EIJPISSN: 2751-000X

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICS

VOLUME03 ISSUE05

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/eijp-03-05-11



POLITICAL OPPOSITION IN THE SOCIALIST WORLD IN THE 50S OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Abdullayeva Shabona

master's student National University of Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: USSR, socialist camp, socialism, "abolition", the idea of "peaceful living", the threat of "nuclear death", "proletarian internationalism", socialist system, capitalist system.

Abstract: This article provides information about capitalism, Eastern Europe, the concept of the countries of the Socialist camp, the approach of the USSR in foreign policy, the concept of "Abolition of Communism" and how the world of socialism was in the late 1950s.

Pages: 51-54

Received: 14.05.2023 Accepted:19.05.2023 **Published**:24.05.2023

INTRODUCTION

After the Second World War, the USSR became not only a winner, but also a powerful country in military and political terms. A two-polar world system, including the socialist system led by the USSR and the capitalist system, will be formed in the world. Poland, Hungary, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia chose the path of socialist development, which means that the USSR is in the sphere of influence. This, in turn, is the basis for the emergence of socialist camp states.

The socialist camp is a term that refers to the countries that followed the path of building socialism in the USSR after the Second World War.

It included the USSR and Eastern European countries where the communists came to power, China after the end of the civil war (1949), then North Korea and North Vietnam. The opposition between two camps (socialism and capitalism) was considered as the most important feature of the system of international relations [1].

THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Stalin's death in March 1953 marked the end of an entire historical period and gave impetus to new political trends in the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet state.

IVStalin's successors faced serious problems with the formation of relations with the "countries of people's democracies" that appeared on the political map of the world after the Second World War in Eastern Europe and Asia. The pro-communist governments of these countries, which came to power with the active support of the USSR, not only focused on the Soviet model of development, but were themselves active guides in planting local modifications of Stalinism.

VOLUME03 ISSUE05

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICSISSN: 2751-000X

If the Soviet Union had more than 30 years of experience in relations with the capitalist countries of the West, it was a new and difficult task to form a system of relations with its ideological allies, which were largely dependent on the USSR.

On March 6, 1953, IV Stalin died in Moscow at the age of 73. Due to his death, the bloodiest period in the history of the Soviet Union ended. As a result, GM Malenkov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, was promoted to the position of the first person in the Soviet leadership. In the foreign policy of the Soviet Union, a number of drastic innovations began to appear. Moscow tended to take a lighter view of most international issues (Korea, Germany, arms, war and peace). Later, by the autumn of 1953, GMMalenkov gradually became a decisive figure in the field of foreign policy of the Soviet Union, so he was removed by the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union NSXrushchev [2]. The struggle within the party diverted the attention of the Soviet leadership from foreign policy. Expectations of change also affected part of Soviet society and were reflected in the summer uprisings in prison camps.

Gradually, the idea of "peaceful living" began to be discussed "in a narrow circle" between the anti-Stalin part of the party-state leadership and the intellectual elite associated with it. This idea is an attempt to give a more modern look in accordance with the new post-war reality. However, the concept of "peaceful coexistence" was not yet announced as the basis of the foreign policy of the USSR.

IVStalin's death and signs of change in the policies of the new Soviet leadership led to a break in the old system of general control over other communist countries. Because of their dependence on the USSR, the Stalinist leaders of the Eastern European countries became dependent on any changes in Moscow's policy. The rise of anti-Stalin sentiment in the USSR led to the departure of the leadership of socialist countries from the ideas of Stalinism. This was accompanied by the expectation of changes in the population of Eastern European countries and the risk of destabilization of Eastern European regimes [3].

An unstable situation also arose in the GDR. The scale of migration from the GDR to the FRG (447 thousand people from January 1951 to April 1953) increased. The reason for the escape of citizens was the wrong course of the leadership of the BGSP headed by Walter Ulbricht on the rapid construction of socialism. The Soviet leadership had warned their East German colleagues that the Soviet Union could not help the GDR, and that the construction of socialism at a rapid pace was dangerous. In Moscow, at this time, at the suggestion of LPBeria, in order to avoid confrontation with the West on the issue of unification and neutralization of Germany, even the issue of withdrawing Soviet troops from the GDR was discussed. from Moscow The mood for change and the uncertainty about the support of the East German leadership from the Soviet Union had a chilling effect on the population of East Germany. Against this background, anti-government demonstrations took place in the GDR in June 1953

The country's government announced new, even lower prices for wages in the industry. They angered the workers. On June 17, 1953, strikes began in Berlin, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Iain, Dresden and other cities. They turned into demands for the resignation of the government and free elections. After that, pogroms, burning of party committee buildings, attacks on prisons and release of prisoners (including criminals) began. Law enforcement agencies were paralyzed [4].

The leadership of the DPRK appealed to the Soviet government with a proposal to use Soviet troops to restore control in the country. Moscow agreed. 15 Soviet divisions stationed in the GDR were put on combat training. VD Sokolovsky, the Deputy Minister of Defense of the USSR, who arrived in Berlin, took over the leadership of the riot control operation. The Soviet troops arrested and shot the insurgents with the verdicts of the military courts. The GDR party leadership managed to stay in power.

VOLUME03 ISSUE05 52

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICSISSN: 2751-000X

Soon, Moscow began negotiations with Yugoslavia on the normalization of interstate relations. In 1953, the two sides again exchanged ambassadors, and in 1955 Khrushchev visited Yugoslavia, in the process normalizing relations with Yugoslavia. However, Tito refused to join the single "socialist camp". This means that the basis of interstate relations between the two countries is recognized not by the principle of "proletarian internationalism" (as in the USSR's relations with other socialist countries), but by the principle of "peaceful coexistence" (as in the development of relations with capitalist and developing countries). received). Moscow is actually the USSR and Western countries of Yugoslavia.

After that, negotiations aimed at restoring Austria's sovereignty began. In May 1955, a five-party state agreement was signed on the restoration of an independent democratic Austria. The treaty, in particular, stipulated a ban on the annexation of Austria to Germany. At the suggestion of the Austrian government, the Austrian parliament passed a law of permanent neutrality guaranteed by all four victorious powers. Soviet troops, as well as troops of Western countries, were withdrawn from the territory of the country. The unity of the country was restored. In March 1954, a scandal broke out in the United States, because it was reported that American scientists could not predict the consequences of the tests of a fusion device conducted in the United States. available in the west According to the information, the results of the hydrogen bomb test in the USSR in August 1953 exceeded the expectations of Soviet experts. Both the military and the politicians were left in a dilemma. "Atomic Death" [5]fears were fueled by reports of accidental contamination of civilians with radioactive contamination. They were blown by the wind from distant nuclear test sites.

Prominent liberal scientists and politicians began to join the fight against the threat of "nuclear death". The mid-1950s marked the peak of postwar pacifism. The modern world was like a world of thermonuclear weapons. Traditional geopolitics and classical military strategy have changed their importance. In the age of atomic bombs, the roles of land forces and navies looked different. The main means of future warfare were long-range aviation and missile weapons [6].

In 1955, the USSR considered it possible to abandon a number of naval bases abroad. On May 15, 1955, Moscow renounced the right to lease naval bases in China (Port Arthur and Dalny), and evacuated the armed forces from there. On September 19, the Soviet-Finnish Treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance was signed under very favorable conditions for the USSR: the Soviet Union received the right to send troops to Finland in the event of a renewed threat from Germany. At the same time, Moscow agreed to evacuate the naval base in Portkkala-Uddu.

For the first time, the main ideas of the new concept were developed in May 1952 in the magazine "Live" by JF Dulles, a member of the Republican Party, entitled "politics of courage". The ideas put forward in 1952 became the basis for determining the foreign policy of the United States. JF Dulles' idea was to put pressure on the USSR and other socialist countries through the threat of a massive nuclear strike. In this way, JFDalles stopped the activities of the socialist countries, forcing them to take into account the possibility of a US strike in their domestic policies. This meant that the Communist authorities had to pursue less repressive policies towards their own citizens out of "fear" of Washington [7].

CONCLUSION

This, in turn, leads to the "liberation" of socialist countries from the "tyranny of communism". The US emphasized the development of nuclear capabilities. The concept of "cancellation", according to its creators, should be more aggressive than "holding". That is, it was necessary to use the threat of a major nuclear strike to intimidate the communist regimes, force them to make concessions, and support internal anti-communist movements that could destroy the repressive regimes.

VOLUME03 ISSUE05 53

EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PEDAGOGICSISSN: 2751-000X

REFERENCES

- **1.** Werth N. History of the Soviet state. 1900-1991: Trans. from fr. M .: Progress: Progress-Academy, 1992. C. 115
- **2.** Bogaturov A. D. Averkov V. V. History of international relations. 1945-2008: Proc. allowance for university students / A. D. Bogaturov, V. V. Averkov. M .: Aspect Press, 2010. S. 144
- **3.** Batyuk V. Evstafiev D. First frosts. Soviet-American relations in 1945-1950. Moscow: Russian Science Foundation, 1995. P. 102
- **4.** . Printed V. O. From the Union to the Cold War: Soviet-American Relations in 1945-1947. Monograph / MGIMO(U) MFA of Russia, department. history and politics of European and American countries. M.: MGIMO-University, 2006. P 75
- **5.** Shubin A. V. The USSR and the regimes of "people's democracies" // Totalitarianism in Europe of the XX century. From the history of ideologies, movements, regimes and their overcoming. M., 1996. C 51-60
- **6.** Batyuk V. Evstafiev D. First frosts. Soviet-American relations in 1945-1950. Moscow: Russian Science Foundation, 1995. P. 102
- 7. Printed V. O. From the Union to the Cold War: Soviet-American Relations in 1945-1947. Monograph / MGIMO(U) MFA of Russia, department. history and politics of European and American countries. M.: MGIMO-University, 2006. P 75
- **8.** Shubin A. V. The USSR and the regimes of "people's democracies" // Totalitarianism in Europe of the XX century. From the history of ideologies, movements, regimes and their overcoming. M., 1996. C 51-60

VOLUME03 ISSUE05 54