

An Assessment of the Principle of Socialism in One Country from the Perspective of the International System

Muhammet Savaş Kafkasyalı

Kirikkale University - Turkey
mstkufan@yahoo.com

Hasan Bekdeş

Sakarya University - Turkey

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n2s2p155

Abstract

When Stalin stepped to head the Soviet Union the idea of socialism in one country which he propounded established both a theoretical ground for the state's applications in the next term and also determined the fate of socialism. The Bolshevik revolution which was the first socialist revolution to take place had developed in the light of very significant discussions and taken form with the different ideas of many philosophers. The socialist ideas which emerged as a rebellion against the current international system and the international economic system which is perhaps the most important part of this system were released from being confined in minds, articles and speeches and finally found a habitat for themselves when they were put into practice with the revolution in Russia. When a theory or ideology is put into practice it is accompanied with various issues which must be settled. When a theory is put into practice, the understanding and approach of the implementers to the theory become as important as the theory itself. Furthermore, the characteristics of the application area of the theory, its form of application and the international system where the application will be included also required a very good assessment. While the problems of the Bolshevik Revolution incurring from the implementation of the socialist ideology on the Russian community and on the communities that were occupied later were attempted to be resolved in line with a theory-practice relationship the understanding of socialism in one country declared by Stalin immediately in the aftermath of Lenin in 1924 generated different problems of a various nature in addition to the current ones. This change has been studied from many angles to date and various views on the causes and effects have been presented. However, limiting the socialist ideology which emerged to counter the international system and as an alternative to this system with a perspective which encompasses the world with the understanding of socialism in one country can be best explained in terms of its relationship with this system. From this viewpoint our study differs from previous ones because it examines the idea of socialism in one country and its application in terms of the structure and functioning of the international system. The problematic of the study consists of the understanding of how the transition from 'continuous revolution' or 'socialism in the whole world' into socialism in one country is affected by the international system.

Keywords: socialism in one country, USSR, international relations, international system.

1. Introduction

The fundamental assertions of our study on the impact of the current international system on the principle of *socialism in one country* are as follows: *the principle of socialism in one country*,

- Is not an ideology which has been thoroughly examined and which has been propounded and implemented after it had been considered appropriate within the framework of the overall socialist theory.
- Is a reflection of the lack of success in exporting the regime by the Soviet Union.
- It has been viewed as the only way that the Soviet Union can maintain its existence within the international system with its current regime.
- It is one of the most significant examples of the structures which are contrary to the structure and operation or structures with the possibility of contrariness within the system mechanism of the international system with the pressure elements of conversion.

In order to verify these claims first it is necessary to investigate what the ideology of *the principle of socialism in one country* means in terms of the structure and operation of the international system, how the system is influenced by the inception-adoption-implementation process of the ideology of *the principle of socialism in one country*. Secondly the

situation in the first article and the contents of articles two and three which are the reasons for this situation, in other words that the ideology of *the principle of socialism in one country* was not developed in accordance with a theoretical approach which complies with the general principles of socialism and that there has been no essential application to establish socialism throughout the world and that these account for the lack of success in exporting the regime and it will be shown that this is the result of regarding the current regime of the Soviet Union as the only way it can sustain its existence within the international system.

2. The Ideology of Socialism/Communism and the Internationality of Revolution

Two significant elements structuring the ideas asserted by Marx and Engels must not be overlooked when assessing their ideas. The first one is that like with all opinions their views are incurred by their own perspectives and secondly by the overall characteristics of the relevant era. Considering that the views they portray are a criticism of the current capitalist system it is clear that these views cannot be reviewed independently from the system which was dominant at the time. Meanwhile the outlooks of Marx and Engels who are the masters of this reactionary outlook and their positions are the mainstay of this ideology. Subsequently this outlook underwent various changes due to the differences in perspectives and the differences in the circumstances of the interpreting individuals and Marx and Engels summarized their own views on this outlook as follows:

Communism is for us not a state of affairs which is to be established, an ideal to which reality [will] have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence. (Marx, Engels, 1964, 47)

Marx who explains the history of societies with the materialist understanding of history which he has developed has classified the forms of society into a five phase evolutionary category based on the form of production: Primitive communal, slave, feudal, capitalist and communist. Four of these forms of society have realized, whereas communism which is the inevitable result of the development of society shall be realized. (Afansiev, 1990; Şenel, 1982, 14)

Marx who said, "the history of all societies to date is the history of class struggles" based the forms of society to date on the antagonism of the oppressing and oppressed classes. According to Marx the class differences which had manifested themselves in various forms of the societies of previous eras have not been eliminated in modern bourgeois societies. The most significant characteristic of this bourgeois era which generates new classes as well is that it has simplified the complex class antagonism observed in the societies of previous eras. Accordingly in the bourgeois era in which class antagonism has been simplified the society has been divided in a comprehensive sense into two camps: The bourgeois and the proletariat (Marx, Engels, 2010, 48-49).

According to Marx the proletariat which emerged as a result of the industrial revolution is the only class with a revolutionary character which stood against the bourgeois in the modern bourgeois era. While the other classes dissipated within the bourgeois system the proletariat which was a special product of this system continues to multiply in numbers along with the developing industry (Marx, Engels, 2010b, 58-60). The reason why Marx has put the proletariat in the center of the revolution is based on the fact that it has been established by the capitalist system per se and the reality that it is the basis of this system. Accordingly, the proletariat which is not included in the system nor involved in the interests of the bourgeois can change the form of production and realize a revolution. (Kagarlitskii, 2012, 29)

According to Marx a revolution which is realized with a communist consciousness and pioneered by the proletariat will not be like previously realized revolutions in which only the division has been changed while the activity processes have remained the same. Since a communist revolution is essentially directed at the activity process it will eliminate all classes and in fact all nationalities. The reason for this is that the revolution will be executed by a class which is the manifestation of the elimination of all classes and all nationalities. (Marx, Engels, 2010a, 71)

Marx and Engels foresaw that the revolution would cover a historic era, that the structural (political, cultural etc.) processes would follow one another within a process and that finally the conversions would overlap on a worldwide basis (Claudin, 1990, 59). They believed that at the beginning of the process advanced capitalist countries which dominate the world markets would generate a social revolution together and they considered this mandatory for communism (Turan, 2010, 365). The reason why it is considered essential for a revolution to be realized in advanced capitalist countries in order to enable a world wide revolution is due to the fact that the material precondition of communism depends on the development of production powers. According to Marx when production powers do not develop shortage becomes a standing status, internal struggles start again and thus inevitably the old system is reinstated. For this reason the development of production forces is a practical precondition of communism. Here Marx approaches the development of production forces from a universal perspective. (Marx, Engels, 1977, 42)

This reality has not changed in terms of the views of Marx and Engels regarding Russia (the development of

production forces). Marx affiliates a radical revolution with the historical conditions of economic development in the assessment of the book 'The State and Anarchy' by Bakunin and criticizes Bakunin for not understanding the economic conditions of social revolution (Marx, Engels, 1877b, 491-492).

Engels in return has criticized the assertion of Tkachov that social revolution is easier to execute in Western Europe because there are no bourgeois in Russia in his article titled 'On Social Relations in Russia':

The revolution that modern socialism strives to achieve is, briefly, the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a new organisation of society by the destruction of all class distinctions. This requires not only a proletariat to carry out this revolution, but also a bourgeoisie in whose hands the social productive forces have developed so far that they permit the final destruction of class distinctions. ... Hence a man who says that this revolution can be more easily carried out in a country where, *although* there is no proletariat, there is no bourgeoisie *either*, only proves that he has still to learn the ABC of socialism. (Engels, 1874)

In the preface of the Russian version of the 'Communist Manifesto' Marx and Engels have given the following answers to the questions 'should the Russian society (obchshina) transit directly to a higher level, that is into communist land ownership? Or on the contrary pass through the historical development which is characteristic of the West?':

In the present time there is only one answer to be given to this question: If the Russian revolution is going to serve the Western proletariat revolution by giving a signal and if they complement one another present day land ownership of the Russian society may be the starting point of the development of communism. (Marx, Engels, 1950, 8)

3. The Principle of Socialism in One Country and World Revolution

The lack of success of the revolutionary initiatives in Europe during 1918-23 (Marcuse, 1968, 42), was a major shock to the faith that the Bolshevik leaders had in the European revolution (Carr, 215-216). Particularly the severe suppression of the communist movement in Germany made the Bolshevik leaders review the idea of a world revolution one more time and the debate involving the problem of World revolution turned into a debate on whether the final victory of socialism was possible in a one country during the years following the demise of Lenin. (Claudin, 1990, 85)

The debate on whether it was possible to establish socialism in one country started with the promulgation of the *socialism in one country* theory by Party General Secretary Josef Stalin (Kapchenko, 106). In the forthcoming years the *socialism in one country* theory which became the official doctrine of Komintern as well as the official doctrine of the Soviet Union was articulated by Stalin for the first time towards the end of 1924 (Claudin, 1990, 89). In May 1924 in his booklet 'The Basics of Leninism' (Ob Osnovakh Leninizma) Stalin wrote that the proletariat of any country could become a power in compliance with the general line of Marxism, however they would not succeed in establishing a socialist economic order in one country; by the end of the same year he had changed his mind and declared that the first edition of the book should be disregarded and a new booklet was published. In this new booklet which was published under the title of "The Problems of Leninism" (Voprosy Leninizma) contrary to the arguments put forth in the first booklet Stalin purported that it was possible to establish socialism in one country. (Deutscher, 408; Claudin, 1990, 86; Trotsky, 2006, 399-400)

Stalin separated the conditions of establishing socialism into internal (Soviet Union) and external (international) elements and attempted to establish the thesis of absolute victory of socialism in one country in affiliation with the propounded theory of *socialism in one country*. (Kapchenko, 102)

Stalin said that "the establishment of a socialist society by the proletariat who have lead the peasantry to victory and consolidated their power is possible and mandatory" (Stalin, 1930, 33) and that all the prerequisites to establish a socialist society in the Soviet Union were available and explained the meaning of the victory of socialism in one country in his booklet "The Problems of Leninism" as follows:

It means the possibility of solving the contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry by means of the internal forces of our country, the possibility of the proletariat seizing power and using that power to build a complete socialist society in our country, with the sympathy and the support of the proletarians of other countries, but without the preliminary victory of the proletarian revolution in other countries.

Without such a possibility, building socialism is building without prospects, building without being sure that socialism will be completely built. It is no use engaging in building socialism without being sure that we can build it completely, without being sure that the technical backwardness of our country is not an *insuperable* obstacle to the building of a complete socialist society. To deny such a possibility means disbelief in the cause of building socialism, departure from Leninism. (Stalin, 1950, 213)

According to Stalin there are two forms of conflict/antagonism facing the Soviet Union: The internal conflicts between the existing peasantry and the proletariat in the Soviet Union (Marcuse, 109) and the external conflicts between

the Soviet Union and all other capitalist countries. Accordingly Stalin predicted that the internal conflicts could be completely overcome with the strength of one country and that the external conflicts of the proletariat of many countries required to overcome these conflicts should not be confused with the internal conflicts. Likewise according to Stalin those who confused these issues with one another were incorrigible opportunists who were violating Leninism. (Stalin, 1930, 272)

Stalin indicates that while capitalism continued to exist in developed capitalist countries the October Revolution and its proletariat dictatorship consolidated the victory of socialism in countries which were less developed in terms of capitalism and processed this situation as a phenomenon (Stalin, 1995, 326). In this context Stalin asserted that the seven year history of the proletariat revolution in Russia abolished the theory of the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country and pointed out that the paths of development of World revolution, that is the victory of revolution in one country was not as simple as it used to be. Stalin indicated that formerly revolution was usually affiliated with the equal maturation of the elements of socialism in advanced capitalist countries and that now this view must undergo some essential changes. According to Stalin because of the events before the monopoly development of capitalism Marx and Engels were unaware of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries which introduced a new opportunity: the victory of socialism in countries one by one. (Stalin, 1995, 356-57).

Stalin argued that the most likely view on the development of world revolution was the breaking away of a series of countries with a revolutionary approach from the imperialist states system. Stalin predicted that thus centers of socialism in the form of Soviet countries would be established one by one and these centers would establish a system and that this system would be confronted with a system established in the same way by centers of imperialism and that the struggle between them would establish the development history of world revolution. (Stalin, 1995, 358-59).

The most severe criticism regarding the dissertation of Stalin on the feasibility of establishing socialism in one country came from his theoretical component (Claudin, 1990, 93) within the party which was Trotsky. Trotsky who was personally depicted as the most resourceful person in the party central committee by Lenin has indicated since his early writings that socialism in one country could not be established in compliance with the general Marxist line (Lenin, 1970, 345). In the pamphlet written in 1905 titled "Conclusions and Perspectives" (Itogi i perspektivi) he indicated that without direct state support from the European proletariat the working class in Russia would not be able to maintain power and that the temporary sovereignty could not be transformed into a long term socialist dictatorship. In the book titled "The Year 1905" it was foreseen that if a revolution carried out in countries which were not well developed in capitalizing remained within a national framework it would be mired in conflicts and the way out would only be possible with a world revolution:

Once it achieves power, the social-democratic party will be faced with a profound contradiction which cannot be resolved by naive references to "democratic dictatorship." "Self-limitation" by a workers' government would mean nothing other than the betrayal of the interests of the unemployed and strikers -- more, of the whole proletariat in the name of the establishment of a republic. The revolutionary authorities will be confronted with the objective problems of socialism, but the solution of these problems will, at a certain stage, be prevented by the country's economic backwardness. There is no way out from this contradiction within the framework of a national revolution. (Trotsky, 195-96)

Trotsky indicated that toward the end of 1924 Russia had been discovered to be a country which could suddenly establish a socialist society with its own power and that it was not correct to attribute the theory to Lenin. Trotsky who was in a constant argument with the advocates of *socialism in one country*¹ criticized Stalin at the IKKI Extended Seventh Plenum (Ispolnitel'nogo Komiteta Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala) held in 1926 for identifying the victory of *socialism in one country* with the renewability of the bourgeois of a country. (Puti Mirovoi Revolyutsii, 1927)

When the power struggles within the party resulted in the absolute dominance of Stalin over the party² this was accompanied with the theoretical discussions regarding the sovereignty of *socialism in one country*. At the same time the theory of socialism in one country became the official doctrine of Komintern at the Sixth Congress of Komintern held in 1928 and the establishment of socialism in the USSR was viewed by Komintern as an essential determining factor of World revolution. As of this date communist parties were obliged to determine their strategies and tactics primarily

¹ One of these arguments took place during the 15th Party Conference held in the fall of 1926. When Bukharin said that if international works could be isolated socialism could be established in the Soviet country Trotsky gave his famous answer which put a smile on the faces of the members of the Congress: "Did you hear that? If we can isolate ourselves from international works we can establish socialism in our country. Yes, if we isolate ourselves this is possible. But it is not possible to become isolated!.. It is possible to walk about naked in January in Moscow if you can isolate yourself from the cold weather and the police. But if you undergo this experience you will see that it is not possible to isolate oneself from the cold weather or the police."

² Stalin's absolute dominance over the party began with a decisive victory at the 15th Party Congress held in 1927. As a result of the liquidations executed in subsequent years the only thing left from Lenin's Politbureau was Stalin himself. (Trotsky, 2006, p. 134.)

according to Soviet policies. (Claudin, 1990, 92)

While the Hitler administration was overwhelming the Communists in Germany although events and policies such as the extension of the Soviet-German treaty dated 1926 and the statement by Germany that the ongoing internal events in Germany would have no impact on Soviet-German affairs (Carr, 2010a, 106-123), the Soviets membership in the UN, an imperialist state's support to armed units (Carr, 2010a, 187-8), "using the problem of Spain as material for a treaty to be drawn with England and France (Carr, 2010b, 13) caused different voices to be raised from time to time (Carr, 2010a, 273) they were generally supported by Komintern. According to Carr these phenomenon were a clear indication of the association of Komintern with Soviet policies which started with the Sixth congress of Komintern in 1928 and peaked with the Seventh congress in 1935 (Carr, 2010, 498). Furthermore Carr indicates that during the Seventh Congress of Komintern the world revolution which had only been repeated as a ritual for a long time and which had turned into a creed (Carr, 2010a, 188) had been pushed from the center of the stage to the outskirts (Carr, 2010a, 497). It is evident that all the reports, all speeches and all arguments presented at the Seventh Congress of Komintern were geared at advocating the USSR. In this context since the alliances established by the Soviets with imperialist forces were not compatible with world revolution they were not included in the world revolution strategy at the Seventh Congress (Claudin, 1990a, 248). Furthermore although attempts had been made to resolve the problem of how the policies to be implemented by the communists of the countries with potential revolutionary developments would coincide with the policies of the Soviet Union which was allied with their own bourgeois governments with some weak theoretical solutions, in reality not much thought had been given to these problems. The fact is that capitalist countries were not in the process of developing the revolutionary struggle but to defend the USSR and ensure its development. (Claudin, 1990a, 247)

Kapchenko explains this situation by saying that Stalin never viewed world revolution as a main objective and instead assessed it as a tool under the orders of the Soviets to protect the national interests of the Soviet Union (Kapchenko, 2005, 104). In 1939 the Soviets made a pact with Germany which had a new impact on Komintern. Claudin indicated that as a result of this pact the turn executed by Komintern was the most contrary turn in terms of the labor class movement so far (Claudin, 1990, 368) and that because of this pact the revolutionary movement had been subjugated to the high interests of the Soviets and that the Communist International had been sacrificed for the great alliance during the Second World War. (Claudin, 1990a, 12)

Whereas even during the years when *socialism in one country* emerged Troçki indicated that symbolized the efforts of saving Soviet foreign policy from the obligations of world revolution. Nevertheless Stalin and those bureaucrats who were affiliated with him did not abandon the Communist International because they said that they wanted to place it into the orbit of Soviet foreign policy. In 1936 Trotsky said, "At this moment the Communist International is in the service of Soviet foreign policy, it comprises a tool which is ready at all times for any kind of service". (Trotsky, 2006, 257-8)

In 1934 in his speech at the 17th Party Congress Stalin declared that the capitalist economy was being completely purged in the Soviet Union and that a socialist social-economic order had gained limitless dominancy in the whole national economy and that the country had established socialism (Stalin, 1992, 272). He said that they were ready to do what was necessary without hesitation on behalf of the interests of the USSR and 'in the past and today we have and will determine a direction for the USSR and only for the USSR'. (Stalin, 1992, 267)

In 1936 Stalin was interviewed by an American journalist named Roy Howard and the American journalist referred to his previous answer with the question "does your answer mean that the Soviet Union has abandoned its intent and plan to realize the World revolution" to which he replied, "that was never our intention or plan". (Izdatel'stvo Partizdat, 1937, 8)

Upon the words of Stalin in the interview with the American journalist Trotsky would say in his socialism in one country theory that 'a transition into 'revolution in one country' is natural'. (Trotsky, 2006, 277)

Kapchenko indicates that the *socialism in one country* theory propounded by Stalin and which prescribes that it is possible to establish socialism in one country is generally assessed in terms of power struggles within the party in literature and that this form of assessment was incomplete. According to Kapchenko *socialism in one country* covers the different ideas of Stalin which have been propounded on the kind of development path the Soviet country should follow in the future. Therefore Kapchenko asserts that attempting to explain this theory as merely intra-party power struggles independently from world opinions by those who prepared it is a fascistic approach. (Kapchenko, 2005, 95)

Carr on the other hand views the *socialism in one country* theory declared in Soviet Russia in 1924 as the product of the obvious lack of success of the Soviet regime in establishing itself in other countries. (Carr, 2010, 116-7)

Claudin indicates that the *socialism in one country* theory was propounded by Lenin and thus the discourse that Lenin revised Marx does not comply with historical reality. According to him this was manufactured by Stalin to support his own dissertation. Claudin argues that as a result of confusing the two concepts which are used in the same meaning with one another has resulted in Stalin's deviation of Lenin's ideas in this subject. Claudin indicates that these concepts

which are confused are the concepts of social and political revolution. Social revolution prescribes the socialist conversion of economic and social structures and political and cultural supra structures whereas political revolution stipulates that power is seized by the labor class. Claudin purports that "Socialist revolution" comprises the primary meaning of the concept, the second meaning as a whole while the second meaning comprises a part of the primary one. Accordingly Claudin indicates that Lenin has used the phrases of 'revolution in a comprehensive sense' and 'revolution in a limited sense' to purport the difference between the meaning of the concept of "revolution". (Claudin, 1990, 58-9)

According to Trotsky the rise of *socialism in one country* ideology is inversely proportional to the defeat of the proletariat. Trotsky indicates that the lack of success of the riots in Bulgaria in 1923, the withdrawal of the workers in Germany and the failure of the general strike in England in 1926 disillusioned the masses in the world in terms of their trust in world revolution and like a beacon this prepared the ground for the rise of the Soviet bureaucracy portrayed as the only path to redemption. (Trotsky, 2006, 127)

4. International Relations and *Socialism in One Country*: Casting a Cloud over a Theoretical Perspective

The theoretical superiority of Socialism/Marxism which rebels against the current international system in addition to providing an alternative during its emergence and development process as a discipline of International Relations (at least in terms of opportunities) has remained outside the scope of key debates in the area of international relations although it could have triumphed. Not only was the international relations theory represented by the USSR not strengthened nor used as a theoretical challenge including its opportunities the country withdrew into itself because of the *socialism in one country* principle. During the ongoing fervent idealism-realism debate in the area of international relations and even during the theoretical debates regarding international relations in subsequent terms Marxism/socialism in its current state were abandoned to the hegemony of British-American philosophers who had propounded and executed the debates in this area. International relations emerged in the UK as the sovereign power of the nineteenth century and developed in America, the sovereign power of the twentieth century (Uzgel, 2004, 28). Indeed Holsti called attention to the erratic national distribution in this area and mentioned 'National Academic Hegemony' of America in this respect. (Holsti, 1985, 12-3)

The fact that realist and idealist approaches of British-American origin dominate the area of international relations has resulted in either the lack of emerging alternative approaches or their generation and emergence within themselves. For this reason these approaches and theories at least with the depicted aspects have carried out a certain function in the obstruction of international relations in following a more meaningful development line. Thus discussion about the international system in a critical way was prevented to a significant degree. R. B. J. Walker asserts that theories regarding traditional international relations and particularly the fact that realism/neorealism which have influenced this discipline for a long time lack self-explanation are important because they prevent the emergence of other theories and approaches (Walker, 1992, 11). In other words international relations theories have become one of the tools of the global hegemonic project and its practices. In the words of Jim George theory has been put into practice. (George, 1994)

By looking at the decisiveness or the dominance of the USA regarding the international system from a different perspective it is possible to determine the connection between the structure of the international system and the needs of the dominant force and the periods when the international relations theories emerged with concrete examples. In this context Robert Cox purports that it is no coincidence that Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz developed their approaches during the Cold War era. The Realist perspective of Morgenthau which affiliated international relations with the desire of human nature to gain power and viewed international policies as a power struggle functioned as an ideological guide for US foreign policy in the beginning of the Cold War. The predominantly economic developments in the international area and particularly the defeat of the US in Vietnam against an insubstantial state necessitated the revision of realism and thus the neorealist perspective by Waltz the structure of which was also defined and which argues that the anarchic structure of the international system compels states to act in the same direction emerged. (Uzgel, 2004, 32-33)

It is observed that the era when international relations were incepted is marked by the British and the Americans and that they steer the intellectual course of events in this area. In the very beginning the UK and the USA started to establish 'intellectual centers' to ensure that the old outlook which emphasized a balance of power of the social elite in international relations was replaced within the framework of their understanding and steered in accordance with their interests. The most important ones among them are the Royal Institute of International Relations in the UK and the Council of Foreign Relations established in the USA. In addition to the intellectual centers organizations such as the Carnegie Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundations and later the Ford Foundation which supported studies on international relations emerged during this era (Olson, Groom, 1991, 71-72). During this era 'special intellectual centers'

undertook a more prominent role in the area of international relations than universities.

The first departments and chairs for international relations were established primarily in universities in the UK and the USA. The first international relations chair was established in the University College of Wales in Aberystwyth, Wales in the name of US President Wilson (Wilson Chair of International Politics) in 1919. This chair was followed by the London School of Economics established in 1923 in London and the Montague Burton chair established in Oxford in 1930. During this time international relations were not instructed in independent departments in the US but included in the Political Science departments. Independent international relations departments in the US started to increase after the Second World War (Yurdusev, 2004, 26). The noteworthy issue here is that in parallel with the supremacy of the UK which was the biggest power in the international system in terms of international policies was also a pioneer in the area of international relations and when the supremacy over the system was transferred to the US the pioneer status in the area of international relations was also transferred to the Americans (Eralp, 2004, 72). In international relations in addition to the determination of policies and implementation skills the power which is able to develop theories that are legitimization tools in a way and ensure that these theories are adopted by the whole world becomes the greatest power in the system. The UK and the USA had not only become economic and military powers, as the superior powers in the areas of ideology and science they also achieved the opportunity to determine the structure and steer the functions of the system (Hoffmann, 1977). On the other hand although the Soviet Union was the second biggest power in the system claiming to be a socialist state and the representative of socialism it was unable to present a theory on international relations which propounded the views of the socialist ideology they had adopted regarding international relations. The main reason for this was that after the revolution while the Soviet Union was attempting to take steps in line with the ideology of socialism in the whole world and develop policies/ideology the country had adopted the principle of *socialism in one country* with Stalin and introverted into themselves.

The introversion of the Soviet Union in line with the principle of *socialism in one country* could not prevent the British-American union from dominating the international system as well as the concomitant determination of the international relations discipline's theoretical perspective. Indeed during the process when international relations were rapidly developing in the UK and the USA and becoming effective worldwide no efforts to be effective in this area were observed in the Soviet Union.³

The studies of international relations in the Soviet Union can be divided into three periods including the Russian Federation. The first period started in the 60's and continued into the mid-80s. During this period international relations separated from the Soviet Social Sciences and became a discipline with its own experts. During this first period international relations were characterized by three disciplines: the history of diplomacy, International Law and International Economic Relations. The works of this period did not analyze international relations in an integrated way. The analyses which focused on the foreign policies of separate states did/could not know their relations with the system in practice. The necessity to integrate these separate disciplines in order to study international relations was only voiced towards the end of the 1960's. Yet these discussions were not geared at propounding a single discipline from these three disciplines, it was geared at ensuring the integration of the disciplines without disrupting their autonomy and ensuring information flow.

Another reason why international relations were not propounded as an independent discipline is that traditionally the Soviet Social Sciences had been separated into 'universities' and 'academies'. There was no affiliation between the experts at universities and the scientists in academic institutes. Scientific research involving International relations were executed by the experts primarily by MGIMO and the experts in the universities of Moscow, Leningrad and Kazan; Scientific research involving International relations in academia were carried out by the America and Canada Institute affiliated with IMEMO, the Latin America Institute, the Africa Institute, the Orientalism Institute, the International Labor Movement Institute, the World Socialist System Economics Institute. Furthermore through the academy the affiliations and relations between the experts of international relations who carry out the international studies and the scientific community of the world have been kept under control.

There is no doubt that the biggest obstacle in the development of the discipline of international relations has been the dogmatic approach of the Marxist-Leninist understanding which has been dominant in the social studies of the Soviet Union. This dogmatic outlook which views the world as an ongoing arena of conflict between socialism and capitalism and has a negative approach for scientific theories and methodologies which are not Marxist has prevented the establishment of a productive relationship with its representatives. However due to the war declared against bourgeois

³In an interview given by R. N. Dolnykova one of the international relations experts of the Soviet union era during the 'perestroika' period said that the theoretical studies in the area of international relations in America was much more advanced than in the Soviet Union and that so far he did not recall the existence of serious theoretical study in the Soviet Union which would advance them. (Novikov, 236)

sciences, due to the 'malicious' bourgeois nature of sociology and political science they were never officially recognized.

In order to get the opportunity of determination and steering international relations and the international system in practice yet acting with the knowledge that this was possible through the determination of their theory the Soviet Union responded to the US by first attempting to make a place for itself within the structure of the current international system and operation and subsequently abandoned all discourse against the structure and operation of this system and launched into competition as a part/unit of the system and incepted *socialism in one country* which was perhaps the most important step on this path.

The change in the attitude of the Soviet Union in time regarding the international organization movement of the League of Nations which is one of the most important elements in terms of the structure and operation of the international system and its representation was an indicator of the development from opposing and attempting to present an alternative to the international system and arriving at the point of integration with the system. The policy to control the international system through international organization was the most successful policy to establish a dominancy primarily by the UK and subsequently more blatantly by the US. Indeed after the League of Nations the US managed to determine and control the international economic, political and military orders of both the UN as well as the other sub-organizations.

In 1920 Lenin commented on the League of Nations by saying, "The League of Nations is a league on paper only. In practice they are a group of predators (monsters) who only fight and mistrust each other" (Lenin, 1981, 142). More importantly his statement in 1922 portrays his disposition against the League of Nations system: "It is natural that we oppose and are against the League of Nations because of our political and economic system." (Lenin, 1970, 241)

In 1919 the most popular heroes for the cartoonists of the western press were US President Wilson and the V.I. Lenin, the leader of the world's proletariat. In December 1918 Wilson proposed a new system consisting of 14 principles and in which self governing nation-states would unite under the auspices of the League of Nations to ensure peace in Europe and Asia. In March of 1919 Lenin propounded 21 conditions and called on the proletariat to break away from their nations and unite with Komintern through the communist party and the Soviet Government which was the homeland of the First World Proletariat and fight against the bourgeois. (Sirotkin, 2004, 11-12; Khodnev, 2012, 84)

Once again when Stalin was asked at a meeting with foreign labor delegations why the Soviet Union did not join the League of Nations he replied as follows:

The reasons why the Soviet Union does not join the League of Nations has been discussed enough in the written press. I can repeat some of these justifications here. The Soviet Union will not join the League of Nations because it does not want to undertake any responsibility in the exploitation of the colonies by the League of Nations for their imperialist policies. The Soviet Union refused to join the League of Nations because they are anti-imperialist, they oppose the exploitation of colonies. The Soviet Union refused to join the League of Nations because they did not want to take responsibility for the new military alliances for the acceleration of armament which would lead to new imperialist wars which were covered up by the League of Nations. The Soviet Union refused to join the League of Nations because they are against imperialist wars.

Finally the Soviet Union refused to join the League of Nations because they did not want to be a part of the lobbying of the imperialist policies of the members of the League of Nations which were covered up. In the presence of this evidence is it surprising that the Soviet Union does not want to be a part of this public enemy farce? (Stalin, v. 10, 206-207)

However, in his reply to the question of New York Times reporter Duranti at a later date 'will your attitude regarding the League of Nations always be based on rejection?' Stalin gave the following answer which was a statement of major change:

No, not always and under all circumstances. Although Germany and Japan resigned from the League of Nations – or perhaps for this very reason - the League of Nations may become a factor which restrains war activities or obstructs them. If the League of Nations is able to act like a hill (obstruction, barrier) and somewhat complicate the matter of war and facilitate peace to a certain degree then we are not against the League of Nations. If historical events develop in this course, despite all its shortcomings our support of the League of Nations is not out of the question. (Stalin, 1951, 280)

5. Conclusion

It has been assumed that the Soviet Union developed with the revolution which it executed with a socialist ideology and that they developed their fundamental policies on the state that was based on this ideology. However, not long after the revolution and the establishment of the Soviet Union together with the principle of *Socialism in one country* which had been adopted in 1924 the state's loyalty to socialism and its feasibility became a subject of debate. In this study on one hand the principle of *Socialism in one country* has been studied in terms of its compliance with socialism together with the

views of socialist philosophers on this matter and how much they have been affected by the international system.

Consequently *Socialism in one country* has been one of the most significant examples which has converted an understanding of the international system that is contrary to this system and rendered it harmless. As such, it is not only a principle which has been developed, adopted and implemented by Stalin in line with his own philosophy; it can be considered a path which is influenced by the system of international relations. Indeed this principle has parted company with USSR's target of extending socialist ideology throughout the world and the understanding of world revolution/continuous revolution and become a life space where it can continue to exist.

It is difficult to say that *Socialism in one country* has been developed in line with socialism and that it has been adopted because it is considered the best path for the development of socialism in the world. Furthermore it is not easy to assert that those who propounded and adopted the principle of *Socialism in one country* acted independently of the international system and that they took the interests of all the world's nations rather than the interests of the Soviet Union when they were developing it.

References

- Afansiev, V. (1990). Felsefenin İlkeleri, trans. Nadiye R. Çobanoğlu, İstanbul: Yar Yayınları.
- Anweiler, Oskar (1990). Rusya'da Sovyetler 1905-1921, trans. Temel Keşoğlu, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınevi.
- Beseda Tovarishcha Stalina c predsedatelem amerikanskogo gazetnogo ob"edineniya "Skripps-Govard N'yuspeipers" g-dom Roi Govardom 1 Marta 1936 goda, Izdatel'stvo Partizdat TSK VKP (b) (1937).
- Carr, Edward Hallett (2010a). Komintern'in Alacakaranlığı 1930-1935, trans. Uygur Kocabaşoğlu, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Carr, Edward Hallett (2010b). Komintern ve İspanya İç Savaşı, trans. Ali Selman, İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Carr, Edward Hallett (2010c). Yirmi Yıl Krizi, 1919-1939, trans. Can Cemgil, İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Carr, Edward Hallett (1989a). Bolşevik Devrimi 1917-1923, Cilt-1, trans. Orhan Suda, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Claudin, Fernando (1990). Komintern'den Kominform'a, Komünist Enternasyonalin Bunalımı, Cilt 1, trans. Yavuz Alogan, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.
- Claudin, Fernando (1990a). Komintern'den Kominform'a, Stalinizmin Doğuşu, Cilt 2, trans. Yavuz Alogan, İstanbul: Belge Yayınları.
- Engels, Friedrich (1874). On Social Relations in Russia.
- Eralp, Atilla (2004). "Uluslararası İlişkiler Disiplininin Oluşumu: Idealizm-Realizm Tartışması", Atilla Eralp (ed.), Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar, 7. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yay.
- George, Jim (1994). Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations, Boulder Lynne Rienner.
- Hoffmann, Stanley (1977). "An American Social Science: International Relations", Daedalus, 106(3), 41-60.
- Holsti, K. J. (1985). The Dividing Discipline, Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Kagarlitskii, Boris Yul'evich (2012). Marksizm: Vvedenie v sotsial'nuyu i politicheskuyu teoriyu, Izd. 2-e, Moskva: Knizhnyi dom "LIBROKOM".
- Kapchenko, N. I. (2005). "Vneshnopoliticheskaya kontsepsiya Stalina", Mezhdunadnaya zhin', 9.
- Kapchenko, N. I. (2006). Politicheskaya biyografiya Stalina, (1924-1939), Tom 2, Тверь: Informatsionno-izdatel'skiy tsentr «Soyuz».
- Khodnev, A. C. (2012). "Problemi sozdaniya Ligi Natsii: vzglyad iz Londona", Yaroslavskii pedagogicheskiy vestnik, No- 4, Tom 1.
- Lenin, Vladimir İlyich (1996). Seçme Eserler, Cilt 3, trans. Süheyla Kaya, Ankara: Inter Yayınları.
- Lenin, Vladimir İlyich (1967). Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 4, Izd. 5, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Lenin, Vladimir İlyich (1970). Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 45, Izd. 5, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Lenin, Vladimir İlyich (1974). Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 35, Izd. 5, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Lenin, Vladimir İlyich (1981). Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 41, Izd. 5, Moskva: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Marcuse, Herbert (1968). Sovyet Marksizmi, Çev. Seçkin Çağan, İstanbul: May Yayınları.
- Marx, Karl, Engels, Friedrich (1950). Manifest kommunisticheskoi partii, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Marx, Karl, Engels, Friedrich (1977a). Seçme Yapıtlar, Cilt 1, trans. Sevim Belli, Alaattin Bilgi, Güneş Özdural, Ahmet Kardam, Kenan Somer, Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Marx, Karl, Engels, Friedrich (1977b). Seçme Yapıtlar, Cilt 2, trans. Sevim Belli, Alaattin Bilgi, Güneş Özdural, Ahmet Kardam, Kenan Somer, Ankara: Sol Yayınları.
- Marx, Karl, Engels, Friedrich (2010a). Alman İdeolojisi.
- Marx, Karl, Engels, Friedrich (2010b). Komünist Manifesto, trans. Celâl Üster, Nuri Deriş, İstanbul: Can Yayınları.
- Olson, W. C., Groom, A. J. R. (1991). International Relations Then and Now: Origins and Trends in Interpretation, London: Harper Collins.
- Puti Mirovoi Revolyutsii (1927). Sed'moi Rasshirennyi Plenum Ispolnitel'nogo Komiteta, Kommunisticheskogo Internatsionala, Stenograficheskiy Otchet, Tom 2, Moskva-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo..
- Sirotkin, Vladlen (2004). Pochemu Trotskii proigral Stalinu?, Moskva: Algoritm.
- Stalin, I. V. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 10.
- Stalin, I. V. (1951). Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 13, Moskva, Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Stalin, İosif Vissarionovich (1930). Voprosy Leninizma, Izd. 2-e, Moskva-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo.
- Stalin, J. V. (1992). Seçme Eserler, Cilt-13, Çev. Saliha N. Kaya, Ankara: Inter Yayınları

- Stalin, J. V. (1995). Seçme Eserler, Cilt 6, trans. İsmail Yarkın, 2. Baskı, İstanbul: İnter Yayınları.
- Stalin, J. V. (1950). Problems of Leninism.
- Şenel, Alaeddin (1982). İlkel Topluluktan Uygur Topluma, Geçiş Aşamasında Ekonomik Toplumsal Düşünsel Yapıların Etkileşimi, Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Trotsky, Lev Davidovich. "İtogi i perspektivi"
- Trotsky, Lev Davidovich (2006). İhanete Uğrayan Devrim, İstanbul: Alef Yayınevi.
- Trotsky, Leon. 1905: Chapter 25 Our Differences The Year 1905, the Reaction, and Revolutionary Prospects.
- Turan, Mehmet İnanç (2010). Marksizmin Doğuşu, İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.
- Uzgel, İlhan (2004). Ulusal Çıkar ve Dış Politika, Ankara.
- Vernadsky, George (2009). Rusya Tarihi, trans. Doğukan-Egemen Ç. Mızrak, İstanbul: Selenge Yayınları.
- Vladimir İlich Lenin (1970). Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, Tom 45, İzd. 5, Moskva: İzdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury.
- Waker, R. B. J. (1992). Insight/Outsight: International Relations as Political Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge Univeristy Press.
- Yurdusev, A. Nuri (2004). "Uluslararası İlişkiler' Öncesi", Atila Eralp (ed.), Devlet, Sistem ve Kimlik: Uluslararası İlişkilerde Temel Yaklaşımlar, 7. Baskı, İstanbul: İletişim Yay.