Comrade Noor Mohammad

Tarakki used to stress on the following three points:

- Further intensification of class struggle.
- Further dissemination of the scientific theory of the working class.
- Emphasis on the popularisation of the philosophical section of the scientific theory of the working class.

The victorious experiences of our party proved the truth of the emphasis placed by our leader on the above three points and it is for this reason that they are now proved and applicable today all over countries having similar conditions of Afghanistan.

(...)

As our great leader was focusing his attention on the intensification of class struggles throughout Afghanistan, within the party he also used to profoundly take into account the reflections of the class nature and the social relations and he did not prepare any ground for the party to be placed at the service of the ruling circles.

(...)

Our great Comrade attached great importance and value to the role of the party in the revolutionary class struggles. He did not confine the role of the party to self movement of the masses. He believed that with the help of proper class struggle of the party, the support of the toiling people of Afghanistan could be attracted. He knew that self movement was budding in the country, thus the revolution would lag behind, if the party waited for it to develop and then lead it. ...

Our distinguished comrade was leading the party. Since the start of the struggle of the prideful party he strongly emphasised the struggles of the working class for the sake of proletarian dictatorship. With due attention to the prevailing situation of our society he did not believe in giving the leadership of the democratic movement to any of the non-proletarian classes and at the start of his party struggles he was interested in the leadership of the working class to be represented by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. ...

I draw the attention of all of you comrades and fighting friends to the fact that in all the revolutionary struggles of the

working class it is clear that the party of the workers led the revolutionary movement of the people. But our great revolutionary comrade with the perception of this revolutionary principle did not believe in waiting for the growth of the self-movement of the people so that it would be led by the party. Instead he believed that the party should attract the active and practical support of the people. Until the party starts its revolution it should be trusted by the people and in that case it would stage revolution and would be protected and supported by the people. ...

(...)

Our great leader always put together different forms of struggles. He never gave way to the possibility of the development of an attitude of submission in the party. He always controlled every form of adventurism in the party. He always studied issues dialectically.

He did not agree with guerrilla warfare for the purpose of revolution, ... in the conditions faced by Afghanistan.

He used to say that due to the historical precedence of dark reaction and its solidarity with imperialism, with guerrilla warfare the political power will be lost midway. This did not mean that he believed only in peaceful struggle. But he used to say that the party should be equipped in such a way so that the revolution is launched in the day light and triumphs transferring political power directly to the proletariat, ... and so it happened during the Saur Revolution.

The darlings of the courtiers and aristocracy profoundly opposed this policy of our great leader within the party. They separated from the party and launched a severe struggle against our great leader and our prideful party, enjoying the full support of the monarchy.

As the thesis of our great leader was in full consonance with the conditions of a country like Afghanistan, all desperate attempts of the sons of courtiers of Nader-Daoud ended in vain.

(...)

Our dear leader was deeply interested in the solid discipline of the People's Democratic Party, the vanguard of the working



class in the country, and had high regard for democratic centralism. Our esteemed Comrade was himself a pivot of attraction among the people ... Just as Mayakovsky used to say about V. I. Lenin: Lenin and party are body and soul.

(...)

This laconic statement shows the highest centralisation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which was concentrated around its great leader, and with this strong and energetic discipline was able to steer successfully the great October Revolution and to defend its gains. We too as true followers of our great leader in the victory of the great Saur Revolution and in defence of its gains, will remain united and always gather around our prideful leader, and with regard to party discipline say:

Party and Tarakki are body and soul,

Can body be separated from soul?

When we speak of party, we speak of Tarakki,

When we speak of Tarakki, we speak of party.

That is the great leader of the world proletariat and this is the great leader of the toiling people of Afghanistan. The two great leaders led two great proletarian revolutions which from the onset were proletarian revolutions in the history of mankind, and transferred the political power with their victory to the workers. That one was the Great Socialist October Revolution and this one is the great Khalqi Saur Revolution. The Great October Revolution shook the whole world, but the great Saur Revolution has set into motion this region of Asia.

With the October Revolution 14 imperialist and reactionary countries of the world joined against the October Revolution. Today too, the greatest imperialist powers, left and right extremists have joined hands in hatching conspiracies against the Saur Revolution. They staged armed interference in the land of Soviets against the great October Revolution because the Soviet Union did not have a friend like herself, and did not have any socialist regime in its neighbourhood. But today similar military interference of aggressors is impossible in the land of the Saur Revolution because it has a friend since sixty years, like the

great country of Soviets, and enjoys the support of the proletarian regimes and all workers and toilers of the world.

The Great October Revolution is supported by all the workers of the world and is a victorious source of inspiration of proletarian internationalism and the world workers' movement.

The support for the Saur Revolution by the toilers for this region does not recognise any borders. They defend it, keeping in view the socio-economic orders of their countries, with correctness and principles of the triumphant Saur Revolution and also with a sense of class brotherhood and solidarity.

The great leader of the socialist country where the October revolution took place declared the peace decree for the first time, and showed a logical link between domestic and foreign policy. The great leader of the Saur Revolution also, after signing of the Treaty of Friendship and Good Neighbourliness between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union declared to more than 100 envoys of foreign countries that today we have signed an agreement whose objective is not aggression against any country. But its lofty aim is to defend world peace. Only enemies of peace shed tears on it.

Thus the foreign policy of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is the continuation of its domestic policy which vehemently opposes any kind of aggression and interference in the internal affairs of others. With the Soviet Union we have the highest friendship, brotherhood, good-neighbourliness, based on respect for national sovereignty and independence of each other and also non-interference in the internal affairs of each other, and our mutual confidence is the result of sixty years of maturity. ...

(...)

It is once again declared that our Khalqi state, in line with the manifesto of the PDPA and high objectives of the Saur Revolution, is in the service of the people, and enjoys their support. If our enemies had miniscule sense of patriotism and if they had at least the least human conscience they should criticise and point to defects in our character, words and our plans. If they had the human moral heroism they would not have planned their

strategy of struggle against us through deceiving the people. They would not have told lies to the people and would not have accused us. We declare to all interested in dear Afghanistan, to all friends and enemies of the Saur Revolution and Khalqi state and also challenge them to come forward and point out defects in our character, in our words.

We rely on the awareness of the people and not on deceiving and gulling them. We hope that our people will be more aware of their destiny and continue their categorical and direct role in its determination. It is the pseudo-Muslims who do not believe even in the Holy Islamic religion also, although they claim to do so; they flout its lofty objectives and are in the service of the enemies of our hardworking people.

Our people today own their country, atmosphere, the earth and the sky, in brief all that belongs to dear Afghanistan belongs to our toiling people.

*ADR Annual, pp.695-711*

From a speech made at the opening ceremony  
of the Academy of Sciences of Afghanistan

This speech was made at the opening of the Academy on 21st February 1979. We have abridged it from the *ADR Annual*.

(...)

As the Academy of Sciences is the most responsible organisation for creative analysis and research in Afghanistan, I would like to raise a few issues relating to the Saur Revolution with the scholars of our beloved country and other scholars of the friendly and fraternal countries of the world on this inaugural day. I am looking forward to the distinguished scholars to deal with the points critically and with deep insight.

It should also be pointed out that our pride in the victory of the great Saur Revolution is because it is a proletarian and Khalqi revolution which has triumphed in accordance with the epoch-making ideology of the working class and the laws of science related to the construction of the society void of exploitation of man by man.

As use of knowledge and science is imbued with class character I start with some concepts of the theory of glorious

class struggle. In this discussion I touch upon the following topics:

Class and class struggle.

Superstructure and infrastructure.

Social psychology and ideology.

Division of society into classes: The most basic and profound division of a society takes place on the basis of the role of private ownership of the means of production. Though a society may be divided into groups on the basis of occupation, private ownership, education, political thoughts etc., in the final analysis all these divisions are the derivatives of the first and basic division of society into classes.

Classes are groups of people who are first of all historically determined by their position in the production system.

(...)

Classes also differ from each other in terms of the amount and sources of income but they cannot give the full characteristics of the classes.

The best definition to cover all the aspects of the classes has been given by Lenin as follows:

Classes are large groups of people who differ from one another on the basis of their position determined historically through social production by their relation, in most cases fixed and formulated in the law, with the means of production, by their roles in organising social work and finally by the dimension of the social wealth they share and the mode it is earned.

The class divisions based on the economic system of a society are also reflected in the political system and moral life. There exist material and social ties between classes. The classes are linked with one another through definite economic relations. The total of these relations makes the class structure of the society and constitutes the material and economic foundation of the class struggle. Nevertheless, relations between classes are not limited to the economic area but they express themselves also in political life. Finally, relations between classes and class struggle in the arena of ideology is manifested in the moral life of the society.

In society with antagonistic classes the basic classes are those without whose existence the dominant mode of production cannot continue. The basic antagonisms of a definite mode of production are demonstrated in the relations and struggle between these classes.

Class struggle begins with the opposing social position and antagonistic interests of various classes.

Class interest is determined not only by the awareness of the class but by the stand and its role in the social production system. As proletarians are deprived of the ownership of the means of production and are subject to the exploitation of capitalists they benefit from the elimination of imperialism and thus they are a revolutionary class.

(...)

The moving force behind the evolution of a class society is the class struggle, serving as the evolutionary source of the struggle among the conflicting forces and trends. This dialectic law is realised in class society through class struggle.

According to Karl Marx the invention of the automobile and the use of machinery in Britain since 1825 were merely the result of the struggle between the workers and the employers.

But this theory that the class struggle constitutes the moving force behind the evolution of the class society does not mean that production forces form the only cause of evolution.

Lenin says ... the real moving force of history is the revolutionary class struggle. According to the theory of bourgeois philosophers, the moving force behind progress is unity among all elements of society which realise its definite shortcomings and institutions. The first theory is materialist, the second idealist. The first is revolutionary and the second reformist. The first serves the proletarian tactics in contemporary capitalist countries as a cornerstone, the second is used as the foundation of bourgeois tactics.

The proletariat carries out the anti-capitalist struggles in three main forms, namely, economic, political and ideological.

The economic struggle is, historically, the first form of the proletarian class struggle. In all countries began the workers'

struggle for defending their daily, immediate economic interests. The economic struggle to meet their daily needs is of vital importance to the working class. However, it does not rescue it from exploitation and insecurity. In order to eliminate the exploitation of man by man, there should occur the proletarian political struggle.

The political struggle greatly influences the struggle in the economic field. In their anti-socialist struggle, it is characteristic of fear lest the proletarian revolutionary movement evolve into a powerful revolutionary force. The existence of a global socialist system and the victories scored by the socialist countries have greatly augmented the strength of the proletariat in capitalist nations.

From the historical viewpoint, the political struggle has evolved after the economic one but the former enjoys priority over the latter due to its importance. And it is a higher form of class struggle owing to the following reasons:

1. In the economic class struggle, action against the exploiters may be confined to separate units of workers while in the political struggle, workers and capitalists are organised against each other as identified classes.

2. In the economic struggle, workers defend their daily immediate interests and sometimes those of their separate groups but in the political struggle, they defend the general basic class interests.

3. In the economic struggle, workers realise only their narrow-minded professional interests but in the political one, led by the new type working class party, the working class acquires the real class-political consciousness of the proletariat, realising their general and basic class interests and their historical mission.

4. The economic struggle provides the proletariat with a political organisation in the form of labour unions but the political struggle calls for the creation of a political working class party, the highest form of proletarian class organisation.

The ideological struggle is the most important form of proletarian class struggle. In order to prepare the working class for economic struggle, particularly the vast political struggle, they should be made aware of basic class interests. The epoch-making proletarian theory gives such awareness to the workers.

The most definite form of class struggle is seen in the conflict among political parties. The parties differ from classes as follows:

1. A party does not embrace the whole class but only a part thereof represents its own class. The very word "party" in Latin means one part.

2. Parties are the result of the conscious solidarity of the most active and advanced representatives of one class on the basis of definite thoughts and objectives while classes are brought about as a result of the economic evolution of society. Therefore, the party is created after the organisation of the class.

The class struggle reveals the real face of each party. Lenin says, the division of each society into various political parties becomes more manifest at times when a profound crisis shakes all countries. Verbosity about all things frail and alien is swept away through the intensification of struggle. The parties ... appeal to the masses. And the latter, guided by their unerring instinct and enlightened through open struggle, follow the parties that represent the interests of a particular class.

The infra and the super-structures are concepts of scientific sociology which reveal the ties among economic, social and other relationships in a given society.

Scientific sociology gives prominence to material economic relationships among all various social relationships, as the main and determining ones. The sum total of these relationships form the economic infrastructure of society. ...

The super-structure comprises ideas and organisations, and the super-structural institutions consist of three groups of social



phenomena.

1. Social ideas, moods, social sentiments which form social ideology or psychology.
2. The various state organisations and institutions, courts, temples, and the likes.
3. The super-structural ideological relationships.

The super-structure above all is the sum total of social ideas and theories. In a class society, the ideas of the ruling class reflect the society's economic system, serving as a weapon in the struggle for its protection, diffusing among all classes and strata of society its social, political, legal, religious views, etc. According to the premier leaders of the world proletariat, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, the ideas of the ruling class are the ruling ideas in society. They also say, the class constituting the dominant material force in society is at the same time the ruling enlightening force.

However, ideas, views and theories form part of the super-structure which not only embraces political, legal, philosophical and aesthetic views in society but also certain institutions as well. These views in a class society are related to the entire system of its socio-political organisations. When one super-structure is transformed into another, a change naturally occurs not only in its social views but also in its related institutions.

In addition, social ideas and institutions include human activities and the relationships emanating from the latter take place under the influence of certain ideas, institutions and organisations. Thus the forms and political ways of class struggle, the moral and legal relationships of the people, etc., are included in the field of super-structural social relationships.

These relationships like ideas and institutions related to them reflect the economic infra-structure and are determined by it. In this manner, the super-structure constitutes the unity of social views and institutions of a given society guiding the ideological activities and relationships.

Changes in the super-structure are particularly profound. When an economic infra-structure replaces another as a result of a social revolution, a new state machinery, political system and

legal institutions are created instead of the old ones. Social consciousness changes. Old ideas are replaced by new ones which are related to the new infra-structure. Lenin says, the old super-structure crumbles down and a new one is created through the independent action of a variety of social forces.

The main laws of the relationship between the infra and the super-structure are expressed through the following principles:

The infra-structure causes the creation of the super-structure, the latter evolving on a given infra-structure while the characteristics of the infra-structure determine the main features of the super-structure.

The super-structure is rather independent in its evolution.

After a particular form of super-structure is brought about as a result of economic conditions, as a rule, it does not immediately reflect the changes instituted in the infra-structure... When a super-structure is brought about, the logic creates evolution for itself and in each stage reflects changes in the infra-structure.

The sum total of sentiments, emotions, habits, thoughts, dreams, intentional tendencies and other common popular traits emanate from those socio-economic conditions under which they exist and constitute social psychology. ... For instance, the working class psychology exudes the feelings of collectivism and class solidarity while the bourgeois psychology is characterised by individualism and making money.

The social psychology does not include the generalized form of opinions and beliefs but emerges in judgements, emotions, sentiments, moods, voluntary actions, etc. From this viewpoint, social psychology is part of the popular consciousness and far-reaching as sentiments are concerned. Ordinary consciousness not only shows a reflection of ordinary conditions but also the results of scientific observation of nature by man in his daily life and the knowledge and skills he acquires in the process of his work, etc., whereas social psychology is part of ordinary consciousness which forms directly in the process of daily and collective activity of the people.

A man with an ordinary consciousness judges the concepts

he uses according to logical laws and forms. But he thinks in terms of primitive concepts at this level as these do not help him to go beyond the limits of his proximate personal experiences and environment. The ordinary consciousness takes shape spontaneously ... and is the product of popular immediate concepts of the surrounding world.

The term "social psychology" is applied to that section of science which is concerned with the study of the psychology of society. The main duty of social psychology according to Marxism-Leninism is the analysis of the characteristics of the socio-economic objective factors of the laws concerning the formation of social sentiments, moods, incentives and other mental processes. Social psychology constituted a special section of sociology toward the end of the 19th century. In capitalist countries like the United States, social psychology was much developed. Despite the divergence of views among the various defenders of social psychology schools in capitalist nations, all of them suffer from a common shortcoming as far as idealism and metaphysics are concerned. They overlook the decisive part played by production relationships in society and give priority to psychological factors in social evolution.

Ideology is a system of political, legal, moral, aesthetic, religious, philosophic views and ideas and the like. It is part of the super-structure and in the final analysis reflects economic relationships. In a society with conflicting classes, ideological struggle belongs to class struggle. The scientific and non-scientific ideology can be the correct or incorrect reflection of reality. The interests of reactionary classes can nourish incorrect ideology. The progressive revolutionary class interests help the formation of scientific ideology. Marxism-Leninism is indeed a scientific ideology which describes the vital interests of the working class and the large majority of humanity making efforts for the sake of peace, freedom and social progress.

The evolution of ideology is determined through economy. Lenin says, as human knowledge reflects nature which is an evolutionary matter existing independently of him, in the like manner social knowledge about mankind, that is his views and

doctrines — philosophic, religious, political, etc., reflect the economic system of society. However, ideology is rather independent. This is made clear by the fact that ideological growth is indirectly affected by a number of non-economic factors such as the internal continuity in the ideological evolution, the personal part played by individual ideologies, the overall influence of various forms of ideology, etc.

Ideology is the system of views and ideas which reflects directly or indirectly the socio-economic characteristics of society, the stand, interests and objectives of a given social class and has been formulated for the sake of protecting or changing the existing social structure.

Ideology appeals to the consciousness of a class as a law formulated by its theoreticians and ideologues. It sprouts from the general psychology but cannot be accepted as a psychological concentration, though related to social psychology.

The psychology of a class and its ideology have common social roots. ...

The ruling exploiting class uses national sentiments to suppress the class consciousness of the exploited, capitalising on patriotism — the sentiment which has been hammered on the masses in various countries in the course of history against the interests of the people.

The significance of the epoch-making working class ideology lies here. This develops the class consciousness of the revolutionary class, protects it from degeneration through individualism, showing it the proletarian thoughts of collectivism, internationalism and popular patriotism.

In the course of class struggle and later due to profound social changes and a great rise in the historical creativity of the people, development of culture and diffusion of the epoch-making working class ideology, there occurs a profound change in the toilers' psychology, the remnants of private ownership and nationalist ideology and psychology are done away with and superstitious overcome.

This ideology is closely related to social psychology and

where there is no class with a given psychology, its ideology is also non-existent. Each ideology is the product of definite social relationships and a reflection of nature and its basic existence. But each ideology does not necessarily feel scientifically the social relationships or correctly reflect nature. The more revolutionary the social class, the more scientific and revolutionary its ideology. A revolutionary class like the proletariat has a scientific ideology, the working class epoch-making ideology.

(...)

Political ideology like another form of social consciousness is above all a definite social entity, reflecting a definite system of production relationships. Contrary to other forms of social consciousness, political ideology reflects the social entity and position of a class as fast as possible and in the most profound manner. This especially lies in the fact that the political ideology of each class registers clearly the objectives of this class, its interests and the ways which are used for the protection of these interests and achieving of objectives.

(...)

With your interest, support, correction and scientific changes, we will be able to continue this series of scrutiny and research and fulfil as much as possible our common responsibility toward the evolution and further enrichment of the epoch-making working class theory.

*ADR Annual*, pp. 712-737

## Khalqi Message

This speech, is the first speech by Amin after the death of Tarakki. It was broadcast over radio and television on 17th September 1979. The speech was published by the DRA Ministry of Information and Culture Publications Department as a separate pamphlet entitled "Hafizullah Amin's Khalqi Message". We are presenting it as published in the pamphlet.

In the name of God, the Merciful and Compassionate.

Valorous compatriots.

Thanks that the general laws of evolution of society are objective and the direction of process of history does not change by the will of individuals, otherwise the oppressions and selfishness of those who lean on the throne of power would have devoured the outcome of others' endeavours and played with the pride and honour of freedom-loving fighters. They saw their greatness in the smallness of others and their height in the

crushing of the corps of others and would never have voluntarily surrendered to right. In the course of history the laws of social evolution curb the endlessness of the oppressors and egoistics and it is the people who determine all the processes of history.

People are the makers of history and it is the people who bring about the most important phenomenon of social evolution through victorious social revolutions. It is here that the Great Leader of the world's workers has said: Revolutions are the festivals of the oppressed and exploited. In no other time except the time of revolution, are the masses in a position to actively go ahead as creators of a new social regime. In such times people can make miracles.

With the victory of the great Saur Revolution the valorous and noble people of Afghanistan have the honour to have such festivals in which they do miraculous acts and go ahead. With the foiling of every conspiracy of imperialism, crushing of every aggression of the enemies of the revolution and eradication of every element obstructing the desirable development of the revolution, the people of Afghanistan are forging ahead and rapidly traverse the path leading to the society of affluence, the society void of exploitation of man by man.

On Sunbula 25, 1358 the people of our beloved country took wider step towards a society which our Khalqi state, our workers' state the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is endeavouring to reach in the light of the glowing torch of the epoch-making ideology of the working class.

In accordance with the saying of the Great Leader of the world's workers which reads, "no class has reached power without bringing about their political leaders and representatives who can organise the movement and lead it", our people have won full confidence today in the power of the working class in Afghanistan and its strong alliance with peasants and other toilers and have brought about their honest servants.

Our toiling people have great honour to enjoy the honest services of their Khalqi state. They can take account of their workers' state at any time and moment they may want.

Our brave and noble people from now on live in full safety and enjoy democratic liberties and inviolable rights imbued with the interests of the toilers. All the selfish and disgraceful organisations which had caused concern to our toilers were wiped out and will change profoundly and qualitatively. A team will be appointed to immediately release whoever are imprisoned without any reason.

Here I would like to point out that for the purpose of wiping out all the tragic grief arising from the individual will in AGSA, I change the name of this office into Worker's Intelligence Office, KAM. KAM will never perform any unjust act and will not put anyone in jail without any reason and will not resort to any act of suppression.

Valorous compatriots,

The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the vanguard of the working class of the country with the support of the undefeatable solidarity of peasants and other toilers leads the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan at a time when it enjoys the vast support of our toiling people. And the heroic armed forces of the Khalq with all valour, bravery, sacrifice and with high sense of patriotism inherited from their proud forefathers and men of history of Khalq and carry on just struggle with high and scientific realisation of its truthfulness defend the gains of the great Saur Revolution and the interests of the toilers in such a way that they give their life in order to let the people live, give their heads in order to let the people be highheaded, shed their blood in order to make the country blossoming, place their chests against the enemies of the revolution in order to protect the homeland and defend the people, burn themselves in order to let the warmth of the festivals of the people grow further. That is why our loyal people take pride in their heroic armed forces and make all efforts and sacrifice to get it further strengthened.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in accordance with the conditions prevailing in the country as a proletarian state fully adjusted and with firm unity and support and vast participation of the peasants and other toilers and all the national patriotic elements of the beloved country and with such



strong Khalqi and military support and full trust and confidence is forging ahead in the light of the epoch-making ideology of the working class towards the construction of a society void of exploitation of man by man and will rapidly eliminate all the economic, political, social and cultural vestiges of the feudal regime by pursuing the non-capitalist path of development. All economic actions of the state will be taken within the framework of social and economic plans to modernise agriculture and industrialise the country in the interest of the public and all the national capitalists and traders will be helped so that they would have greater part in the construction of the country and play their prideful and patriotic role.

Since the real strength of the toilers is linked with their class awareness the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will make use of all possibilities in order to develop and promote the standard and scientific understanding of all the toilers of the entire nationalities of Afghanistan and will proceed ahead for the real ensurance and effectuation of brotherhood and equality of democratic rights and liberties of all the nationalities and tribes residing in Afghanistan.

From now on all the selfishness and irresponsibilities and the feelings of unrest and unsafety and irresponsible treatment of the state officials towards the people will be totally wiped out. No one will be imprisoned without any crime. Every patriot of the country should live with high sense and heroic spirit of patriotism and with a heart full of love for the land, people and the revolution. From now on there will be no one-man government in our beloved country Afghanistan. All the state affairs will be collectively carried on by the Politburo, Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Revolutionary Council and Council of Ministers of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan with a spirit of unity full of honesty and loyalty to the homeland and the people. As the great Saur Revolution is an example for all the toilers of the countries similar to Afghanistan our party and Khalqi state will also be an example to them.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan while absolutely

supporting the interests of the workers and other toilers, and with unbreakable conviction in the epoch-making ideology of the working class, unbreakable determination for continuing revolutionary struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, reaction, apartheid and racial discrimination, national oppression, despotism, and exploitation of man by man and hostility against ambition-seeking and nationalism, profound loyalty to proletarian internationalism and defence of the liberation movements of the peoples all over the world honestly follows its foreign policy of non-alignment and fearlessly defends peace in the region and the world and the charter of the United Nations.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will honestly continue its friendship and brotherhood with all the socialist countries, specially the defence of the friendship between the peoples of Afghanistan and the Soviet Union having passed proudly the test of 60 years and has developed to the stage of brotherhood, is a part of patriotism of the toiling people of Afghanistan, of which every aware individual of the country has consciously realised its significance.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is profoundly interested in the development of the historic friendship between Afghanistan and India and fortunately this feeling of friendship is also being realised by the other side.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is desirous, like ever before of the consolidation of friendly relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan and between Afghanistan and Iran.

Our toiling people have deep feeling for the bright future of the toiling peoples of Pakistan and Iran and whatever they want for themselves they want it for their Pakistani and Iranian brethren too. We have shown great interest in removing every misunderstanding between the governments of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and Pakistan and Iran through friendly talks.

We expect that His Excellency Zia-ul-Haq, President of the Republic of Pakistan and His Excellency Agha Shahi, his adviser on foreign affairs, at appropriate times as soon as possible can

pay a visit to Afghanistan at our invitation which will be very useful in removing the misunderstandings. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has extended its hands of friendship towards all those states who are interested in having friendship with us.

History has clearly shown that whenever any ruler of Afghanistan wanted to make a secret deal over the national issue of the people of Pashtoon and Baluch he has been eliminated disgracefully. We expect with all interest that this only issue of political difference between Afghanistan and Pakistan will be honestly solved through friendly talks in the light of history in such a way as to be confirmed and supported by the peoples concerned.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan has the honour that under the leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan it is at the service of its people with all loyalty and honesty, belongs to the people and learns from the people and uses its knowledge in the service of the people. It fully assures the toiling people of Afghanistan of the honour of providing safe and free grounds of performance of all religious sacred ceremonies. No pressure or force is exerted on anyone of the individuals of the country which would be contrary to his religious sacred beliefs. Profound respect is paid to the honours of the sacred religion of Islam. Every toiling and patriotic Muslim can perform his Islamic religious sacred duties with all freedom and high humane spirit. It will not refrain from any lawful help to patriotic religious scholars.

I hope that all the true patriots and brave toilers of dear Afghanistan will have in their view the patriotic aspiration of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and give no right to anyone to act contrary to it. Anybody who acts against the lofty aims of our regime and causes harm to the toilers of the country and reflects it in a distorted way, he is a traitor to the country and the people if it is done consciously, he is foolish if it is done unconsciously, he should correct it.

Noble and brave compatriots.

With the hope of love for the people and with the hope of

making all efforts for the construction of your dear country, for I want you, while observing the principles of criticism and self-criticism, to seriously attend to all the words and actions of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan so that the enemies of our country should not find any chance to make the smallest penetration.

From today Sunbula 26, 1358 you can take any account from the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and its members concerned.

We believe that all the aspirations of the people can be fulfilled well in the legally experienced regime. Lawfulness is imperative in the society. The more legal evolution takes place, the better and speedier will be the revolutionary victories.

In a society with Khalqi regime the best lawfulness can be ensured within the framework of the constitution. The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan will soon charge a commission to draft the constitution of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and prepare it to go through its legal channels.

Dear compatriots,

Construction and blossoming of our dear country Afghanistan requires the active and responsible role of all of you in the social life and affairs of the people. All of us are proudly at your service with proletarian humbleness so as to join hands and build our beloved country with high sense of patriotism and reach the stage where a society free of exploitation of man by man would be constructed. You should also expand the scope of your support, solidarity and collective and individual work with all pride and proletarian humbleness and take greater part in your regime. As everything in Afghanistan belongs to you, you should not refrain from any effort to develop it with all the sense of patriotic responsibility and stand high-headed and proud for the realisation of the aspirations of the motherland and increase rapidly productive work. You belong to the country and the country belongs to you. You are of the Khalq and the Khalq is yours and finally you belong to the Khalqi regime and the Khalqi regime belongs to you.

Therefore whatever you do is for your country, your people

and yourselves. With this realisation of responsibility and with this sense of patriotism you can realize the main slogan of your party and state which is food, clothing and shelter in such a way as to become once again a prideful source of inspiration and attention of all the toilers of the world.

Long live Khalq!

Victorious be the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan,

Triumphant be peace, democracy and social progress all over the world.

## From the speech to KAM employees

This is the second speech Amin made after the death of Tarakki. It was made on 18th September 1979 before employees of KAM (the Workers' Intelligence Institute) in connection with changing the name and methods of work of the old intelligence organisation. It was published by the DRA Ministry of Information and Culture Publications Department as a separate pamphlet entitled "Hafizullah Amin Addresses KAM Employees". We have abridged it from that pamphlet.

Dear brothers,

I have the honour to have an opportunity to stand before you and present a few issues.

You know that no system can last long without the conscious role of those who penetrate in all social system like the blood which circulates all over the body. You among our

society's noble and honest youths play a role today that in the progress of the Great Saur Revolution and in the preservation of the products of Revolution has a special importance. The Great Saur Revolution, the workers' revolution which gained victory with the completion of class struggle in the country, overthrew the oppressive and exploiting feudal system and transferred the power to workers with the unity of farmers and other toilers, cannot possibly continue without having certain special organs. Every system must have armed forces. The armed forces consist of army, the intelligence force and the Sarandoy of the country. You are a major section in a major organ of the social system.

With the presence of imperialism no system in the world can remain without the armed forces. As long as imperialism exists in the world the reliance of every system on its armed forces is necessary. And without the existence of the armed forces in today's society no revolutionary regime can continue. Especially in conditions like Afghanistan the continuation of a revolutionary workers' regime is unimaginable unless a strong armed force exists in the society.

Today the people of Afghanistan are proud to have an armed force which consciously struggles for the defence of the revolution and the products of revolution. This is indeed a great pride. Other revolutionary regimes also that established dictatorships of the proletariat by achieving the workers' revolution, had in their first stages great difficulties in connection with the armed forces. In some revolutionary countries the armed forces had even been totally eradicated and new peoples' revolutionary forces had to be built. But in Afghanistan from the beginning of the Great Saur Revolution there existed the armed forces especially the heroic army of the people. This force developed and today it forms the brave, fighting and heroic army of the people who consciously in the light of the history making ideology of working class defend the country, the revolution and the interests of the people. Such a heroic army which has valorously and devotedly taken position with love of homeland, love of people and love of revolution against the enemy is in need of two other organs of the peoples'

armed forces. In other words, the victory of our heroic army depends upon the possession of these two organs of the armed forces. It is urgent that we should have the peoples' intelligence forces. Similarly we must have the peoples' police force or Sarandoy. And we are proud that in these two respects, too we are not left behind.

We have strong patriotic organisations. We have started, we will proceed and we will complete. You belong to the considerable organ of armed forces i.e. the intelligence section or organisation of our country. This role is different from the intelligence section of reactionary and exploiting regimes. In the reactionary and exploiting regimes the intelligence force served the interests of exploiters and oppressors and protected all the exploiters and oppressors, and was in the service of exploiters and oppressors. But in workers' regimes, in peoples' regimes the highest pride goes to one who is in the service of toilers, in the service of workers and who serves the revolutionaries. This honour is now that of you dear brothers and sisters. We are proud that we have a strong and powerful regime of workers, ... and the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. ... The party is mixed with the people. It lives with the people and cannot remain apart from the people even an instant. They are organised as conscious, pioneering, and struggling elements of our society in the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and are serving the people and the country in best manners. In pursuit of this heroic struggle of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan in the field of discovering the facts related to the role of our enemies within our society, the organ which is active is the organ related to you. In the beginning of the Great Saur Revolution we named this organ as "The Afghanistan de Gatto Satonki Idara", (Administration for the protection of Afghanistan's Interests) AGSA and played a considerable role in safeguarding the revolution. We can never deny that you had an outstanding role in neutralising the enemy's conspiracies. You performed your patriotic duties in best ways in the detection and neutralising of the enemy's conspiracies. So far you could detect tens of the conspiracies of the enemy and nullified them. This fact is recorded in history.



Our enemies know better than all that you have played your patriotic parts in the detection and neutralisation of the conspiracies hatched by enemies of our country. As a servant of the people of Afghanistan and as a servant of you, brave colleagues, I have always said and will say again that your role in the detection and neutralisation of conspiracies hatched by imperialism, reaction, left wing extremists and other enemies of our country has been performed very well. You have worked well for the benefit of the people and you have fulfilled your duties in most patriotic manner. The only regret lies in this that there have been some errors in the method used so far, not in you. Errors do appear in the method of work sometimes. They occur in the method of work and in the execution of work. The authorities of the organisation with which you work brought about certain errors and mistakes. I am telling you today that as a whole I am pleased with your role and your work in the detection and neutralisation of the conspiracies of the enemies of our country, and I will always remember it with satisfaction. I hope that you achieve further success in this way, because these achievements of yours are not limited to yourselves. These are achievements of our people and our revolution. These days you friends have thought that a change should occur in the method of work of AGSA, Organisation for the Protection of Afghanistan's Interests. The method of work pursued so far has left some unfavourable memories in the minds of our compatriots which cannot in any way relate to your patriotic duties and your patriotic role. And no body can relate them to your patriotic efforts, to your patriotic labours such that it belittles the value of your work. Therefore, I analysed and evaluated your work and came to the conclusion that some kind of shortcoming existed in the method of work, in the executive and functional relations, not in your patriotic keenliness. Therefore I decided to let my compatriots know about it, to make them aware so that they may not worry about your patriotic work, and make sure that you patriots are assigned to defend the interests of the people. You are in the service of the people. You never have the desire to see any innocent individual arrested, and hurt or troubled without

any wrong-doing. Moreover, you are interested to have performed such services to let our compatriots get busy in the construction of our beloved country with relaxed souls and confidence. Of course, all of you and us know and cannot deny the fact that the method of work and the kind of authorities and relations have left some unfavourable memories. It has left such effects among the people of which we must be aware so that they are not only not repeated but in the shortest possible time we should reassure our people that no conspiracy against their rights is hatched, no conspiracy against the democratic rights of our people is hatched. On the contrary, we will pay serious attention and make efforts day and night to guarantee all the democratic rights and liberties of our people in its best way.

In this respect not only do we assure the people but also we should create such conditions that we can totally guarantee that our people can highly benefit from their democratic rights and liberties along the way to the development of products of revolution.

That is why we wanted to change the name of AGSA. Of course a mere change of name will not be enough. We should change its total nature. The name of the organisation of which you have the honour of being member and through which you serve your country, is renamed as Workers' Intelligence Agency or De Kargarano Astekhbarati Moassessa, abbreviated as KAM. I hope that KAM according to the impression it leaves on the mind of one by hearing it will also be able to perform its duties successfully and honourably. Today the enemies of our country are launching strong propaganda trying to distort the picture of our peoples regime in the minds of others. It is particularly the duty of you young compatriots, to make efforts to correct this shortcoming, not in the form of giving orders and not in the mere framework of dry laws, but the law should be consciously pursued and should be implemented with the realisation of its nature.

You are devotedly in the service of people which in fact, does not appear in the first stages of performing the duties, or cannot be seen. The better way of putting it is that it cannot be witnessed

well, because your role in increasing the influence of our peoples friends is not too much. Your major and basic role is in the eradication of the influence of the enemies of our country, in the abolition of the imprints and effects of the enemies of our people and our revolution. Because the people do not properly sense the influence and the effects of the enemies before it results in the fulfilment of the enemy's wishes. In the beginning of the influence the people do not realise it. The people knew there could be no influence. People would throw it away if they knew it. If they know that the enemy is working against them they will immediately throw them away. Because nobody accepts the enemy. But since the people do not understand this influence from the beginning, then you should understand when the enemy has influenced. Since the enemy's conspiracies are not sensed by the people, you are the ones to sense it and to detect it. Thus you detect and annihilate the germs that cannot be seen by the people. Therefore the fulfillment of your duties reflect the highest workers', people's and humanitarian spirit. Because we see that, except for the responsible persons of the government, others do not see what you are doing.

But if someone runs a roll on the street everybody will understand that he is building a road. If a man begins the foundation of a building everybody will see that he is making a building. If an engineer makes the plan of a dam, it will be seen that he has drawn the plan on a sheet of paper. But when you destroy the invisible effects of the enemies, invisible because people cannot see them, the people do not realise what you have done. But be sure that in the revolution, not any service to the country will be lost. Along the way of workers' revolution every word that comes out of the mouth, every step taken towards the creation of a society without exploitation of man by man, every desire that comes to the mind and heart, will have its effect, cannot remain unhonoured, and will have its reward. For this consideration every patriotic role of yours in the future of our country, in the future of our revolution and in the future of our people will be fairly reflected. Because the enemies will be destroyed. If our heroic army repulses the enemy on the battle

front, you repulse the enemy within the Afghan society. If our valorous army fires upon the battle line of the enemy and marches forward towards the enemy's power, you put all the facts before the heroic army so that according to them they will proceed with confidence toward the enemy's positions. In all developing process of the revolution your patriotic role will certainly reflect and your contribution to the products of revolution, to the further victories of the revolution has a major effect. You are aware that the development of the products of revolution and the growth of its victories depend upon the people. The people should protect them. The people should be its motive force. The people should feel that all victories, all the products of the revolution are rightly theirs. In this too you have a great responsibility. The people should not have any worries about the KAM. For this reason you and I pledge to the people that we will not do anything to cause justified dissatisfaction of the people.

It is for this reason that we announce to the people that whenever they can, at any scope that they can, they should follow the work and action of all the patriots to see with what a devotion and patriotism, with what a high feeling of patriotism they are at their service, at the service of their country and their revolution.

From the 26th of Sunbula we challenge all our friends and enemies to do whatever *criticism* they want. Our people, our noble and toiling people should lead their revolutionary life and work with confidence so that the revolution is completed, production is increased, the country advances forward and the enemies are blinded. The workers of KAM with full faith and pride announce that after this whatever happens will be against our enemies. Every shot that is fired will be in the face of our enemies; and any dagger that moves will do so to pierce the heart of our enemy. Any assault will be toward the enemies. After this our people should be confident that our prisons will be open only in the face of the enemies of people and totally closed in the face of the friends of the people. After this the fighting sons of people, the patriotic sons of people will go to schools, not to the prison. Our enemies must know that after this the destiny of our people

will not be defined only by one individual. Nothing will be carried out by the personal intention of one individual. Everything will be done with fair calculation in a collective manner. After this the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the Revolutionary Council of Ministers will represent the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. This reflects that the best form of carrying out the country's works is to do it collectively and all the standards of the history-making ideology of the working class will be implemented in the development of the Great Saur Revolution, so that the way the toilers of the developing countries learn from our revolution, they will also learn from the collective work of our party and our state.

This method of our work and this honesty of ours, thus love and keenness in the products of our revolution, in the works and duties of all patriotic staff of KAM shines such that further brightens the eyes of our friends and blinds the eyes of our enemies.

We hope that you brave patriots with the realisation of the true nature of your duties, with the realisation of vast possibilities of your pride, beware of your duties. You play the role of spirit in the stabilisation and development of our society. You are like the angels of our society. You should be completely aware of every movement and every nerve of the society and all the actions taken by any living thing in the society of Afghanistan. And you should evaluate them in the light of the interests of the people and the country and the interests of the Great Saur Revolution and make conclusions accordingly.

Once again I would like to say that if you are not accurate, honest and deep in your duties, the revolution cannot possibly develop favourably. Beware that the development of the revolution has a direct link with your role. For you have great duties and the possibility of great honours before you. I expect that you take care, think, see every action of yourselves performed unconsciously. No matter how useful it is, it is not favourable. But if you perform anything consciously, realising the end of it, they will have a fruitful and honourable result when

you accept them voluntarily. Man accepts all the difficulties and hardships accruing from a voluntarily accepted undertaking. Today your heroic brothers have voluntarily accepted to defend their homeland, their revolution and the people in the hot battle line of struggle, they give their lives, turn their bodies practically to shields in order to destroy the enemy and to protect their country. The factor of all victories of your heroic army is their conscious struggle in the defence of the country of workers, in defence of the land of farmers, the land of toilers. You too, when accepting to defend the land of workers, farmers and toilers, you know that you defend the land of those who own their country. Today you are not defending a country which does not belong to you, ... you are its owners, you have authority in it and the power in it is in the hands of you and the toilers. For this consideration whatever work that you do, whatever trouble that you suffer whatever heavy load that you bear on your shoulders, is not without reason. Because you do all these for yourselves, for your own people. The important point is this that before the Saur Revolution the country was ours but its authority was not with us. Today the country is his who also has its authority, who has power in it. Thus you defend a country that belongs to yourselves, belongs to the toilers. Whatever sacrifice that you give, will not be without reasons. However much work that you do day and night, it is worth it. Because you work for yourselves and for the people. You belong to people and people are yours. The people are proud of you and you are proud of the people. The more you work the better results you will get. Once again I draw your attention to this point that the people have lots of expectations and they watch anxiously to see the way you deal with them. I hope that by your contacts with the people our toilers feel proud and satisfied not fear and awe. We do not depend on fear and awe. We depend on workers' pride and honour. We hope that every individual of our toilers keeps his head high with a working pride and honour, and never has the slightest fear or anxiety or despair. In this respect your role is very effective. You please the people and capture the hearts of people. You must have love with people and with their hearts.

Every action of you will please a family or maybe it will despair families. It is considered a crime to despair the people. Our people have been oppressed and despaired for decades and centuries. Now there is no need to do the least acts that may create despair and fear in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan our people are expecting encouraging and honourable dealings and contacts.

Your contacts with the people have direct links with the despairing or hope giving effects in the people. You should be aware of the great role of your duties. You either capture the heart of the people or, God forbid, you will annoy and break their hearts. With this value and this role of your duties, I am sure that you compatriots with a feeling of patriotism will do best services for your people. This is the method of your work which will give crushing blows to the enemy. You should never insult anybody. We hate to insult a man; even if he is our enemy, his humanitarian dignity is respected by us. I hope that with your patriotic, honest and noble cooperation in Afghanistan the general feeling of man's dignity is developed proportional to our revolutionary aspirations, and that our people achieve their highest humanitarian aspirations, so that through this our society is a best example of high morale for all the societies of countries similar to Afghanistan.

I find my pride among the patriotic efforts and strivings of all my colleagues, not in being away from them. Our best honour is to serve with our patriots together in one battle line, in one rank. For this consideration I will always be ready to serve you patriots. Any moment at any time that you may wish, my patriotic and friendly arms will be open to embrace you so that we join hands for the best humanitarian service of our people. To achieve these high aspirations, I wish you highest, vastest and greater victories.

## Appendix III.

# From the accusations brought against Amin and the “evidence” cited in regard to his being an agent

The following passages are taken *directly* from a section included in the first edition of the book *The Truth About Afghanistan*. In the second edition of the same book, Amin's name is mentioned only six times.

### **Amin, murderer and imperialist agent**

Babrak Karmal, in a message to the people of Afghanistan over Kabul radio on December 27, 1979, said: “The day of freedom and rebirth of all the brother peoples of Afghanistan has finally come after terrible suffering and torment. The torture machine of Amin and his lieutenants, those savage butchers, imposters and killers of tens of thousands of our compatriots — fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, sons and daughters, children and old folk — has been smashed today. This blood-thirsty machine is falling apart, down to its last blood-stained cog... The bastions of the despotic rule of the bloody dynasty of Amin and his supporters — those watchdogs of sardars Nadir-Shah, Zahir Shah, Daoud-Shah, the hirelings of world imperialism with



American imperialism at the head, have been destroyed. There will be nothing left of these bastions. The last remnants of the citadel of national and social oppression in our beloved native land are crumbling.”

A political gambler and schemer, Hafizullah Amin had wormed his way into the ranks of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan soon after it was founded in 1965 by Noor Mohammad Tarakki, an outstanding son of the Afghan people. The party failed, however, to stand united for very long. It broke up into two wings, each acting on its own. After an almost ten-year-long split, a unification conference was called in July 1977. It elected a 30-men Central Committee, with Noor Mohammad Tarakki as General Secretary and Babrak Karmal, Secretary of the Central Committee and Member of the Political Bureau.

At that time active preparations were being made for the anti-feudal and national-democratic revolution which was carried out in Afghanistan in April 1978.

Ominous events began soon afterwards, however.

As Noor Ahmad Noor, Member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, once said, “the party’s unity became slack, in point of fact, it began to disintegrate”. The imperialist stooge Amin, traitor to the cause of the revolution, played the key role in that fateful process. He succeeded in seizing some of the important governmental reins of the newborn democratic republic and launched a campaign against many honest members of the Party who were loyal to the cause of the revolution including Babrak Karmal and Anahita Ratebzad. A blow was struck at the Party’s core and some of its members had to emigrate or go underground. Others were arrested and many murdered in Amin’s dreadful dungeons. Over two thousand Party members were arrested within as few as nine or ten months preceding the December change of government, and close on 500 of them were shot.

But members of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan were not the only ones to fall victim to Amin’s tyranny. In sweeping away, by fraud and scheming, all those who

wanted to check his criminal designs, Amin brought down a wave of terrible repression upon large sections of Afghan society and, above all, upon the very sections the Afghan revolution had relied on. In fact, even before Amin found himself at the helm of the state, many arrests and executions had been made at his personal instructions.

Many of the intellectuals who had brought the torch of knowledge to the illiterate mass of the Afghan people, became Amin's victims, as did many army commanders who had been active in the April revolution, such as General Abdul Kadir.

Hundreds of Afghan clergymen, peasants and workers also suffered under Amin's yoke and the unwarranted massive reprisals which he and his fellow-thinkers unleashed forced many ordinary Afghans to escape abroad. There, unfortunately, they were exposed to intense brainwashing by Afghan counter-revolutionary forces and Western, Chinese and Pakistani propaganda.

#### **In the CIA's service**

Aslam Watanjar, a member of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and of the Presidium of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, said that there was mounting evidence to prove that Amin was a hireling of American imperialism and a CIA agent. All his efforts were aimed at undermining the revolutionary movement in Afghanistan, discrediting the April Revolution, creating a reign of terror within the country and undercutting the foundations of the people's rule.

Many Afghans who were trained in the United States in 1962-1964 can confirm that Amin, during his period of residence there maintained close contacts with known American CIA agents and officials. We now know for sure who recruited Amin and guided his spying activities inside our Party and we can say exactly which CIA agents Amin met, and where, in 1973-1978, when he received the assignments to blow up the Party.

It is certain that Amin continued collaborating with American imperialism after the April Revolution. On his return

from a visit to the United States in 1978 where he attended a session of the UN General Assembly, Amin boasted that he had received some very expensive gifts. It was after that visit that he grew tougher in dealing away with honest Party members and directed his course towards his one-man-rule in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

In September 1979, Amin began to lay the ground for a closer relationship with the United States. He held confidential meetings with American officials, sent his own emissaries to the United States and transmitted personal oral messages to President Carter. This is well known to the present US charge d'affaire in Afghanistan who conferred with Amin on October 15, 1979.

*Kabul, January 16, 1980*

### **Amin, murderer of the legitimate president**

The assassination of Noor Mohammad Tarakki was Amin's foulest crime. Tarakki disappeared under rather strange circumstances in mid-September, 1979. It was officially announced that he was gravely ill and therefore had to relinquish all his posts. At his very first press conference after seizing power, Hafizullah Amin made it quite clear to foreign journalists, without any beating about the bush, that Tarakki's days were numbered, adding cynically that as he was not a doctor he could not say when Tarakki would actually die. No one in Afghanistan or anywhere else in the world believed in the subsequent announcement of Tarakki's sudden death from a grave illness.

In reality, Noor Mohammad Tarakki was savagely murdered by officers of Amin's guards on Amin's personal orders.

Here is the testimony of the Guards' former chief, Major Jandad:

"I have the following to report about Amin's conspiracy and the murder of Tarakki. A few days after we returned from the non-aligned summit in Havana, to which I had accompanied him, Noor Mohammad Tarakki called me to his office and said:

'Jandad, you are the commander of the presidential Guards and are responsible for my safety. When we were in Havana some differences arose within our leadership. So I want you to be especially vigilant in keeping guard and warn the unit commanders that nobody should leave the presidential palace compound without special orders.

"I gave an order to increase vigilance. Subsequently Tarakki called the Chief of the Army's General Staff Yakub and told him the same thing — to redouble vigilance. Yakub, however, was Amin's right hand man.

"The next morning Amin called me to his office: 'What did you talk about?' he asked me tersely. I said that Tarakki had asked for the protection of the presidential palace to be intensified. Amin also wanted to know whether Tarakki had mentioned him. He was greatly disconcerted.

"On the evening of September 14, 1979 (I was out of the palace at the time), there was an exchange of fire right outside Tarakki's office which was being guarded by his personal aid. The Guards were alerted. Telephone communication with the palace was cut. Some 'commando' squads arrived at the palace along with military units loyal to Amin. They surrounded the presidential Guards and disarmed them. By next morning all of Tarakki's supporters had either been killed or seized. The chief of General Staff, Yakub, instructed me to obey only his orders. To all intents and purposes, Amin was already in power by that time. Tarakki was isolated and placed under house arrest. For two days he was left alone. Then Amin told a presidential Guards officer, Ruzi, to take Tarakki's family to some other place. Nobody was allowed to enter Tarakki's room without Amin's permission."

In the course of the inquest, another defendant A. Hadud testified: "I had just been made chief of KAM (security service — Ed.) and I was on duty on October 8, 1979. In the evening I was summoned by the Guards chief, Jandad, who told me that I was to kill Tarakki on orders from the Party and the Revolutionary Council. I asked him how I should do that. Jandad answered that everything had been prepared, including the grave and the

shroud. He said that Ruzi and Eghbal would also take part in the killing.

“When I went off-duty, Jandad summoned us to his office and repeated the assignment. He said it had been decided to put Tarakki to death. Ruzi, on his part, added that we had no right to disobey the Party’s orders. Thereupon we left the office, boarded a white landrover and drove to Kote-Bahchi (apartment of the Chairman of the Revolutionary Council in the former Royal Palace in downtown Kabul). On arrival, we parked our car at the entrance, entered the building and went up the first floor where Tarakki was. Ruzi was the first to enter the room, we stayed behind in the corridor.”

Asked by the examining judge who Ruzi was, Hadud said that at that time Ruzi was the Guards’ deputy political commissar. Eghbal was the Guards’ intelligence chief and subsequently chief of KAM. Both were senior lieutenants.

“When we entered Tarakki’s room following Ruzi, Ruzi told him that we were to take him to another place. Tarakki gave Ruzi his Party card asking him to give it to Amin. He also gave Ruzi a black bag containing money and jewels, asking him to give it to his wife if she was still alive. Then, we all went downstairs. Ruzi led Tarakki into a room in which one of the servants must have lived and told me to fetch a glass of water for Tarakki. However, he then changed his mind and said that neither I nor Eghbal were to go but I still ran out of the room. I could not find a glass for the water, and when I came back I saw that Ruzi and Eghbal had already tied Tarakki’s hands with a towel and placed him on a bed. Ruzi was strangling Tarakki, having blocked his mouth with a cushion while Eghbal was holding him by the feet. Ruzi ordered me to hold Tarakki by the feet, but I wouldn’t do that. About fifteen minutes later Tarakki was dead. Then we wrapped his body into the shroud and carried it out of the building.”

Asked by the examining judge what time it was then Hadud testified that it was about 23.30. “We put Tarakki’s body into a car which had been parked by the entrance. With Ruzi at the wheel, we drove towards the main gate of the palace. On our way

there we were stopped by Jandad who handed Ruzi a small transmitter, ordering him to keep in contact with him, Jandad. Later, we drove to the cemetery in the same car and found the grave ready for Tarakki. I was ordered to act as a sentry.

“Once Tarakki had been buried, Ruzi contacted the Guards’ commander by radio and reported to him that the assignment had been fulfilled. Then we all went to the Guards’ premises to find Jandad in his office. When he saw us he called a soldier and ordered him to serve us a meal, but we declined it, because we were much too agitated. Jandad reassured us saying that we were not responsible for anything since we had only carried out the Party’s orders. At that moment there was a call for Jandad from the militia chief Ali Shah Paiman and Jandad ordered him to post a militia guard by Tarakki’s grave.”

Asked by the examining judge what he now thinks of the murder of Tarakki, the founder and leader of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Hadud declared: “After the December events and what I learned about Amin’s betrayal, I understood that all of Amin’s orders and injunctions, circulated by Yakub, Chief of the General Staff of the Afghan Armed Forces, and by Jandad, the Guards’ Chief, were those of a traitor. It is quite clear to me now that a conspiracy by Amin was behind it all.”

The investigation of Tarakki’s murder has shown that Hafizullah Amin was a traitor and an agent of the American secret services and that he was responsible for that heinous crime.

#### **Condemnation by N.M.Tarakki’s widow**

Washington and certain other capitals began to mourn Amin as soon as his dictatorship collapsed on December 27, 1979. A statement by the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan reads: US President Carter was not ashamed to take H.Amin under his protection, as the country’s legitimate president, which was anything but the truth since Amin usurped power and cooked up and carried out a conspiracy against N.M.Tarakki. He then established a bloody dictatorial regime and killed everyone who disagreed with him. Why did the US Administration keep silent

when H.Amin destroyed, without trial, thousands of honest people — intellectuals, clergymen and workers — innocent citizens of Afghanistan? Noor Bibi Tarakki, widow of Noor Mohammad Tarakki, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, President of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, made the following appeal to US President J. Carter.

“As you know,” the appeal states, “in April 1978 a popular revolution took place in Afghanistan. You undoubtedly know that the revolution was carried out by the national armed forces under the guidance of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, headed since its inception by my late husband — Noor Mohammad Tarakki. The April Revolution was accomplished in the interests of the overwhelming majority of our people, and therefore it is not surprising that it was received by my countrymen with enthusiasm and inspiration.

“During the subsequent period of time extending to the middle of September 1979 my husband, being the legitimate head of state — President of the Revolutionary Council, tirelessly worked to create a new, prosperous Afghanistan. But in September last year the conspirator and apostate Amin, who did not disdain using the most perfidious methods, took power in the country in a treacherous and foul manner. He killed my husband — I repeat — the legitimate head of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, and put all of our family, including myself, in his terrible prison.

“Your attempts to defend the criminal and murderer Amin provoke wrath and indignation in me and in all honest Afghans. You allow yourself to call him the ‘lawful president’ of Afghanistan. Your words insult the memory of my late husband, Noor Muhammad Tarakki, who was villainously killed by Amin and his butchers. These words cannot be anything but blasphemy to the memory of thousands of Afghan patriots who were tortured to death by him, although they were innocent.

“I was unfortunate enough to witness the crimes of that blood-thirsty gang who didn't even spare women or children. My

relatives and I were among those who fell victim to the crimes of Amin and his men. And now, when retribution has come, when the Party formed by my late husband, its glorious sons and daughters, and all Afghan patriots has cleared our dear motherland, Afghanistan, of these criminals, you take under your protection those who were cursed by the people for their criminal deeds.

“Why did you keep silent, Mr. President, when they villainously killed my husband, the legitimate President of the free Afghan people, the man who gave up his life for the happiness and the bright future of his countrymen? Why didn’t you, Mr. President, display your concern at the time when the killer and traitor Amin imprisoned, tortured and killed genuine Afghan patriots?”

“I am happy and take pride in the fact that our children, disciples and successors of the cause of my late husband, Noor Mohammad Tarakki, have again lighted the flame of freedom and restored justice to our native home. They have always fought for the happiness of their unfortunate people, and the people supported them. The people believe them and will be with them till the very end in the cause of defending their motherland and the revolution.

“We, the Afghan people, love freedom, peace and independence more than our own lives and are ready to shed our blood for their sake. We are putting things in order in our own home and demand that no one prevent us from following the road we have chosen for ourselves. We wish no ill and commit none against your country. What is going on now is quite the contrary — it is your government which gives covert and overt support to the dark forces which are coming out against our people.”

### **A conspiracy against the revolution**

The seizure of power and the leadership of the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan by that agent of imperialism Hafizullah Amin and his followers had disastrous consequences for the country. The April Revolution departed so far from its



original goals that if the healthy forces in the Party, taking into account the will of the people of Afghanistan and using the national liberation army of Afghanistan, had not deposed Amin and his clique and ensured a transition to a new stage of the revolution, the consequences of Amin's rule for the country would have been catastrophic.

**Statement by Afghanistan's Minister of the Interior  
Sayed Mohammad Gulabzoi**

The facts irrefutably demonstrate that Amin and his associates were CIA agents on the payroll of imperialist forces hostile to Afghanistan. The information we have obtained indicates that, ordered by the CIA, Amin joined forces with the counter-revolutionary rabble hiding in Pakistan and planned, acting in collaboration with the leaders of the reactionary "Islamic party of Afghanistan", to carry out a coup d'état on December 29, 1979. He intended to murder all honest leaders and Party activists devoted to the revolution and establish his dictatorship in the country.

Shortly after the cold-blooded assassination of Noor Mohammad Tarakki, the founder of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and the first head of the free Afghan state, Amin stepped up his activities aimed at establishing and broadening contacts with counter-revolutionary elements in Afghanistan and abroad. Late in September 1979, Amin's emissary had a secret meeting with Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, one of the leaders of the "Islamic party of Afghanistan", whose headquarters were in Pakistan. An agreement was reached at this meeting "on ending confrontation and on possible cooperation". At the same time Amin's elder brother, Abdullah, began speaking more openly about the need "to stop playing revolution" and urged the appointment "to all top Party and government positions of relatives and loyal people". The CIA stated that the Amin regime, taking into consideration its internal evolution, could meet the long-term interests of the United States.

On October 4, 1979, Amin held a secret conference in Kabul

at which he and his associates discussed and approved the terms on which they were prepared to form an alliance with the "Islamic party of Afghanistan" and also adopted specific plans for jointly preparing a coup d'état. The conference decided that immediately after the coup, all slogans put forward during the April Revolution must be renounced, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan dismissed and its leaders and activists eliminated as soon as possible. In "a new state of Afghanistan" Amin, a CIA agent, was to become President, counter-revolutionary Gulbuddin Hekmatyar — Prime Minister, and M. Yakub — Minister of Defence. The government was to be composed of Amin's brother Abdullah, his nephew Asadullah, M. Eghbal, N. Suma, A. Jalil, H. W. Katawazi, former minister of information and culture, and S. D. Sahrai.

In mid-December 1979, Amin's personal envoy left Kabul on board a special plane of the *Ariana* Afghan Airline Company to visit Paris, Rome and Karachi where he was to meet American intelligence agents and inform them of the progress in the preparations for a coup. On December 22 to 24, Amin's special "envoy" for the same purpose visited the Pakistani city of Peshawar, one of the centres of Afghan emigre counter-revolutionary groups. Hekmatyar's headquarters was situated near Peshawar.

Washington's representatives in Kabul assured Amin that the organisers of the coup would be supported "by the strength of US armed forces in case of necessity".

The only reason December 29, 1979, did not become another tragic date in the list of many similar dates in the history of Afghanistan was that the Party and all patriotic forces stood on guard to defend the gains of the revolution and when the decisive moment came, exposed and eliminated Amin.

*Press Conference, Kabul, January 21, 1980*

**The aim of the conspiracy was to exterminate half of Afghanistan's population**

*Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, Chairman of the Revolutionary Council and Prime Minister of the Democratic*

*Republic of Afghanistan:*

The thwarting of the plot which was organised against independent Afghanistan by US imperialists in collaboration with Peking and the regimes of Sadat and Begin was one of the main results of the current new stage of the April revolution.

Babrak Karmal reaffirmed that the leadership of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan had indisputable documented evidence, including Amin's personal records, which showed that this agent of imperialism and the CIA would not have hesitated to annihilate half of Afghanistan's population to further the imperialists' objectives. Amin and his followers carried out CIA assignments and, forging an alliance with Gulbuddin Hekmatyar and other leaders of counter-revolutionary organisations hiding in Pakistan and maintaining contacts with Israeli secret services, planned to carry out a bloody coup in Kabul late in December, 1979, and physically destroy most Party members, intellectuals and army officers. If Amin and his clique had not been exposed and stopped in time, Afghanistan would have been plunged into a tragedy like that which took place in Chile when a fascist junta seized power there, or in Kampuchea when power in that country was usurped by the Pol Pot clique.

*Press Conference, Kabul, January 21, 1980*

**To build a new, free and independent Afghanistan****Babrak Karmal's address**

"I greet you and congratulate you on behalf of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the Revolutionary Council and the state and government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan on the overthrow of the regime of Hafizullah Amin, that blood-thirsty agent of American imperialism, oppressor and dictator. I greet you, my long-suffering fellow-countrymen, faithful Muslims of Afghanistan, Sunnites and Shiites, Ulems and clergymen, soldiers and officers of the country's heroic army, Afghan traders and businessmen, patriotic landowners, hard-working craftsmen, the tribes of Afghanistan whose peace has been disturbed, herdsmen

and nomads of our country, government employees, intellectuals and progressive youth, workers and peasants, fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, all those who have been oppressed by that hangman, murderer and charlatan of history Hafizullah Amin, and his henchmen.

“I am telling the whole world that a link in the chain of despotism, the regime of Hafizullah Amin and his henchmen, has been destroyed in the heart of Asia. The autocratic and bloody regime of that traitor to the people and the country has collapsed under the weight of its own crimes and an end has finally been put to its atrocious adventures. (...)

*The Truth About Afghanistan*, Novosty Press, First Edition, Moscow, 1980, pp.83-94.

\* \* \*

The following is an extract from an article written especially for Novosty Press by a correspondent of the Indian newspaper *Janayugam*. Here it is said that Amin did not call upon Soviet troops. But *Soviet News* reported that Amin and Tarakki had called upon the Red Army exactly 14 times.

Abdul Zuhoor ridiculed the story widely spread by the American, Chinese and Pakistani media that Amin's overthrow was the handiwork of the Soviet Union which allegedly ousted him by bringing in the Soviet Army. The entire planning and execution of the uprising of December 27 was the work of the Leadership Committee of the People's Democratic Party, in coordination with the Kabul City Committee and Army units loyal to the April revolution, he asserted.

There has been a great deal of hullabaloo as to who invited the Soviet Army into Afghanistan. This was one of the several

questions put to Babrak Karmal, General Secretary of the People's Democratic Party and Prime Minister, at a memorable press conference, held on January 10, 1980. Western correspondents threw at Karmal one provocative question after another but with supreme self-confidence and poise he deftly dealt with all of them. Karmal said it was the old government that had invited in a limited contingent of Soviet troops. This was not done by Amin, who has been proved to be an agent of the CIA, but by the majority of the Revolutionary Council, he explained. He pointed out that the Soviet troops were there to guard the country against the danger of foreign intervention and that they would be withdrawn the moment that danger is removed.

*K. Gopalakrishnan*

"Janayugam" correspondent

(India)

*The Truth About Afghanistan*, p.103

\* \* \*

The paragraph below is from an article written by Novosty Press special correspondent, Vladimir Nakaryakov on 25th January 1980.

I remembered Babrak Karmal, leader of the People's Democratic Party and the Afghan state, saying at his first press conference that Amin had even surpassed the Nazis in brutality.

*Vladimir Nakaryakov,*

*APN Special correspondent,*

*January 25, 1980*

*The Truth About Afghanistan, First edition, pp.127-128*