

SPECIAL NUMBER.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8. No. 63

17th September 1928

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

**SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST
INTERNATIONAL.**

(FULL REPORT.)

Forty-first Session.

Moscow, 22nd August, 1928 (morning).

**The Situation in the U. S. S. R. and the
Problems Confronting the C. P. S. U.**

Report of Comrade Varga.

Chairman Comrade PIATNITSKY:

We come now to point 5 on the agenda: The Situation in the Soviet Union and the Problems confronting the C. P. S. U. I call on Comrade Varga to speak:

Comrade VARGA:

Comrades, the period in which we are now living is the period of the decline of capitalism, the period of moribund capitalism and simultaneously the period of proletarian revolution. The fact that there is stabilisation does not alter this fundamental fact. In this period the revolutionary proletariat forms into revolutionary armies under the single leadership of the Communist Parties. The process of formation of these revolutionary armies is in different stages in different countries. In some countries the revolutionary ranks are only just being formed, in others, the fighting proletariat has already great achievements to record. In the Soviet Union the proletariat secured victory, overthrew the bourgeoisie and captured political power. So far the Soviet Union is the only country to do this.

This fact brings about a change in the methods of the class struggle. In the forefront of the international class struggle

comes the struggle between countries still governed by the bourgeoisie and the Soviet Union, where the proletariat is in power. But even in the Soviet Union the class struggle continues. The period of the proletarian dictatorship does not bring with it the cessation of the class struggle; it merely assumes another form. It would be a mistake to believe that there is no class war in the Soviet Union. Here and there even the methods of the class struggle that are characteristic of capitalist countries are to be found. I want to remind you of the number of worker and peasant correspondents that have been murdered by elements hostile to the dictatorship; now and again the proletarian government is compelled to pronounce sentence of death upon its enemies. Hence, the most acute forms of the class struggle are still to be found in the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless comrades, in the Soviet Union the character of the class struggle and its aim are different from the character and aim of the class struggle in capitalist countries. In capitalist countries we have the struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist State; in the Soviet Union the proletariat protects the State, because it is a proletarian State. In capitalist countries we stand for revolution; in the Soviet Union we stand for

peaceful development towards Socialism. In capitalist countries we are in favour of overthrowing the capitalist form of society; in the Soviet Union we work for the transformation of class society into Socialist society, to be transformed eventually into Communist society. The alliance between the proletariat and the vast masses of the toiling peasants is one of the principles upon which the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union is based, as Lenin emphasised in all his works. This is dictated by the fact that in the Soviet Union, while we have about 60 millions employed in agriculture, we have at the very most 5 millions employed in industry proper. Hence, the peculiar forms of the class struggle in the Soviet Union and the struggle around this enormous stratum of toiling peasants. The struggle is not carried on against these peasants but against the capitalist elements; and the struggle is to decide who is to lead this vast army of toiling peasants. On innumerable occasions Lenin in his works pointed out the peculiarity of the situation in the Soviet Union. He always warned us to avoid a conflict between toiling peasants and the proletariat. In the last speech he delivered at the IV Congress of the Communist International, in speaking of the experiences of N. E. P., he said:

"This was the first and, I hope, the last time in the history of Soviet Russia that we have the vast masses of the peasants against us, not consciously but instinctively".

And before he delivered that speech, in his celebrated pamphlet on the Tax in Kind he wrote the following:

"Classes cannot be deceived; we must present the question squarely: the interests of the classes differ; the agricultural small producers do not want what the workers want. We know that only by an alliance with the peasantry can we save the social revolution in Russia so long as revolutions have not taken place in other countries. The peasantry have shown that they are dissatisfied with the relationships that have been established here; that they don't want these relationships and that they refuse to live as they are living now. There is no doubt about this; they have expressed this very strongly; it is the will of the vast masses of the toiling population. We must reckon with this and our methods are sufficiently flexible to allow us to say frankly: we want to re-examine the whole question".

In the economic system of the Soviet Union capitalist elements still have certain functions to perform, certain functions that must be carried on until the organisation of socialist economy has gone so far forward as to make them superfluous. Until that time however, we have, in addition to the class struggle, a limited co-operation with the capitalists, co-operation limited by the interests of the proletarian dictatorship. In the last article he ever wrote Lenin, in 1923 wrote:

"In the Soviet Republic the work of social construction is based on the co-operation between two classes: the proletariat and the peasantry. The N. E. P. men, i. e. the bourgeoisie, are now permitted to participate in this co-operation on certain conditions. If serious class differences break out between these classes, i. e. between the proletariat and the peasantry, a rupture will be inevitable. But our work of social construction does not by any means imply that such a rupture is inevitable."

Thus, comrades, Lenin advocated co-operation with the masses of the peasantry on the assumption that in the work of social construction in the Soviet Union there is nothing that must necessarily lead to a rupture between the workers and the toiling peasantry. You see, comrades, how different are the conditions of the class struggle in the Soviet Union as compared with those in capitalist countries.

Nevertheless, the revolution and the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union is part of the world revolution. As part of the international proletariat confronting the international bourgeoisie, the proletariat in the Soviet Union stands with the proletariat in other capitalist countries in a single proletarian army. That being the case, it is absolutely necessary that the general staff of this army, the Congress of the Communist International have a clear picture before it of the situation in the first proletarian State, in the main army of the world revolution. A united leadership of the struggle is inconceivable unless the various separate armies have a clear picture of what is going on in the stronghold of the proletarian

revolution. That is why, comrades, I will try as clearly and precisely as possible to describe to you what is going on in the Soviet Union. This is all the more necessary for the reason that since the Soviet Union has been established the capitalist and social-democratic press have been continually writing about a crisis in the proletarian dictatorship. The slightest difficulty that confronts the Soviet government is immediately magnified into a severe crisis.

Of course difficulties arise, comrades, but these cannot be described as crises. I will speak more in detail about this later on. First of all we must speak of the enormous successes achieved by the proletariat of the Soviet Union in the last few years since the V. Congress. In my report I will deal with the following points:

1. The economic achievements in the last few years.
2. The elements of Socialist development in Soviet society.
3. An analysis of class relationships.
4. The actual difficulties.
5. The prospects of further development.

I. THE ACHIEVEMENTS IN ECONOMIC CONSTRUCTION IN THE SOVIET UNION SINCE THE V. WORLD CONGRESS.

I will commence with the achievements of the last few years. These achievements show, contrary to the assertions of the bourgeoisie and of Social Democracy, that the proletariat is capable of taking control of the productive forces created by capitalism and of developing them further. The development of the Soviet Union shows that the capitalists are superfluous for the further development of humanity, and in fact harmful. The development of the Soviet Union shows that capitalism is only a passing, an historical category. This has not only been proved in theory but also in practice by the facts of the tremendous work of construction that has been accomplished in the past few years.

In 1921 Lenin estimated that the restoration of the big industries "will take not less than 10 years, in view of our poverty-stricken State, and perhaps even longer." This was one of the rare occasions that Lenin was mistaken. The restoration of the big industries did not take 10 years, but a much shorter period. Today we can say that the restoration of Soviet industry is now complete, that we have now entered the period of the complete reconstruction of the whole of the economic system and that the pre-war level has already been exceeded. In the last ten years the increase of production has assumed enormous dimensions. Permit me to quote a few figures to you:

The value of the output of agricultural produce in 1925, calculated in pre-war values, amounted to 10,300 million roubles; 1925/26 12,300 million roubles; 1926/27 12,800 million roubles; and the estimates for the current year 1928/29 is 13,200 million roubles.

The value of the output of industry in 1924/25 was 5000 million roubles; 1925/26 6900 million roubles; 1926/27 7600 million roubles; 1927/28 8900 million roubles (in pre-war values). The increase in the output of agricultural produce from year to year was: 19%, 4% and 3% respectively. In industry the annual increases were: 39%, 14% and 13.4% respectively.

You will observe a slackening down in the rate of increase. This is quite natural for the reason that we have no more means of production left over by the capitalists to put to use and we must now produce our own means of production:

The next point that I want to draw your attention to is that the rate of economic development in the Soviet Union is far more rapid than it has been in any capitalist country since 1921. I take 1921 as the starting point because that was the year in which industry had sunk to the lowest point in the Soviet Union and also the year of the severe post-war crisis in capitalist countries. Taking 1921 at 100 we can make the following comparisons: production of wheat in the Soviet Union 365, whereas for the United States the figure stands at 107, England 76, Germany 112. The same applies to the production of rye. In the output of manufactured goods the difference is even greater.

It may be objected that I am quoting figures from Russian sources. But comrades, similar figures are published in capital-

ist countries. Every year the League of Nations publishes a huge volume of statistics of the state of production and commerce. In this volume we find the following figures of the production of raw materials and articles of consumption for various important areas. Here 1913 is taken at 100 and the methods of calculation are the same as I employ above. Values are expressed in pre-war gold prices and the figures we get are as follows:

For Europe, not including the Soviet Union, the index of production for 1926 is 95, i. e. a drop of 5% as compared with 1913. For Europe, including the Soviet Union, the index of production is 100. Thus, by including the Soviet Union in the statistics of production the index figure for Europe is raised by 5%. This shows that while Europe is still 5% below the prewar level we are so far above it, even on the calculations of the League of Nations, that the inclusion of the Soviet Union raises the index level for the whole of Europe from 95 to 100.

It must be emphasised, comrades, that the progress in the Soviet Union was achieved exclusively by means of its own resources, whereas the restoration of Germany, Poland, Italy and other countries was achieved with the help of large credits obtained from America. As you know, the credits received by the Soviet Union are relatively insignificant; several hundred million roubles as against 10,000 million marks lent to Germany, the population of which is only half that of the Soviet Union. The proletariat of the Soviet Union succeeded in restoring its industries and carrying them beyond the pre-war level and above the level of the rest of Europe, as the League of Nations figures show, not with the help of the capitalist powers but in conflict with these powers on the world market. This, comrades, is the most important thing I can say on this point.

I have shown, comrades, that at the present time the rate of increase has slackened down because we have utilised to the utmost all the means of production we took over from the former capitalists and that, for the last two years we have had to produce our own means of production. This means, comrades, that enormous capital must be accumulated in the country. Whereas in the first years of the proletarian dictatorship the Soviet Union lived on the stocks left over from the pre-revolutionary times and whereas up to 1924/25 the total wealth of the country had actually declined, in the last few years, there has been an enormous accumulation of wealth. I want to recall to your mind the speech Lenin delivered at the IV. Congress in which he proudly referred to the fact that our industries for the first time had made 20 million roubles profit, which could be reinvested for the further development of industry. But, comrades, in the four years that have passed since the V. Congress, the State industries, the socialist sector of the industry producing means of production made 9500 million roubles profit and the raw materials and manufacturing industries 3500 million roubles, making altogether 12,900 million roubles. In round figures 13,000 million roubles have been accumulated in the last four years. You see from this what the 20 millions, of which Lenin boasted at the IV. Congress, have grown into. These accumulations do not include the accumulations of the peasantry and of private industry.

These great accumulations have enabled the Soviet Government to make large new investments in industry. I want to remind you comrades of the great progress of electrification, of the big Dnieper scheme, of the Siberian-Turkestan Railway, of the Volga-Don Canal project, etc.

At the same time we observe an increase in the incomes of all the workers. While the average annual income per worker in 1924 amounted to 507 roubles, at the present time it has risen to 669 roubles. The annual income of the city worker has risen from 572 roubles to 843 roubles. The level of prices during the last four years has undergone little change. The budget index i. e. the retail prices index stood four years ago at 1,86 and at the present time stands at 1,93. The total national income has increased from 15,600 million roubles to 24,000 million roubles, i. e. an increase during the four years of over 50%.

We may also make a comparison between the accumulation in pre-war times with that of the present time. Before the war 22%, more than one fifth of the national income went to the governing class out of a total of 2,700 million gold roubles.

Approximately half of this was accumulated. Real accumulation — after subtracting fictitious capital, amounted to 800—1,000 million roubles. We see therefore that the present rate of accumulation is approximately twice that of pre-war accumulation.

The general increase in prosperity is reflected in the improvement in the social conditions of the general population. First of all I want to point to the enormous increase in the population itself. During the last four years there has been an increase of the population of more than 3 million; the birthrate in the Soviet Union is the highest in the world — 45%. Notwithstanding the fact that there are no laws prohibiting birth control in Russia, notwithstanding the fact that every woman has the right to decide for herself whether she shall bear children or not, in fact when a woman does not desire to bear children she has every facility for avoiding child-birth under the most hygienic conditions. Yet notwithstanding this we have an enormous increase in the birth-rate which is accompanied by a diminution in the death-rate, hence the large increase in the population of over 3 millions. In 1911—1913 the death rate in Russia was 29 per thousand, in 1926 it was only 21,4 per thousand. This is one of the greatest achievements of Soviet hygiene and of the Soviet State as a whole. Diseases that were chronic in Tsarist Russia, for example cholera, have now entirely disappeared, and other diseases like typhus and tuberculosis have declined enormously.

I have before me an article written by Comrade Semashko on the X Anniversary of the Commissariat for Public Health, in which he quotes numerous statistics showing the great progress made in public health. For example, infant mortality, which in 1913 stood at 26%, the highest rate in Europe, dropped to 18.7% in 1926. Of 100 children born, nine less die now in their first year of life than in the time of Tsarism. Equally great progress has been made in raising the general culture of the people, in promoting general literacy and particularly in raising the culture of the formerly oppressed and persecuted nationalities. All this is evidence of the great progress that has been made in the country during the last few years.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT TOWARDS SOCIALISM.

I come now to the second point. Clearly, however welcome this cultural and material progress may be, we must still ask whether this progress is in the direction of our socialist goal or not, because we find material progress in America, for example, and in capitalist countries we observe a certain rise in culture. Therefore, I want to deal now with the question as to what extent this development is socialist development. First of all I must point out that there are two sectors in the process of construction in the Soviet Union: 1. the socialist sector and the other the private sector. One of the lines of development of Soviet economy is that the private economic sector is coming more and more under the influence of the socialist sector. However that may be, all the evidence goes to show that the socialist sector has become enormously stronger in many respects in the past four years. I will quote a few of the most important figures proving this.

Of the wage workers employed in the Soviet Union in 1924, 80% were employed in the socialist sector; today the percentage is 81. Of the total production of the country (including agriculture) in 1924, 30% was socialist production; at the present time socialist production represents 40%. In 1924—1925 44% of new capital investments were socialist investment, at the present time 65% are socialist investments. In absolute figures we get the following: In 1924—1925 the industrial and agricultural branches of the socialist section of production brought in 4,200 million roubles while the private section brought in 11,000 million roubles. In 1927—1928 however, the socialist sector brought in 8,200 million roubles, i. e. an increase of 100%, whereas the private sector in the same period brought in 13,800 million roubles, an increase of only 20%. The total production is increasing very rapidly, but the socialist section of production is increasing more rapidly than production as a whole.

We observe the same thing in commerce. In the last few years, as a result of the rapid development of cooperative trading, private trading has been greatly diminished. In 1921—1922 we had 20,000 co-operative stores, at the present time we have 78,000. The membership of cooperative societies has

increased from 7 millions to nearly 18 millions. Parallel with this, private commerce is being squeezed out of the sphere of commodity circulation.

The second factor in this process is the industrialisation of the land. There is hardly need for me to stress the point here that the basis of the proletarian dictatorship is the development of large-scale industry. In this respect enormous progress has been made in the past four years. This progress is absolutely essential for the Soviet Union in order that it may not become an agrarian appendage to the capitalist world, and in order that its power of defence shall not be weakened. You comrades know that in the present stage of military technique industrial development is one of the most important factors in defence in the event of war. An agrarian country that has no industries is practically unarmed in war. Thus, the development of large-scale industry is technically, as well as from the class point of view, in the conflict with the capitalist world which confronts us, one of the fundamental reasons for the necessity for socialist development. I will quote a few figures to show what progress has been made.

The relative importance of industry and agriculture has changed as follows: in 1924/25 agriculture represented 67.6% of the economy of the Soviet Union as a whole and industry 32.4%; in 1927/28 agriculture dropped to 59.8% and industry rose to 40.2%. Within the sphere of industry itself the production of means of production has developed more than industrial production as a whole. The relations between the production of means of production and production of articles of consumption can be expressed in the following figures. In 1926/27, 887 million roubles were invested in the production of means of production and 278 million roubles were invested in the industries producing means of consumption. Thus, in the present economic year four times as much capital has been invested in the production of means of production as was invested in the production of means of consumption.

The following figures will serve still further to illustrate the relation between these two branches of industry. In 1924/25 the value of the output of means of production was 41.6% of the total output of industry and that of means of consumption 58.4%, i. e. a considerable preponderance of means of consumption. In 1927/28, i. e. in the present economic year, the production of means of production will amount to 55%, while articles of consumption will amount to 45%. We see, therefore, that the line of development is towards Socialism, towards industrialisation, towards transforming the country from an agrarian country into an agrarian-industrial country. I must add also, that the development of industry, including also the development of the production of means of production, is proceeding at a far more rapid rate than in capitalist countries.

III. CLASS RELATIONSHIPS.

Comrades, you know that in analysing the class relationships in the Soviet Union Comrade Lenin defined five types: Socialism, State capitalism, private capitalism, small commodity production (handicrafts, home industries and the peasantry) and patriarchal system (the system that prevails among the more backward peoples in the Soviet Union). No change has taken place in this general structure in the past few years, but the importance of certain social economic types has undergone considerable changes. The socialist element has grown enormously; State capitalism is quite insignificant. The "hope" that State capitalism will develop to a considerable extent in the form of foreign concessions has not been fulfilled. In the present state of Soviet economy concessions play a very insignificant role. Similarly the patriarchal system also plays a very insignificant role, so that we have only three outstanding types at the present time: Socialism, small commodity production and private capitalism. And correspondingly with that we have three main classes: the proletariat; the peasantry, the handicraftsmen and the urban petty bourgeoisie; and the capitalist class.

The question then arises: in what way is the attitude of these three main classes influenced by the economic policy of the proletarian dictatorship? I must first of all point out the difference that exists between the economic policy of capitalist States and the economic policy of the proletarian dictatorship. The economic policy of capitalist States is directed towards

preserving the capitalist mode of production. The economic policy of capitalism is directed towards strengthening the class basis of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The economic policy of the Soviet State, however, is directed towards strengthening the class basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under capitalism, the policy is to support the "sturdy" peasantry, whereas the policy of the Soviet Government is to uplift the poor peasants, to support the middle peasants and to fight the wealthy peasants. In the capitalist world we have: striving for the maximum profits for the capitalists. In the Soviet Union production is carried on for the maximum benefit of all the toilers. In capitalist countries the independent producers are subordinated to the capitalists. In the Soviet Union, however, the independent producers, the small commodity producers, by improving their position, by collectivisation, are led into the channels of socialist production.

What methods can the dictatorship employ to carry out its economic policy? The situation in the Soviet Union in this respect differs radically from that in the capitalist world. Certain methods are common to both, for example, taxation and tariffs. But the proletarian dictatorship, which is in possession of the economic key-positions, has other means at its disposal by which to influence the private economic section. First of all there is the fixing of prices by the State, bank, credit, etc. Of course there are certain limits to the employment of these methods, and these limits will exist as long as the private economic section exists. But these methods are very effective and can be employed very successfully. What are the limits to the employment of these methods? These are the necessity to co-operate with the vast masses of the peasantry. Unless the limitations of these methods are recognised a rupture with the masses of the peasantry will be inevitable, which in the special conditions prevailing in the Soviet Union may threaten the very existence of the proletarian dictatorship.

a) The Proletariat.

When we come to examine the conditions of each separate class under the dictatorship we find the following:

The conditions of the proletariat in the last few years have improved considerably. The real wages of the industrial proletariat represent 134% of pre-war wages (including social services) and far exceed the development of the real wages of the proletariat in the most powerful capitalist countries, as the following figures show: — Soviet Union 134%; U. S. A. 130%; England 103%; Germany — skilled workers 103%; unskilled workers 93%. I must add that the figures for the capitalist countries are official figures, and therefore must be taken as the most favourable that could be presented. In actual fact the difference between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union is much greater than here presented.

In regard to the working day, already in 1926, before the 7 hour day was introduced, the average working day in the Soviet Union was 7¹/₂ hours as against 9¹/₂ hours before the war. You know, comrades, that at the present time a large number of factories have adopted the 7-hour day or are in the process of introducing it. Moreover, in the mining industries there is now a transition to a 6-hour day. In addition, as you know, every worker gets an annual vacation of at least 2 weeks. More than a half million workers are sent each year to rest homes. You see, therefore, that the conditions of the workers have been enormously improved.

This does not mean that there is no exploitation in Russia. There is exploitation, and we must not ignore it. First of all we have a concealed form of exploitation in the home industries, the so-called "kustars". A large number of such kustars are set up by capitalists, who actually employ them, as independent producers. As such they do not come under the labour protection laws, nor can they become members of trade unions. We have about 100,000 workers working in this way.

In addition there is the exploitation of the agricultural labourers by the rich peasants, which is very difficult to keep under control. In the Soviet Union there are approximately 2 million agricultural workers, and you will be surprised to learn that not more than 600,000 are organised in the trade unions. But, comrades, you must not forget the enormous territory covered by the Soviet Union. You must not measure the task of organising the scattered agricultural labourers in the Soviet Union with Western European scales. Just remember,

that it takes an express train 10 days to travel from the Polish frontier to Vladivostok; that the Soviet Union stretches from the North Pole to the Indian frontier and that the agricultural labourers in this enormous territory are scattered among 800,000 villages, many of which are over 1,000 kilometres from the nearest railway station. It will require considerable efforts indeed on the part of the trade unions and the proletarian dictatorship before all these labourers exploited by the wealthy kulak peasants can be completely organised.

b) Peasantry.

Now I come to the position of the peasantry under the dictatorship of the proletariat. On this point I want to mention two theories. The bourgeois thinkers advance the following theory: in the Soviet Union the industrial proletariat lives like a parasite upon the peasants; the proletariat exploits the peasant class. Comrades, I have obtained a wealth of material from the State Planning Commission showing what the peasants have obtained from the revolution and how the relations between town and country have changed. I will read you the most important of these figures.

The peasantry obtained from the big landowners 75 million hectares of land and from the rich peasants an additional 65 million hectares, making altogether 140 million hectares. Calculated in pre-war roubles the value of this land would amount to 20,000 million roubles. Roughly speaking, the income from this land prior to the war was 1,000 million roubles gold. The fact that the peasantry obtained land to the value of 20,000 million roubles laid the basis for the military alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry during the war against intervention.

But, comrades, this basis for the alliance is beginning to decline in importance. The peasants feel safe in the possession of their land and therefore there must be some new basis for maintaining the alliance. Obviously the alliance could not exist for a moment longer if it were true that the proletariat exploited the peasants. We will investigate the distribution of the national income to see whether it is true or not. Let us take a capitalist country for comparison. What does the peasantry in a capitalist country give to the cities without compensation? It gives the following: taxes, rent, interest on mortgages and other debts. In addition there are also administration costs, such as litigation costs, fines and what in Tsarist Russia played a very great part, the bribing of officials. These are the imposts which the peasantry had to bear in pre-war times.

What is the position now in regard to taxes? Before the war the peasants paid round about 500 million gold roubles per annum — after deducting what came back to them from the State in the form of certain services. Today, if allowance is made for the sums that the Soviet Governments grants to the peasantry for economic development purposes, the taxes borne by the peasantry amounts to 236 million pre-war roubles per annum. The rent which the peasants had to pay before the revolution, counting 25 million dessiatins at an average rent of about 14 roubles per dessiatin, would amount to 314 million gold roubles per annum. The interest on mortgages which the peasantry had to pay amounted, to another 100 million roubles per annum. It is difficult to calculate the amount the peasants had to pay in fines, for bribery, litigation costs, and so on, but I think we can put that down at 100 million roubles per annum. Taking all these sums into account we must come to the conclusion that the peasants today pay to the town about 800 million gold roubles less than they paid before the revolution.

On the other hand we have the "scissors" problem, that is to say, that the price of agricultural produce is lower than the price of manufactured goods as compared with pre-war time — which is the case all over the world. We can calculate this difference at about 40%. Now the peasants sell produce to the cities amounting to 2,500 million roubles. Forty per cent. of this would amount to 1,000 million roubles; calculated in pre-war roubles it would amount to about half this sum. Thus, a rough calculation shows that there is absolutely no exploitation in this sense at all. In fact the peasants give to the cities several hundred millions less than they did before the war.

Of course this does not mean that no part of the income of the peasantry is used for the purpose of building up So-

cialist industry. Certainly the peasants must contribute towards this and will have to do so for several years to come. The fact that we obtain no foreign loans and that we exploit no colonies compels us to accumulate our capital for the purpose of building up our industries out of the incomes of the toilers themselves, and the 60 million working peasants must contribute towards this. This contribution will continue to be made in the form of the "scissors" until we have reached the level of capitalist countries.

But does this mean that the peasants are exploited? Of course not. The contributions that are made by the peasantry in the form of the "scissors" are not squandered by a governing class as was the case before the war. What was the case before the war? The landlords took hundreds of carloads of grain from the peasantry in the form of rent and exported it, and out of the proceeds went on pleasure trips to Paris. What is the situation today? What the peasants give to the cities is used for the purpose of building up socialist industry, and to the extent that industry is developed the prices of the goods the peasants have to buy are reduced. In this way the peasants receive back in full all that they give.

The Opposition advanced the theses that we must raise the price of manufactured goods in order to extract the largest possible share of the income of the peasantry for the purpose of socialist industrial development. I have already said that although the power of the proletarian State is very great, it is not limitless, either economically or politically. The economic limitations to this power are the following: if hard-pressed the peasantry can dispense with manufactured goods for a very long time. The peasant can weave his own cloth and instead of sugar he can make his own syrup. If the peasant finds that the price of the State manufactured goods are too high he can withdraw into his self-sufficing economy again and declare a trading strike (refuse to sell or buy) as was actually the case in 1923. Moreover, in the Soviet Union we have private industry: handicrafts, private capitalist industry, home industries, and so on. If we fix too high a price for State factory goods we will give an opportunity to these more backward forms of industry to develop at the expense of State industries. In other words if the peasant is able to obtain from the handicraft workers, boots, cloth, and so on, at a lower price than he can obtain them from the State industries, of course he will purchase them from the former. Consequently, to open the "scissors" still wider would mean to reverse the evolution of the Soviet Union, would mean a curtailment of agricultural production for the market and the development of backward and hostile elements in industry. Moreover, such a policy would be disastrous from the political standpoint, because it would break the alliance and co-operation between the working peasants and the city workers.

Equally erroneous is the theory advanced by Otto Bauer, namely, that the dictatorship in the Soviet Union is not a proletarian dictatorship, but the dictatorship of the peasantry. This theory, which is being widely promulgated by the Social Democrats, is absolutely wrong, and is proved by the relationships between the peasantry and the proletarian dictatorship that have prevailed up till now.

Neither of these theories is true. The peasantry neither dominate nor are they exploited. It is absolutely necessary for the time being to take a certain part of the product of the peasantry for the purpose of developing our industries, because we have no outside sources from which to obtain the means for this purpose. But if a proper policy is adopted, this contribution can be taken in such a manner as not to destroy and at the same time not to endanger the alliance between the peasants and the proletariat. The contribution from the peasantry will be necessary only up to the time when our industries have been completely developed.

c) The Process of Differentiation in the Rural Districts. The Kulak.

Comrades, I now come to the process of differentiation among the peasantry, with particular reference to the differentiation which went on in the economy of the Soviet Union during the N. E. P. period. At the time of the introduction of the New Economic Policy, Lenin pointed out that on the basis of free trade and the system of petty economy there was bound to arise a capitalist development and that it was the task of the

Soviet State, of the proletarian dictatorship, to keep this capitalist development within reasonable bounds, to restrict it, and to remove the capitalist elements from production as soon as Soviet economy has recovered with the aid of the New Economic Policy. Lenin never considered the New Economic Policy to be just a retreat and nothing more, but a retreat for the purpose of preparing for a subsequent offensive, for a subsequent transition to Socialism. Now, comrades, what has taken place among the peasantry under the regime of the New Economic Policy? Unquestionably, a certain differentiation has taken place. But it is exceedingly difficult to gauge the extent of this differentiation. Why? In capitalist countries, where land may be freely sold, the concentration of land serves as an excellent gauge for measuring the differentiation. In the Soviet Union, the selling of land is forbidden. It is, therefore, impossible for a capitalist stratum of peasants to emerge upon the basis of land ownership. But there are various other criteria: for example, the size of a peasant's farm. There are various interesting statistical data showing how the cultivated area has changed in recent years. The following figures were established by the Central Statistical Department:

Peasant families:	1922	1926
Out of 100		
No land at all . . .	4.1	4.5
Up to 4 hectares . . .	81.0	67.0
Up to 8 hectares . . .	13.0	23.0
From 8 to 13 hectares . . .	1.4	5.2
More than 13 hectares . . .	0.2	0.8

Thus, upon the basis of the size of the land holdings the differentiation of the peasantry can be quite clearly established. But, comrades, the land area is not an adequate criterion, because there are various ways of concealing the differentiation; concealed forms of peasant dependence upon wealthy peasants; concealed forms of exploitation of the poor peasants by the kulaks.

The correlation is approximately as follows: there are in the Soviet Union about 25 million peasant farms. Out of these about 8 millions are poor peasants, about 16 million middle peasants, and about 1 million kulaks. As to the magnitude of this kulak element, there are various estimates. There is an estimate by Larin which sets it at 2%; Molotov gives it as 3 to 4%; an estimate by the Communist Academy (Geister) sets it between 5 and 7%, whilst the Opposition estimates it at 10%.

The fact of the matter is this: the broader the view taken of the stratum described as poor, the slighter becomes the difference between this stratum and the middle peasants, because there is a fairly graduated transition in the village: it is not like in the town where one can say more or less precisely: you are a capitalist, you are an artisan, you are a worker. The rural population is in a constant state of flux: poor peasants passing into poorer middle peasants, middle peasants into wealthier middle peasants, big peasants into wealthy peasants, etc. If we employ the term "kulak" too loosely, the typical exploiting character, which is the special feature of the kulak and not the size of his farm, disappears. I am of the opinion, therefore, that if we stick to the definition that the kulak is an exploiter, a man whose income is derived chiefly from the exploitation of the labour of others, then we must agree to the estimate made by Larin, which sets the kulaks at approximately 2%.

What form does this exploitation take? You must bear in mind, that there are three principal elements in agricultural production, the soil, labour-power, and the means of production. Under the present conditions the situation is determined by the possession of the means of production. Why? The revolution gave land to the landless peasants, but not sufficient means of production, while some of the poor peasants lost the means of production they obtained in the revolution as a result of bad harvests. We therefore have the following situation in the village: there is the poor peasant who possesses his holding of land and his personal labour power, but he lacks the necessary live stock and implements to cultivate his land. This is the basis upon which the exploitation of the poor peasants by the kulaks develops. This takes different forms, for instance the kulak rents the poor peasant's allotment and

the latter has to help in cultivating this land, receiving only a slight portion of the crops, while the lion's share goes to the wealthy peasant. Or, where such renting is inconvenient to the kulak, on the ground of taxation, the opposite arrangement is made: the poor peasant requests the kulak to come with his horse and plough to till his allotment. Ostensibly the poor peasant is the employer, the exploiter for whom the kulak is working. In reality, however, this is a form of concealing the most relentless exploitation of the poor peasants, because the major share of the harvest is taken away by the kulak. Or, arrangements are made whereby the kulak uses his horses and means of production to till the land of the poor peasant, in return for which the poor peasant has to work for a long period for the kulak. Owing to the fact that the land is nationalised and cannot be sold, and also owing to the heavy pressure of taxation upon the kulak, the differentiation in the village assumes a concealed form and cannot be quite clearly ascertained. Naturally, the policy of the dictatorship is to protect the poor peasants in every way against the wealthy peasants, by giving them seeds, by selling them the means of production on credit, by tilling their land with the tractors of the Soviet farms, by organising them on collective lines, and so on. Nevertheless, the dictatorship has not yet arrived at a solution of this problem; the solution is handicapped by the actual poverty of the Socialist sector. It is true that the Soviet Union is potentially one of the richest, perhaps the richest country in the world. There are still in the Soviet Union millions of millions of hectares of uncultivated land. There are gigantic forests, many times larger than the territory of Germany. But the necessary means of production with which to realise this natural wealth are lacking. Since the Soviet Government is still unable to place the necessary means of production at the disposal of the poor peasants, we shall have for a time to put up with a situation in which the rich peasant exploits the land of the poor peasants, either by renting his land or helping in its cultivation. This state of affairs will terminate as soon as the industry of the Soviet Union is able to turn out sufficient tractors, ploughs and machinery to help all these poor peasants, so that they can cultivate their land themselves, and if possible, to get them all organised on collectivist lines.

What is the extent of the power of these wealthy kulaks and what are their actual possessions? I will cite some very interesting figures compiled by Larin concerning these 2% of real exploiting peasants. He draws the following picture:

Taking the peasants as a whole, the distribution of land is 65 dessiatins per hundred souls. Taking the 2% separately the proportion is 240 dessiatins per hundred. Thus on the average, this stratum holds four times the amount of land held by the other peasants. However, statistics show that the 2% owns double the amount of cattle; each of these kulaks exploits on the average 2 wage-earners, whilst all the other peasants employ only 0.02%; thus, nearly the whole of the exploited agricultural labour is entirely absorbed by these 2% of real kulaks.

d) The Urban Bourgeois Elements.

Out of the total volume of production in the industry of the country, about 12% is produced by private capitalists. They employ about 17% of the total workers employed, and Larin estimates their profits at 75 millions annually. The interesting theoretical point in this connection is that this capitalist stratum has its own ideology and its own line of economic policy. Its economic policy is to form a united private system of economic production and circulation of commodities side by side with the Socialist system, from which it wants to keep free. How is this done, comrades? The private capitalist purchases his raw materials chiefly from the kulaks. He distributes these raw materials chiefly among home industry workers, on the capitalist basis of the contract system. He goes on to distribute the goods produced by the home workers through private trading channels, selling them chiefly to the peasants. It is highly interesting to observe how elastic this new born group of capitalists in the Soviet Union is. For instance, we prohibit the transportation of private stocks of corn over the railways. But they go to work and organise their private transportation in small boats by the river routes. They purchase the corn from the kulaks, deliver it in their own boats to the private mills where it is ground into flour. They sell the flour to the private merchants in the towns, who in their turn sell it to

private consumers. This is the economic policy of the new bourgeoisie. The strength of this stratum is naturally very slight, because it has no organisation whatsoever. This must be borne in mind. Although the bourgeoisie in the Soviet Union economically still constitutes a certain force, it is nevertheless completely powerless from the class standpoint. It has no organisation, and as a class, it is completely crushed, suppressed, deprived of all influence and is tolerated only as long as it still performs a certain function in the national economy of the Soviet Union.

Why has it a certain function? Because the Socialist sector is not yet sufficiently developed to be able to manage entirely the exchange of commodities between town and village, down to the remotest corner of the Soviet Union. The moment the Soviet economy, the Socialist sector, will be sufficiently strong to manage this, there will be no further use for these functions and this capitalist stratum will be removed without the slightest political difficulty. In this respect, its role is quite different from the role of the middle peasants to represent a big political force.

Of the three principal classes I have named, the proletariat stands entirely on the basis of the dictatorship, and so also do the poor peasants. The middle peasants are in alliance with the proletariat, but oscillate in their allegiance according to circumstances. The capitalist stratum, the kulaks and the private capitalists are hostile to the Soviet economy of the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin once said: "The kulak becomes dangerous especially when he is able to draw the middle peasants to his side." The task of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union is precisely to hinder the kulak from winning the hegemony over the middle peasants; because the middle peasants comprise 16 million peasant farms with about 40 million adult peasants. If this force turned against the proletarian dictatorship, it would naturally represent a dangerous force: it would mean civil war.

IV. THE ROLE OF PLANNED ECONOMY IN THE ECONOMY OF THE SOVIET UNION.

Comrades, you know that unlike the anarchic system of production which prevails in the capitalist countries, in the Soviet Union there is a system of planned economy. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union experiences economic difficulties from time to time. Why? To understand this, we must consider the following facts: what is planned economy in a situation where both a Socialist and a private economic sector exist? Such an economy consists of three elements. Firstly, it is based upon foresight, i. e. upon forecasting economic development and influencing it. Foresight in regard to future development is practised also in the capitalist countries. Every big capitalist Trust has its "conjuncture bureau" which tries to calculate future conditions of production and consumption. The same is also carried on in our planned economy. Then we have the regulation of production, of course only in the Socialist sector, for the Soviet Government can regulate production only in its own factories and on its own agricultural estates. Finally, we also have the planned influencing of the private sector. There are 25 million peasant farms in the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Government cannot decree how much these 25 million farms should produce, how much they should sell and how much they should buy. This is impossible. But the Soviet Government can influence the course of production and consumption. For instance, suppose it is necessary to develop the production of cotton. In such a case, we shall pay higher prices for cotton, while at the same time supplying cheap grain to the cotton-growing districts, so that the peasant will be better off by raising cotton for us than by growing grain for himself. You see, comrades, there is a difference in principle between the regulation of the Socialist sector and the systematic influencing of the private economic sector. The means used for this planned influencing is the regulation of buying and selling prices. The only way we can direct peasant economy is by arranging things so that the course we desire shall prove advantageous to the individual peasant. You see, comrades, what tremendous difficulties this planned economy has to contend with. If we had complete Socialism, an exclusively socialist system of production, our planned economy would consist only of planning and regulating. Today, it consists of foresight, planned influencing and regulation; and these three things must be co-ordi-

nated. But this is not always done, nor is it always possible, in view of the complicated nature of the tasks.

What is the concrete purpose of planned economy under these circumstances? It is to guide the whole national economy of the Soviet Union into Socialist channels. It must strive, firstly, to maintain equilibrium between the production of the means of production and the production of the commodities to be consumed. It must maintain equilibrium between agriculture and industry. The total value of the commodities in circulation must balance with the total amount of currency in circulation. In other words, it must keep stable the purchasing power of the currency in the home market. Furthermore, it must maintain a proper balance of foreign trade, between exports and imports, so as to secure the purchasing power of the currency abroad; it must judiciously distribute the investments between the production of the means of production and the production of articles of consumption. All this has to be determined beforehand not only for one year, but for five and ten years ahead. You see, comrades, planning economy is not so easy as talking about it. It is very difficult to work out a good plan, and it is even more difficult to carry out a good plan in its entirety, because we have also a non-Socialist sector, which we can influence only indirectly. Therefore, notwithstanding the planned economy, periodical difficulties arise in the Soviet Union. You must observe, however, that there is a cardinal difference between the crises of capitalism and the difficulties of the Soviet Union. Under capitalism the immanent laws of capitalist development lead periodically to over-production and to crises. It is inherent in the system. In the Soviet Union, however, the difficulties arise either on account of miscalculations in the economic planning or, in the majority of cases, they are the result of a shortage. The crises under capitalism are due to over-production. The crisis-like phenomena in the Soviet Union are the result of under-production, the result of shortage. This is the cardinal difference.

The stronger, the more capitalistic a capitalist State is, the more regularly do crises recur, and the more acute are these crises. The richer the Soviet economy will be, the larger its reserves will be from which to fill any unforeseen gaps, the less will be our difficulties.

The same difference exists as regards to unemployment. Unemployment under capitalism results from the operation of the inherent laws of capitalist development. Under capitalism there must be a reserve army of labour, and this reserve army, now, in the period of decline, is assuming the character of a chronic mass phenomenon, which I have called structural unemployment. In the Soviet Union, however, unemployment is due solely to the poverty of the economy of the country. If means of production could be provided for all the unemployed, there would never be any unemployment in the Soviet Union, because the capitalist restrictions of the market no longer exist in the Soviet Union; even today. To put it more plainly: if we could provide the unemployed with the means of production, we would be able to build tens of thousands of new houses for which there is such a tremendous demand in the Soviet Union. These houses could be provided with furniture and the necessary comforts; hundreds of thousands of kilometres of roads and railways could be built; the peasants could be supplied with cheap up-to-date means of production, to that they would be able to turn out increased quantities of new materials. There are not limits to our market. In the Soviet Union, even today, regardless of the existence of private capitalist elements, an increase in production implies an increase in consuming capacity. If we could provide the unemployed with the means of production, they would naturally begin to receive wages immediately and to consume to the extent that they produce, and things would move smoothly. Not so under capitalism, where the tendency is for the social consuming power to lag behind the producing power. Under capitalism there is always either open or latent over-production. In our economy there is always a latent shortage of commodities. I will return to this subject again. Just now I merely wish to point out that unemployment in the Soviet Union is not a phenomenon resulting from the structure of society, but it is simply the consequence of a shortage in the means of production, which prevents employment being found for these workers.

Another concrete example. We have a fairly big over-population in the rural districts: on the other hand there are millions of hectares uncultivated land. And yet, the two ele-

ments cannot be brought together. Why? Because there is a shortage of means of production in the Soviet Union with which to settle these workers on the new land, with which to build houses for them, to supply them with ploughs, horses, etc. These elements will be kept apart as long as there is not sufficient productive power to supply them with the necessary means of production.

Thus, comrades, when I say that we have difficulties in spite of our planned economy, these — apart the difficulties of calculation — are not the difficulties of over-production, but always difficulties of under-production, of the shortage of means of production and the insufficiency of reserves.

V. THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE PRESENT YEAR .

And now I come to the question of the difficulties we experienced in the current year about which so much noise was made in the foreign press. Every day we read: there is an acute crisis of the Soviet system. The rupture between the peasantry and the proletariat is imminent and so on. It was asserted all the time that there was a crisis in Soviet economy. But, comrades, all these statements are absolutely wide of the mark. No crises occur in the Soviet economy, and there was none this year. There are difficulties, or rather, there were difficulties in the grain collection, there is a problem connected with the raising of corn, but there is no crisis whatever in the Soviet economy.

Allow me, comrades, to cite a few figures. In the course of the first 8 months of the current year the industrial output was increased by 20% as compared with the preceding year instead of the 13.4% provided for in the plan. The productivity of labour increased by 12%; real wages by 9%, while cost of production was reduced by about 6%. Thus, comrades, there is no crisis in industry. As regards raw materials, we see this year an increased output ranging from 25% to 100% over that of the preceding year. There can be no talk whatever of a crisis. There were difficulties in the collection of grain. These difficulties were due to different causes. I will first allude to the general causes and then to the special causes. The general causes lie in the backward development of our agriculture. It may be said that our agriculture as a whole has regained the pre-war level, nevertheless the production of grain in particular is still 5% below the pre-war level. As against this, comrades, the population increases year by year, as I have said. The population today is approximately 6% to 7% larger than before the war. Therefore, on pure mathematical grounds, apart from the increased consuming requirements of the emancipated toiling masses of the population, there is a difference of 11—12% as between the production of corn and the number of consumers in the country.

Why is our agriculture in a backward condition? The main reasons are; firstly, the low cultural level of the peasantry, which is the legacy of the old Tsarist regime. Although the cultural level of the peasantry has risen tremendously, nevertheless it is very much below what it should be. Secondly, the system of excessively small land allotments. Twenty-five million peasant farms including 8 million poor peasants with very small strips of land. Naturally, no rapid development of production can be expected upon such small strips of land. Furthermore, the small allotments are broken up into tiny plots of land, scattered over different places, each individual peasant cultivating from 10 to 20 little plots of land. Next comes the shortage in the means of production, of which I have already spoken. Things are further aggravated by the low productive level of the petty enterprise of the peasants. The result is that on the average, the yield of a hectare in the Soviet Union is approximately one-fourth the yield in Germany, Belgium, England, etc., although the quality of the soil is by no means worse. Of course, this backwardness has its redeeming points, since it means that there are tremendous possibilities for increased production. It may be confidently assumed that it would be possible by means of simply measures requiring no large outlay of capital, e. g. improved seeds, deeper ploughing, the substitution of iron ploughs for the five million wooden ploughs still used in the Soviet Union, and so forth, to double the yield of crops within a reasonable period of time. And when this is achieved, there will naturally be quite a big increase in the grain exports.

These are the general causes of the backwardness of our

agriculture in regard to the industrial pace. There are also some special causes. These are the following: the peasants are working as independent small producers, and the individual peasant cultivates those particular crops which he finds economically advantageous to his own private enterprise. It happened that the prices paid by the Soviet government for cotton, hemp or other so-called technical crops were much higher than the peasant could realise by raising corn or cattle and selling them on the market, so that there was a relative decrease in the raising of corn. Furthermore, owing to the large investments of capital in the socialised industries, the peasants in recent years obtained sources of income apart from the selling of agricultural produce. Large numbers of peasants are working in the towns as builders, as unskilled workers. The enormous growth of the building industry has been the source of considerable income for the rural workers. Furthermore, the building activity means that the transportation of timber, stone, sand, etc. provides quite a big source of income for the better equipped peasants. The report of the Planning Commission states that the aggregate income of the peasants from sources other than agriculture (working as labourers, hauling, etc.) in 1926/27 and 1927/28 amounted to 2300 millions annually, or nearly as much as they realised from the sale of agricultural products outside of the village. What does this mean? It means that the more prosperous peasants were not compelled immediately to sell their corn in order to pay their taxes, and to purchase in the market the necessary manufactured goods. They had other incomes apart from agriculture, and they also had considerable income from the selling of technical crops and of dairy produce. Naturally, they could afford to wait, and sell their corn when they thought it most advantageous to do so.

At this point the influence of the kulaks asserted itself. According to Larin's calculations, about 20% of the surplus grain is in the hands of the kulaks. The comrades know that, as regards grain, 20% constitutes a very big manoeuvring fund. If in a capitalist country a corn ring or a trust manages to get hold of 20% of the harvest, it is certainly able to do a good deal of manoeuvring in the matter of fixing prices. And this was also attempted by the kulaks in the present economic year. The result was, as you know, that in the beginning of the year 1928 the Soviet government was short of 128 million poods of grain as compared with the required quantity, or about one-fifth.

The necessity arose then for the Soviet government and for the Party to accelerate the collection of grain and to adopt extraordinary measures against those kulak elements who hoarded grain for purposes of speculation. We reached a point when these capitalist elements of the Soviet economy tried to exceed the bounds set for them by the dictatorship, and the dictatorship reacted by adopting extraordinary measures. The peasants who hoarded corn were treated as profiteers. A part of their hoard was confiscated and so on. The result was that by the 1st of April the deficit was made good. During that period the alignment of the class forces in the village became clearly visible. The poor peasants and the agricultural labourers supported the Soviet government and its organs in the struggle against the kulak. They reported to the Government's representatives what quantities of grain were being hoarded. Once again it was demonstrated that the old political line of Lenin, "Rely upon the poor peasants, form an alliance with the middle peasants, and always fight the kulaks", is the absolutely proper line for the proletarian dictatorship to follow.

When the campaign against the kulaks came to an end, new difficulties arose. These difficulties were due to the fact that in the Ukraine and the Northern Caucasus a fairly large proportion of the winter grain had perished, and it was necessary to resow the land. The Soviet government was obliged to distribute about 30 million poods out of its grain supplies for seeds to enable the peasants to sow summer crops instead of the perished winter crops. The bad situation naturally caused a further shrinkage in the supply of grain on the market, so that there was a certain shortage.

What measures did the Soviet government take to prevent a recurrence of this difficult situation, which presents a particularly striking example of the general tendency towards a shortage of commodities in the Soviet Union? Most of the comrades know about those measures. The price of grain for the coming year was raised, so that the raising of grain in

the coming year will be as advantageous to the peasant as the raising of other crops. It was decided, firstly, to reorganise the existing Soviet farms, and secondly, to establish new big State corn raising farms. On this work has already commenced. Already some hundreds of thousands of hectares are being newly ploughed on these Soviet farms, and it is hoped that in the course of a few years the Soviet farms will raise enough grain to make it impossible for the kulaks to manoeuvre in the collecting of grain. We must emphasise here that there is no social crisis whatever in agriculture as a whole, or any crisis in grain production. It is true that the kulaks, as a result of the coercive measures applied against them, have reduced their area of cultivation to some extent, but as against this, there was a larger sowing of the spring crops by the middle and poor peasants thanks to the support extended to them by the Soviet government. There can be no talk of an impairment of the understanding between the proletariat and the middle peasantry, but in order to ensure the grain, it has been decided not to apply any extraordinary measures this year in connection with the grain collection.

I now come to a few minor questions and defects which are frequently raised in the course of debates between our comrades and the social democrats, and which it is necessary to elucidate on practical grounds. Very frequently it is said in the social democratic press: Look how badly the proletarian dictatorship manages, how dear are the manufactured goods turned out by the Soviet enterprises. Well, comrades, it is a fact that our manufactured goods are dearer than in the advanced capitalist countries. Why? Because the equipment of the Soviet factories is to a large extent obsolete, because the growing consuming capacity of the population compels us to work the old factories in order to turn out as large a quantity of goods as possible. A large number of the old skilled industrial workers fell in the civil war, whilst another section of the skilled workers are now employed on important positions in the Soviets, in the army, etc., so that large numbers of unskilled workers had to be taken into the industries in recent years. Last but not least, the workers are considerably less exploited in this country than they are elsewhere. We have already started introducing the seven-hour day, every worker has a paid vacation of fourteen days, and so on. It stands to reason that with poor technical development and with shorter working hours than in the capitalist countries our cost of production must be higher.

We are frequently asked: why is your foreign trade so small, why do you only export and import one third of what you used to do before the war? Well, comrades, this is easily explained. It is because the peasants and the workers in the Soviet Union are now better fed than before the war. The grain output is somewhat less, the population is larger, the food is better; therefore a certain quantity is now consumed in the country which formerly used to be exported. The exports before the war were not the export of surplus products; it was rather, a starvation export, as Professor Schring puts it. The peasants starved whilst the landlords took away their crops for rent and exported the grain to foreign countries in order to import luxuries for themselves or to cover the expenses of the Russian aristocrats who were squandering money abroad. Today the situation is quite different. Therefore, we have no grain surplus. Agriculture is developing; the yield of produce will increase, both on the individual farms of the small and middle peasants as well as on the Soviet farms. Thus, in a few years we will again be able to export grain on a large scale. The home consumption of grain does not keep on growing forever, it reaches a certain point and then it begins to drop. For instance, in America the consumption of grain is much less today than it was twenty years ago. Why? Because the people consume large quantities of dairy products, meat, poultry, fruit, etc., and therefore require less bread. The same process is already to be seen in the Soviet Union today. The urban population passes from the consumption of black bread to the consumption of white bread. The amount of bread consumed remains stationary, whereas the consumption of meat and butter steadily increases. This explains why our foreign trade is slight. Naturally, we can import only as much as we export. We have no capital imports, no credits of any appreciable size. Our imports will increase to the same extent that our exports increase, but this will happen only

after we have satisfied the requirements of our own people and a new surplus will become available for export.

I have already spoken about the problem of unemployment. Unemployment in this country is due to the shortage in the necessary means of production to provide employment for the unemployed workers. Whence does this unemployment originate? It originates first of all in the fact that we have eight million poor peasant homesteads from which the younger generation migrates to the towns; it is also due to the fact that hundreds of thousands of clerks and officials have been discharged from the Soviet offices which used to be overstaffed. Only 1% of all the unemployed are skilled workers. Nearly one-half of the unemployed are women; about one-third of the unemployed are the so-called brain workers. It might be asked: how is it that the Soviet government is now carrying out rationalisation which will entail the discharge of more workers whilst there is so much unemployment already? Wouldn't it be much wiser to employ more workers and to refrain from improving the methods of production? But such a policy would be wrong. To begin with, it would contradict our policy of bringing up the industry of the Soviet Union to the level of the higher developed capitalist countries and even beyond that. Only when we succeed in doing that will we be able to go on with the building up of Socialism.

On the other hand, there is a tremendous difference between rationalisation in the Soviet Union and rationalisation in the capitalist countries. The aim of rationalisation in the capitalist countries is to get more profits, it throws the workers out of work; in the Soviet Union the purpose of rationalisation is cheaper production. To the extent that the process of rationalisation releases a lot of labour power, the working hours are reduced, for the present to seven hours a day, and even to six hours in the mines; and to the extent that the productivity of labour will be increased in the socialised industries on account of rationalisation, we shall further shorten the working hours, so as to be able to employ more workers in industry.

Thus, rationalisation in this country is quite different from what it is in the capitalist countries. There is also the same cardinal difference between unemployment in this country and unemployment in the capitalist countries.

I now wish to say a few words about the relatively difficult problem of the technical forces. You know about the Shakhty case. It was discovered that a section, not a very big one, but an important section of the technical specialists had been for years connected with the former owners abroad, at whose orders they were wrecking the Soviet mining industry. How was that possible, considering that Communists are at the head everywhere? Well, comrades, one can be a good Communist, but that does not mean that one understands technical matters, particularly if it has to do with new things, with the sinking of new shafts, as was the case here. It is very difficult for anyone without technical education to decide which specialist is really honest and which is a scoundrel. It stands to reason that the treacherous specialists who were condemned at the Shakhty Trial were outwardly quite loyal to the Communists. They always talked about having the welfare of the Soviet Union at heart. It was very difficult for anyone not having special technical knowledge to detect the deception. The question is why are those specialists hostile to the Soviet Government, to the proletarian dictatorship? Well, think of the difference between the position of the technical expert in this country and that in a capitalist country. In a capitalist country the expert has the prospect of rising to the ranks of the big capitalists by working in the interests of capitalism, by technical inventions, and so on. He has the chance of rising to commanding positions in the capitalist economy, he may acquire a fortune of millions. We find that in all capitalist countries a superior stratum of technical specialists who are very closely associated with the capitalists by their standard of income, by their mode of living, and by their ideology. Such opportunities are altogether lacking for the technical experts in the Soviet Union. They cannot become millionaires. They cannot climb to the high rank of the big capitalists. Nevertheless, they are assured of a fair standard of living, and, provided they are not entirely corrupted by the capitalist spirit, providing they have not lost joy of doing creative work, they will find here endless possibilities for the

development of production under Socialism. As a matter of fact, comrades, the overwhelming majority of the technical forces today are loyal to the Soviet Union. But there is a small section, consisting mainly of those who occupied commanding positions under capitalist management, who have not been working honestly for the proletariat, who just do their work but their heart is not in it.

The worst thing about this matter is that there are so few Communist technicians. It stands to reason that during the period of war and civil war, the Communists had no opportunity of obtaining years of training in a technical college. Only now are the first batches of Communist technical students graduating from the schools. Furthermore, even when a Communist graduates from a technical school, he is not an expert, for it requires years of practice to become one. A man who has passed his examination today cannot take up responsible technical work tomorrow. The old technicians are anxious to preserve their monopoly. They do not impart their knowledge to the young technicians, because they want to keep their knowledge to themselves and thereby bring pressure to bear upon the Soviet Government. And the fact is that without these technical specialists it is extremely difficult to build up a new industry, although the creative force of the proletarian dictatorship is exceedingly great. You can judge for yourselves how great this force must be when you remember that in spite of the systematic sabotage on the part of leading technicians for many years, a growth of production has been possible as I showed in my speech here today.

VI. THE IMMEDIATE PROSPECTS OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION.

There are sundry other difficulties in the Soviet construction work. The transition from capitalism to Socialism is not a simple and easy process. It is a big struggle, which has to overcome fresh difficulties every day, in order to slowly transfer the whole of the national economy to socialist lines. Nevertheless, comrades, we have no reason whatever for taking a gloomy view of the future. We have before us the five-year plan for the development of the economy of the Soviet

Union. In that plan we see the following: the industrial output will increase during these five years by 122%, or to be more precise, the production of the means of production will increase by 142% and the production of articles of consumption will increase by 109%. Nominal wages will be increased during these 5 years by about 30—40%, whilst the real wages will be increased by 50%. The agricultural output will probably be increased during this period by about 30—40%.

But a danger threatens from the outside, in my opinion, from a possible and probable attack upon the Soviet Union by the capitalist Powers. The problem this Congress has to solve is how the world proletariat can prevent this attack, and if the attack is made to secure the victory of the proletarian dictatorship. The Soviet Union emerged triumphantly from one period of intervention, but this triumph was not achieved only by its own forces; it was achieved by the help of the world proletariat. On this matter Lenin wrote the following:

“It is not we who were victorious, considering that our military forces were insignificant; we were victorious because the capitalists were unable to array the whole of their military forces against us. The workers in the leading countries determined the course of the war to such an extent that it was impossible to carry on the war against their wishes, and finally they disintegrated the war against us by their passive and semi-passive resistance.”

In the coming war the proletariat of the world will give even more decided help to the Soviet Union, the only fatherland of the workers, the citadel of the world revolution. The overthrow of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union by the united capitalist powers would wipe out the gains of a decade, postpone the triumph of the world proletariat for many years, and senselessly prolong the birthpangs of the new society. This must not happen. With the help of the proletariat of the world, the proletariat of the Soviet Union will protect the common fatherland of the toilers against all attacks, until the hour strikes of the victory of the world revolution.

(Loud and prolonged applause.)

Forty-second Session.

Moscow, 22nd August, 1928 (Afternoon).

The Situation and the Problems of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Report of Comrade N. Manuilsky

Chairman: Comrade Piatnitzki.

In my report on the inner Party situation of the C. P. S. U., I must sum up the results of the struggle against the Trotskyist Opposition that took place in our Party. Why is it necessary to ideal with a question that has already been settled by the Party? Why should it be necessary to return to that piece of Party history, considering that the Trotskyist Opposition is defeated, that the Leningrad section of that Opposition is once again in the ranks of the Party after having publicly admitted its errors? The difficulties arising in connection with the recent grain collections strikingly demonstrated to the toilers of the Soviet Union as well as to the Communist International whether the leaders of the Opposition would have led the revolution had they been entrusted with the guidance of the work of Socialist construction. The toilers of the Soviet Union realise now what would have happened had they seriously attempted to carry out the Smirnov programme which advocated that we should quarrel with the peasantry for a couple of years in order to accelerate the process of industrialisation. Why then

should we resuscitate the past? Would it not be better to talk of the tasks that now confront the C. P. S. U.? I think, however, that the VI Congress cannot ignore the lesson of the struggle the Party has carried on for many years with the Trotskyist Opposition, however boring and dull it may be to go over it again.

The Trotskyist Opposition is not merely a “national” phenomenon. The fight against it was conducted along the whole international front. Lack of faith in the work of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R., which characterised our oppositional tendencies, were very closely interwoven with the pessimistic and defeatist moods which spread among the Western European labour movement as a result of the events in Germany in 1923, as a result of the defeat of the General Strike in Great Britain and of the temporary retreat of the great Chinese Revolution. Hence, the Trotskyist Opposition not only reflected the pressure of the non-proletarian classes within our country, but it also reflected in its hysterical zig-zag policy the increasing pressure of world capitalism on the whole of

the international proletariat and upon its revolutionary fortress, the U. S. S. R.

The roots of Trotskyist ideology lay not only in the class relationships in the U. S. S. R., but deeper. They grew and spread in the objective conditions which arose in Europe after the first post-war revolutionary wave had subsided. Consequently, the fight against the Opposition was not a Russian controversy artificially introduced into the West European Sections, but was the result of the Social-Democratic relapse which occurred in the West European Parties. The offensive opened by the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. merely accelerated the process.

The present epoch of the III. Communist International is distinguished from the pre-war epoch of the II International by the profound internationalisation of the ideological and political life of all our Parties, of their problems, their politics and their tactics. We differ from the Socialist Parties of pre-war times by the fact the inner-Party disputes of our Communist Parties do not bear a limited local character. Affiliated to the III. Communist International is an enormous Party which has successfully accomplished the proletarian revolution and has carried on the dictatorship of the proletariat for over ten years. It would be a strange thing indeed, if the fundamental questions affecting this Party did not affect the internal Party groupings in other Sections of the Communist International. It would be no less strange if the lessons and experiences of our Party in its struggle against the opposition were not made the common property of the whole of the Communist International.

The fight against the Trotskyist ideology was an essential element in the Bolshevisation of all our Communist Parties. Only in the light of the discussion that was carried on by the C. P. S. U. and by the whole of the Communist International in the fight against Trotskyism as a doctrine reflecting the Social Democratic survivals of the II. International will the European comrades understand the replies our Party gives to current questions on the basis of the political course laid down by the XV Congress of our Party. This course did not represent a new turn in the policy of the Party. This policy could be introduced only after the Party had dissociated itself from the crude opportunist errors of the Opposition, errors which were screened by high-sounding pseudo-revolutionary phraseology. The execution of this policy was systematically sabotaged by the Opposition in so far as the Party was compelled to concentrate its attention upon replying to oppositional accusations which discredited and distorted the Party's line. Only after it succeeded in liquidating the Opposition did the C. P. S. U. obtain freedom of action to develop the line of the Party to its fullest extent. Hence, in my report I must deal with the fundamental questions of principle in the policy of our Party, questions which our Party settled on the basis of the experience accumulated in the struggle against the anti-Leninist views of the Opposition.

Before I take up the above-mentioned questions, however, I would like to say a few words about a legend which is being zealously spread by the bankrupt Opposition in the U. S. S. R. as well as abroad. The legend is as follows: a number of adherents to the Opposition who are striving to get back into the Party try to explain their capitulation by claiming that the course adopted by the Party after the XV Party Congress has demonstrated the correctness of the Opposition's criticism. According to these people it would appear that the Opposition has not become bankrupt, has not admitted its bankruptcy or capitulated to the Party, but that the millions of the Party membership have bowed to the group of unrecognised individuals whose subjective estimation of their own personal role in history is in profound contradiction to actual facts. These people, clutching at this argument like drowning men at a life-belt, apparently believe that the enormous population of our country, which certainly does not consist of lunatics or idiots, will believe that the semi-Menshevik and Menshevik views which brought the adherents of the Opposition to the brink of counter-revolution have really become the accepted views of our Party. This is not the first time in the history of our Party, or in the history of the labour movement, that groups which have politically disgraced and discredited themselves showed their magnanimity by condescending to amnestie an erring Party. This was the case with

the little "Vpered" (Forward) group which arose in the period of reaction that set in after the defeat of the working class in the revolution of 1905. This group in fact played the role of an ultra-Left channel through which certain groups of intellectuals, who accused the Bolshevik Party of all sorts of opportunistic sins, were diverted from everyday revolutionary work. This group proved to be absolutely politically rotten, and when the revolutionary tide again began to flow in Russia in 1912 it proclaimed that the Bolshevik Party, headed by Lenin, had come back to the "Vpered" group. This was the case also with Trotsky, who for twenty years had wandered around in anti-Bolshevik tendencies, differing from the Bolshevik Party on fundamental questions like the estimation of the driving forces of the revolution, the attitude towards Menshevism, the attitude towards the war. In 1917, however, on the eve of the October Revolution, he came to Bolshevism, but, not as one who was convinced of his errors, but as a man from whom the Leninist Party was to learn all that it should know. In 1922 Trotsky wrote:

"In the period between January 9th and the October strike 1905, the author (i. e. Trotsky) developed his views on the character of the revolutionary development in Russia which became known as "the theory of permanent revolution"... although there has been an interval of twelve years, this estimation has been confirmed in its entirety." ("New Course", Published 1924.)

In his well-known letter to Comrade Olminsky dated December 6, 1921, Trotsky wrote:

"I consider that my estimation of the driving forces of the Revolution was absolutely correct."

But what was this estimation of the driving forces of the Revolution, which Trotsky alleges was confirmed in October 1917 and which he considered as being correct in 1922 as a result of five-years experience of the proletarian dictatorship in our country? It would not be worth while dealing with this had it not come to the front again in application to a country where the economic structure, social relationships, class groupings, and inter-relationships with world imperialism, differ entirely from those which existed in Tsarist Russia. I have in mind China, to which Trotsky in 1928, after our Party's ideological battle with him over the question of this estimation, after his followers had erroneously accused the leadership of the C. P. S. U. with having in the heat of the controversy invented Trotskyism as a special ideological tendency, is applying his old estimation of the driving forces of the revolution. In one of the documents on the programme question he sent to the Congress, Trotsky says about the following concerning the Chinese Revolution:

In China there can be no democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry as a phase of the revolution because right from the very beginning the Chinese Revolution was turned, not only against the urban bourgeoisie, but also against the rural bourgeoisie; because feudalism in China is most closely interwoven economically with industrial capital. The proletariat must inevitably take power upon its own shoulders, because in China there is no other class capable of solving the problems of the bourgeois-democratic and agrarian revolutions. Having taken power into its hands the proletariat must inevitably take the path of social revolution. The Canton uprising clearly demonstrated this.

In a letter written to one who shares his views and which is now passing from hand to hand in oppositional circles, Trotsky writes:

"The enormous theoretically decisive significance of the Canton events for the fundamental questions of the Chinese Revolution lies in the fact that here, thanks to an adventurous undertaking, we have received what so rarely happens in history and politics, namely, a laboratory experiment on a gigantic scale. We have paid for this experiment very dearly; all the more reason therefore, we must not brush it aside. The conditions for this experiment were almost chemically pure. All preceding resolutions recorded, pres-

cribed and asserted like twice two are four, that the revolution was a bourgeois agrarian revolution and that only those who "leap" over events can speak of the dictatorship of the proletariat based on an alliance with the peasant poor representing 80% of the Chinese peasantry... And yet, on the threshold of the Canton events the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, according to a report in "Pravda", passed a resolution to the effect that the Chinese Revolution has assumed a permanent character. The same point of view adopted by the representative of the Comintern, Comrade N. Just as in the Paris Commune, which also bore the character of a laboratory experiment, the Proudhonists and Blanquists acted contrary to their own doctrines and by this more clearly revealed class relations according to Marxian logic, so in Canton the leaders, steeped to their ears in prejudice against the bogey of permanent revolution, commenced action, and from the very first step they took found themselves guilty of committing this very original, permanent sin."

Thus, we have before us an estimation which claims the right of international citizenship. Apparently, the author of this estimation is inclined to apply it to all countries and to all times where a revolutionary situation exists. I hope the comrades will forgive me for quoting a few passages characterising these views. These passages have already been quoted in the course of our discussion and so the delegates of the VI. Congress are no doubt acquainted with them. But I cannot refrain from quoting these passages because they are the starting point for my further exposition. In his preface to his book "1905" Trotsky wrote:

"The theory of permanent revolution expressed the idea that the Russian Revolution which pursues bourgeois aims, cannot fulfil its immediate bourgeois tasks unless it places the proletariat in power. And the proletariat, on taking power, will not be able to confine itself to the bourgeois limits of the revolution. On the contrary, in order to make its victory secure the proletarian vanguard, right from the outset of its rule, will make deep inroads, not only into feudal, but also into bourgeois property. In doing so it will come into hostile conflict, not only with all the bourgeois groups which supported it in the first period of its revolutionary struggle, but also with the broad masses of the peasantry with whose aid it came into power. The contradictions in the position of the workers' government in a backward country in which the peasantry represents the overwhelming majority of the population can be solved only on an international scale, in the arena of the world proletarian revolution."

If you ponder the idea developed in this passage you will inevitably come to the following conclusions which characterise the political features of the Trotskyist Opposition as they become revealed in the Party's struggle against it:

1. Unless it receives the support of the world revolution, the victory of the proletarian revolution in a single country cannot be anything else than a brief episode. This means that we must not expect a durable and lasting victory for this revolution. Its prospects are the prospects of the June uprising of the Parisian proletariat in 1848 or at best, the prospects of the Paris Commune. The roots of the pessimism lie in the moods of pre-war Social Democracy, which measured revolutionary events by the scale of the first test of strength of the working class and its defeats, by an underestimation of the proletariat's will to power and a slavish dread of the mighty power of the capitalist system. Such an attitude cannot be described otherwise than as revolutionary defeatism; for it is perfectly clear that if the world revolution is belated in its aid then the position of the proletariat in the country in

which the revolution has been accomplished is a hopeless one. Under these conditions, wrote Trotsky, in another passage,

"it is hopeless to believe, as the experience of his'ory and theoretical reasoning show, that the Russian Revolution, for example, could hold out against conservative Europe, or that Socialist Germany could remain isolated in the capitalist world".

(Trotsky's Works, Vol. III, Part I. pp. 89-9. Russ. Ed.)

It is perfectly obvious that if the victory of the proletariat in a single country can only be a brief episode, then it is idle to talk about durable Socialist construction. Under these conditions, the proletarian Party can do nothing except manoeuvre and try to postpone the day of its defeat. From this point of view N. E. P. is nothing else than a retreat. Nor can there be any talk about taking up the attack upon the capitalist elements of economy to which Lenin referred at the XI. Party Congress. At best it would simply have to mark time, for:

"Without the direct State aid of the European proletariat, the working class of Russia will be unable to retain power and transform its temporary domination into a durable Socialist dictatorship."

(Trotsky, "Our Revolution". p. 278 Russ. Ed.)

2. The second conclusion to be drawn is that the proletariat that has achieved victory in a single country will inevitably come into hostile conflict with the broad masses of the peasantry, which it is incapable of leading in the work of consolidating the gains of the revolution and in the advance along the path of Socialist construction. In this conception we have a most strikingly expressed negation of the leading role of the proletariat in relation to the peasantry in the epoch of proletarian revolutions, — the doctrine which represents one of the fundamental postulates of Leninism on the question of the proletarian dictatorship.

3. The third conclusion. According to this Trotskyist conception, the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry are regarded not in the form of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry in which the proletariat maintains leadership, but as a joining of classes that must inevitably end in rupture. Thus, the forms of acute class struggle which exist under capitalist conditions are automatically applied to a country where the proletariat is victorious, in which it possesses wide opportunities for regulating the class struggle and for directing its relations with the peasantry along the channel of agreement. At the same time this method of representing the question places the peasantry who are the natural allies of the proletariat on the same level as those classes which are profoundly hostile to the proletariat. Starting out from the wrong premise that it is impossible to build up Socialism in a single country where the proletariat has been victorious, and where, as Trotsky in the purest Menshivist style, writes in the document he sent to the Congress:

"In our present economic level, in our social and cultural conditions we are far nearer to capitalism, and a backward and uncultured capitalism at that, than to Socialist society"

the advocates of this premise cannot but define the development of the class relationship between the proletariat and the peasantry in a land of the proletarian dictatorship except from the "capitalist" point of view and reduce this development to the same level as the class relationships that exist between the working class and its class enemies.

4. Fourth conclusion. On the basis of the forms of relationships between the working class and the peasantry the Trotskyist conception ascribes to the Workers' State a specific role in the period of proletarian dictatorship. If these relationships in the period of proletarian dictatorship must inevitably develop in the form of a severe and irreconcilable class struggle, then it follows logically that the Workers' State must, in relation to the peasantry, represent a cruel apparatus for coercion

and suppression as it is in relation to other hostile classes. In so far as second place is given to the work of Socialist construction in the period of proletarian dictatorship and in so far as the task of "holding on" until aid comes from the world proletariat is placed in the forefront, the functions of economic regulation of that State assume insignificant importance and on the contrary, the functions of administrative coercion and repression become the normal method of administration. The policy of such a government would be a policy of impulses.

5. From this follows the fifth conclusion to be drawn concerning the absolutely false ideas regarding the forms of proletarian dictatorship in relation to the peasantry. It is perfectly obvious that if we doubt the possibility of an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, if we start out from the inevitability of "hostile conflicts" with the broad masses of the peasantry, as with other classes hostile to the proletariat, then we must inevitably come to the conclusion that the attitude of the proletarian dictatorship towards the peasantry must be identical with its attitude towards counter-revolutionary classes. The dictatorship will not be carried on in the form of an alliance with the peasantry, but in the form of a domination over the peasantry. This will be the policy of commanding and not leading, a policy of copying the methods of the bourgeois dictatorship in relation to the peasantry. There is not a grain of Leninism or of "Leftism" in this conception of the attitude of the dictatorship towards the peasantry. It is merely copying bourgeois views regarding the character of the proletarian dictatorship, views which are totally alien to the proletariat. The falsity of this conception is borne out the more strikingly for the reason that it completely lacks an analysis of proletarian class policy towards the various social groups among the peasantry. Following the threadbare social-democratic line, the whole of the peasantry is lumped together into one heap as a reactionary mass. The poor and middle peasantry, which represent the main strata of the rural population, and in relation to whom the proletariat in the period of proletarian dictatorship is obliged to make its policy as concrete as possible — establish the closest links with the poor peasantry, seek an alliance with middle peasants and win them away from the influence of the kulak upper stratum of the rural population, — all this completely disappears from the field of vision of the adherents of those who subscribe to this false conception. No distinction is drawn between the kulaks — towards whom the proletarian dictatorship adopts an attitude different from that which it adopts towards other social groups of the rural population, — and the poor and middle peasants. The kulak peasants, the poor peasants and the middle peasants are lined up on an equal footing confronting the proletarian dictatorship — which is thus presented as being isolated from the masses of the peasantry.

6. Finally, there is the sixth conclusion to be drawn concerning the role of the Workers Party which has taken power in a single country in conditions when the active aid of the international proletariat is delayed. Such a party will inevitably be confronted with the dilemma: either to die gloriously in the fight between the proletariat and the peasantry, or adopt an anti-proletarian policy, begin to adapt itself to the interests of classes that are alien to it and thus gradually degenerate. From this logically follows the Thermidor theory in regard to the proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. and to the Party which leads this dictatorship. From this also logically follows the lack of faith in the C. P. S. U. and the orientation towards the Western Communist Parties which are only as yet fighting for the victory of the proletarian revolution in their respective countries. From this it follows also that the immediate task of the Comintern is not to Bolshevise its Western European Sections, not to overcome the Social-Democratic legacy of the past, but to Europeanise the C. P. S. U., i. e. to return to the old Social Democratic idea advanced by Trotsky in the period of the struggle between Bolshevism and Menshevism. It is in this lack of faith in the C. P. S. U. that the roots and the ideas of the "third revolution", which Trotsky's adherents abroad developed in the pages of the Maslov and Suhl press organs, are to be sought.

Is it necessary to prove that the sum of these views which follow logically from the estimation of the driving forces of the revolution which the Trotskyist Opposition still regards as

correct has nothing in common with the policy of our Party, that it never has had and never can have anything in common with it? Had our Party adopted such a policy towards the world revolution, towards the work of Socialist construction and towards the peasantry, it would have ceased to be a Leninist Party, it would have slipped into a policy of gestures, it would have been reduced to a small crowd of people with nothing to lose, bearing no responsibility towards the world proletariat for preserving the proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. and consequently, bearing no responsibility for the fate of the world revolution. The firm Leninist policy of our Party would have been abandoned in favour of a policy of adventurist leaps, peculiar to the intelligentsia, of a leaping out of historical conditions in which the genuine struggle of the international working class for the world revolution is being fought, and it would inevitably have resulted in the backbone of the working class in the Soviet Union and of the Communist movement of all the world being broken for a number of years to come. The conclusions to be drawn from Trotsky's position must be borne in mind because in connection with it I shall in my report have to deal with the following six fundamental questions: 1. The world revolution and socialist construction in the U. S. S. R.; 2. the leading role of the proletariat and the forms of its alliance with the peasantry; 3. The class struggle in the period of proletarian dictatorship; 4. The role of the State and of the proletarian dictatorship; 5. Forms of proletarian dictatorship and labour democracy; 6. The role of the Party and the hegemony of the Party.

THE INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTION AND SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION IN THE U. S. S. R.

I come now to the question of international revolution and Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. I will not dwell on this at length because the question of building up Socialism in a single country was discussed in great detail at the VII. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. This question primarily concerns the question of the aid which our Socialist construction renders in developing the international proletarian revolution; in revolutionising the workers in capitalist countries. It concerns the question of the propaganda effect of the living experience of our work of Socialist construction, in demonstrating the advantages of our system over the system of capitalist slavery and exploitation; the question as to what extent the fact that the proletariat in our backward country, in the midst of incalculable difficulties is laying down the road along which it will be easier for the millions of the workers of other countries to travel after they have captured power facilitates the tasks of the proletarian revolution in other countries. Only a madman, or an incorrigible Social Democrat can regard this as "Messiahism", i. e., the belief in the providential mission of one's own country, which led Guesde and Kautsky towards social-patriotism at the time of the war. It would be superfluous and undignified for our Party, as well as an insult to the Congress, to present a pile of documents in order to prove the truth that should be an elementary one for every Communist that our Party, both prior to the victory of the proletarian revolution in our country as well as after it, always regarded itself as a part of the international proletarian revolution, that we always regarded our work of Socialist construction as the laying of the foundation for the victory of Socialism all over the world. The workers of all countries were witnesses to the manner in which the world reaction led by the British bourgeoisie avenged itself on the Soviet Union for the sentiments of honest proletarian solidarity which the workers in the U. S. S. R. displayed towards the British General Strike and the Chinese Revolution. Wherever the revolutionary struggle is being waged, in Indonesia, in Syria, in Vienna, or around Sacco and Vanzetti in America, the heart of our Party beats in unison with that of all those who are oppressed.

Secondly, the question of the international revolution and of Socialist construction is a question of the aid which the international proletariat can render in making the victory of Socialism in our country secure by bringing about revolution in their own countries, and giving revolutionary support to the U. S. S. R. Only a lunatic would think that it is unnecessary to support the forces besieged in a fortress. It is precisely

because the international revolution is belated that our path is so difficult and severe and that our difficulties are so great. We are at the present time compelled to build amidst a hostile capitalist ring. We are an isolated economic system. We are compelled to rely solely upon our internal division of labour. We are obliged to protect ourselves against the pressure of capitalism by trenches represented by the monopoly of foreign trade in order to defend the right we won in October to build up Socialism. One must indeed be bereft of all revolutionary sense to regard this as "narrow nationalism". We know that the victory of the proletariat in other capitalist countries will compel us to reorganise our economy on the basis of international division of labour. When the international revolution is brought about it will not be the international duty of our Party and of our working class to establish independent branches of industry, which today make us independent of capitalist markets. It will be the business of the highly industrialised countries to combine their work with that of our more backward country on the basis of a greater increase of productive forces and international division of labour. All this is indisputable truth, to which no politically mature person can object.

That which separates us from Trotsky is that which separated Trotsky from the Bolshevik Party for a quarter of a century. For a quarter of a century, except for brief intervals Trotsky, in the periods of decline of the revolutionary wave, exploited Left wing slogans in order to mask opportunistic actions. This was the case when Trotsky occupied a centrist position in the struggle between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks. This was the case during the imperialist war, when under cover of Left wing sounding internationalism, Trotsky fought against Leninist defeatism — the highest form of proletarian activity in the fight against imperialist war and the highest manifestation of the profound sense of proletarian solidarity that the world labour movement has ever known. This is the case now, when Trotsky is exploiting the idea of international revolution in order to pour cold water upon the constructive zeal and untiring energy of the proletariat of the Soviet Union in the work of Socialist construction, when he is sowing scepticism and disbelief among the ranks of the international proletariat at the very moment when threatening clouds are gathering over the Soviet Union. The path to world revolution does not lead through Suhl but through the internationally organised Communist movement and its backbone, the C. P. S. U. The road from Suhl leads only to Alma-Ata. This is all I desire to say on the first question.

THE LEADING ROLE OF THE PROLETARIAT AND THE FORMS OF ITS ALLIANCE WITH THE PEASANTRY.

I come now to the second question, the question of the leading role of the proletariat in the period of the proletarian dictatorship and the forms of its alliance with the peasantry. Our revolution and the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in our Union for over ten years has provided considerable experience in this respect which must be utilised by all Sections of the Communist International. Trotsky never discussed the question of the allies of the working class either before or after the proletarian revolution. According to Trotsky the only bearer of this revolution and the only class capable of consolidating its gains is the proletariat, isolated from all other classes. For that reason Trotskyism could never find a place in its theories for the peasantry or for the toiling masses of the colonies either in the proletarian revolution or in the system of the proletarian dictatorship. This attitude also bears the birth-mark of Social Democratic ideology which Trotskyism bears. Social Democracy was incapable of discussing the question of the proletarian revolution concretely; it could never link up the question of labour's revolt against capital with the movement of all the oppressed and exploited. Pre-war Social Democracy regarded the proletarian Social revolution as a myth by which it could deceive the workers. As a matter of fact the "purely proletarian" conception of the social revolution conceals a profoundly pessimistic attitude towards the revolution. Indeed it was simply a means for putting off the day of capitalism's doom until the time when capitalism had converted the majority of the population of the whole world into pro-

letarians, when the break up of the capitalist system had reached such an advanced state that the proletarian revolution would fall into the workers' lap like a ripe apple from a tree. This method of presenting the question enabled the pre-war pedants of the Second International to keep up the "irreconcilable class" pose while conducting a profoundly anti-revolutionary and anti-proletarian policy in regard to the proletarian revolution.

That is why Trotskyism failed to grasp the idea of the leading role the proletariat plays in relation to the peasantry. It also failed to grasp the idea of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry. The idea of the proletarian dictatorship assumed an abstract form lacking the vital content of a concrete estimation of class forces in a given country in given historical conditions. While muttering awkward slogans for a whole epoch like "permanent revolution" and "United Socialist States of Europe", Trotskyism at best loses it bearings at times when revolutionary processes were interrupted or, as is evident from the recent evolution of Trotskyism, adopts a purely social democratic course. Unlike Trotskyism, the Leninist doctrine of our Party first of all raised and solved the problem of the allies of the working class in the epoch of proletarian revolutions on the basis of the experience of the Russian Revolution. Speaking at the III. Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said:

"The significance of the period which is opening in Russia at the present time from the international point of view — that is, if we regard the international revolution as a single process, — in its essentials lies in that we must solve in a practical manner the problem of the attitude of the proletariat towards the last capitalist class in Russia." (Report of the III. Congress of the Comintern. P. 357. Russ. Ed.)

Secondly, the Leninist doctrine subordinated the peasant question, which many thought to be the fundamental aspect of Leninism, to the idea of the proletarian dictatorship.

"The fundamental problem in Leninism, its starting point, is not the peasant question, but the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat; the conditions under which it can be achieved and the conditions under which it can be consolidated. The peasant question, as a question of the allies of the proletariat in its fight for power, is a derivative question." (Stalin: "Problems of Leninism", p. 12. Russ. Ed.)

Thirdly, and finally, the Leninist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat outlined the forms of the alliance with the peasantry and placed in the forefront the leading role of the proletariat in this alliance. Speaking at the III. Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said:

"The Mensheviks argue as follows: the peasants represent the majority; we are pure democrats. Therefore, the majority must decide. But as the peasantry cannot be independent this argument practically means nothing more nor less than the restoration of capitalism." (Report of the III. Congress, p. 357. Russ. Ed.)

Thus, the Leninist doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the alliance with the peasantry as a condition for achieving and consolidating that dictatorship served our Party as a theoretical compass which enabled it to avoid the Trotskyist conception of the proletarian dictatorship; for the Trotskyist conception ran counter to the alliance with the peasantry, i. e., it is a conception which removed the question of the peasantry from the theory of the proletarian dictatorship and converted it into a question of civil war with the peasantry. On the other hand, the Leninist doctrine protected the Party from falling into another conception which would have eliminated the leading role of the working class in relation to the peasantry and would have reduced the question of the proletarian dictatorship to that of a compromise with the peasantry. This was the conception that the proletarian dictatorship was a bloc

between two classes on the basis of complete political equality. While the first Trotskyist conception of the proletarian dictatorship would inevitably have led the proletariat to a rupture with the peasantry, the second conception, had it arisen and become formulated, would have confronted the proletariat after it had established its dictatorship with the danger of degenerating into a purely bourgeois democracy and to the restoration of capitalism. These are not idle questions for our Party. They have something more than a mere theoretical significance. The question of the leading role of the proletariat, of the alliance with the peasantry, of the social groups in the rural districts that will join the proletarian front in the struggle, — all these questions will continue systematically to confront our Party in the period which separates us from the second wave of world revolution. It is on the basis of these questions that international capital and the counter-revolutionary groups within the country will endeavour to find the vulnerable places in the fortress of the Soviet power in the U. S. S. R. The practical solution of these problems will be largely determined by the correlation of class forces within the country as well as in the international arena. Around them various ideological tendencies will arise in our Party. During the last grain collecting campaign, for example, we observed among the lower ranks of our Party organisations a tendency to regard the alliance with the peasantry in a manner which eliminated the class content from the system of a proletarian dictatorship. In our State and Party organisations that are connected with the rural districts there were Communists who "linked up" with the kulak upper stratum of the countryside, became susceptible to its moods, and jointly with it put up a tacit resistance to the measures adopted by our Party for the purpose of accelerating the grain collections. These people, having lost their class instinct and under the influence of their environment having adopted the point of view of another class, vulgarised the smytchka (alliance) idea and drifted towards the Menshevik conception of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry against which Lenin uttered his warning at the III. Congress of the Comintern. At the same time we observed tendencies of another kind during the grain collecting campaign, tendencies to carry the above-mentioned measures to the extreme. If these tendencies had developed and become formulated they would have grown into the conception of the proletarian dictatorship which is characteristic of Trotskyism. It is perfectly clear, however, that after the ideological defeat inflicted upon the Trotskyist opposition, after the many years of work our Party has put in in the struggle against Trotskyism and after having trained our Party to understand the necessity for an alliance with the peasantry, the latter tendencies I have mentioned are less dangerous for our Party than the tendencies which lead to the weakening of the leading role of the proletariat in the alliance with the peasantry.

Thus, from the examples I have quoted it is clear that the question of the proletarian dictatorship cannot be discussed separately from the question of alliance with the peasantry. On the other hand, the problem of the alliance with the peasantry cannot be regarded otherwise than as being subordinated to the problem of the proletarian dictatorship. To forget this postulate undoubtedly means a departure from Leninism and will inevitably result in a deviation either towards Trotskyism or towards pure Menshevism. Smytchka (alliance) is not a non-class union with the elimination of class interests. It is an alliance of classes, each having their own class interests. But from the absolutely correct Marxian postulate that the working class and the peasantry each have their own class interests Trotskyism has drawn the false conclusion that these interests must inevitably come into hostile conflict. Our Party has fought unceasingly against this theory of disunity with the peasantry for a number of years, and had we trained our Party on this theory we would without a doubt have ruined the great historical cause that the world proletariat has entrusted us with. On the other hand, the anti-thesis to Trotskyism, namely, that Smytchka presupposes the complete unity of class interests on the basis of one class sacrificing its interests and of one class continually making concessions to the other is also theoretically conceivable. This would be the most peaceful kind of smytchka. But such a kind of smytchka does not exist in reality. The alliance we have carried out with the peasantry in the course of ten years of the revolution presupposed mutual concessions, joint distribution

of the burdens and sacrifices connected with the transitional period.

At the III. Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said:

"We are the State power; we, to a certain extent, are able to distribute the sacrifices, to impose them upon several classes and in this way relatively lighten the burden of certain strata of the population. On what principle must we act? On the principles of justice or the majority? No. We must act in a practical manner. We must distribute the burdens in such a manner as to preserve the power of the proletariat. This is the only principle by which we must be guided."

(Report of the III. Congress, P. 359. Russ. Ed.)

Our alliance with the peasantry has not always been idyllic. Firstly, because the peasantry sometimes reminded us that the proper proportion in the "distribution of sacrifices" was in its opinion, disturbed. It reminded us of this in its own peculiar peasant way by curtailing the area of land under cultivation in the period of war Communism, for example. The difficulties we experienced recently in connection with the grain collections was another reminder of this. Sometimes the State of the proletarian dictatorship is compelled to remind the peasantry of its duty as an ally. Secondly, while relying upon the poor peasants and steering a straight course for a durable alliance with the middle peasants we have never established any links with the kulaks. At times our relations with this social group of rural population are extremely strained. It is sufficient to recall the Makhnov movement in the Ukraine. Therefore, we would be utterly wrong to vulgarise the question of the alliance with the peasantry as against the incorrect Trotskyist point of view, to deny the possibility of brief, isolated and local collisions with certain groups in the rural districts during the period of the proletarian dictatorship. The wisdom of the Leninist policy in regard to the alliance with the peasantry lies in "distributing sacrifices" in accordance with the correlation of class forces, the only principle to be followed being the preservation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence, the forms of our alliance with the peasantry have differed at different periods of the Russian Revolution. There was a time when our alliance bore the form of a military alliance for the common armed struggle against the landlords and the capitalists. This form became obsolete when the civil war came to an end. In 1921, after certain incidents had occurred, we realised that other forms have to be adopted, forms based upon the economic alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry.

On the introduction of N.E.P. we took market relations as a basis for this economic alliance. But we did not merely restore the anarchic conditions of the capitalist market; we placed the proletariat in command of the key positions by which it was able, to a certain extent, to regulate these market relations. We know that this is precisely the form that is destined to continue in existence for a very long period. This form of alliance marks a whole historical period until the whole basis of social relationships has been reconstructed. The misfortune of our Opposition was that they failed to understand the nature and historical duration of this period; that in their fits of hysteria they desired to modify this form of alliance which would inevitably have resulted in a Trotskyist disunion. But every thinking Communist understood that with the introduction of N.E.P., when the positions of Socialised industry were extremely weak, when we stood in danger of being overwhelmed by the anarchy of the market, we would not remain simply within the boundaries of free competition between different economic forms, but that we would inevitably take up the offensive against the private capitalist elements of our economy as we became stronger. We do not regard N.E.P. only as a retreat or as a permanently established correlation of forces, as a permanent dividing line between the Socialist and private capitalist sectors of our economy. It is perfectly clear to us that the strengthening of the positions of Socialised industry and the growing importance of planning and regulation in our economy would inevitably lead to the restriction of anarchic market relations in the alliance with the peasantry. What other meaning could the slogan that Lenin

advanced at the XI. Party Congress have? Namely: "The retreat has come to an end; we must now take up the offensive along the whole economic front". The plan of co-operation which Lenin drew up considerably modified the fundamental form of the alliance established with the peasantry at the time of introduction of N.E.P. By adopting, developing, and strengthening this plan, we, in the words of Lenin, "found the degree of combining private interests, the interests of private trade, and the degree of verification and control of these interests by the State; the degree of their subordination to the common interests". In one of the documents he recently sent to the Congress, Trotsky strives to belittle the importance of this co-operative plan as a means for advancing our work of Socialist construction by the argument that this co-operative plan only refers to the social-organisational or political aspect, but does not in the least help to solve the material-productive aspect of Socialist construction. Only a hopeless Philistine who has no faith in Socialism whatever, who considers that Socialised economy, which is a higher type of economy than petty individual economy, cannot change the narrow material-productive basis that we inherited from the pre-revolutionary period, can argue in this way. It is well known that owing to the advantages it possesses over small production, large scale production under capitalism serves as the basis for developing productive forces. But why should large scale production lose this quality when it is applied for the purposes of Socialist industry, under the political dictatorship of the proletariat?

Why does Trotsky think that the question of the political power of the working class plays no part at all in the expansion of the material-productive basis of economy, which is being built up by the hands of the proletariat? As is known, the Great French Revolution, by placing political power in the hands of the bourgeoisie and by breaking down the "social organisational" forms of feudalism, greatly enlarged the material-productive basis of French economy at the end of the 18th century and converted France from a country of small artisans and guilds into a land of capitalist production. We will assume for the sake of argument that in that epoch the French bourgeoisie was a progressive class on the general background of feudal relationships and that our country was a backward country compared with capitalist countries, — but even on this assumption Trotsky merely repeats the Menshevist argument about our country not being sufficiently ripe for Socialism. To deny the influence of "social-organisational" forms upon the level of the material-productive basis means to abandon Marxism. Throughout the whole history of capitalism and the history of precapitalist economic forms we can trace the fact that social-organisational forms were not only the product of the material-productive structure but that the former also influenced the latter. In our development we have approached the point in our relations with the peasantry when by means of higher "social-organisational" forms the proletariat strives to increase the productivity of agriculture. Trotsky, in believing that the collective forms of agriculture will not raise the material-productive basis of agriculture, falls into the embrace of kulak ideology as represented by Professor Kondratyev. The plan recently adopted by the XV. Party Congress of organising collective farms and large State farms contains nothing new in principle. It does not mark a change in our attitude towards the millions of individual peasant farms. The Party is perfectly conscious of the fact that for many years to come the individual peasant economy will occupy a very prominent place in the economics of our country. The plan of collectivisation adopted in the 11th year of the proletarian dictatorship is merely another step in the development and deepening of the co-operative plan proposed by Lenin. We are now making a great experiment and are trying to establish strongholds of socialisation in the very heart of rural life, similar to the key positions we now occupy in the towns. This is a most complicated and difficult task; for we have to overcome individualistic prejudices and customs which have been cultivated for very many years and by practical demonstration year in and year out to convince the millions of the peasantry of the advantages collective forms of agriculture have over individual forms. This stage of our attack upon the relics of capitalism in our country will extend over a long period. At this stage we must not for a moment forget that the only principle pursued is the preservation and strengthening of the proletarian dictatorship. The characteristic feature of this stage will be that we will have to differentiate the forms of our alliance with the peasantry to a greater degree than we have

done hitherto. Starting from the market relations of N. E. P. we create, by restraining the anarchy of market relationship by means of the key positions at our command on the one hand, and by organising peasant farming on co-operative lines on the other, by redoubling our efforts towards collectivising the poor and the lower groups of the middle farms and establishing model Soviet farms, a number of channels through which the proletariat could bring its influence to bear upon the peasantry in the direction of strengthening its alliance with it. At the same time we must not lose sight of very important instruments of this alliance like the cultural revolution which is taking place in our country and which is training the young generation of the masses of the peasantry in the political and social ideas of the October Revolution. Our rural correspondent movement, our village patronage societies, the enormous political and educational role the Red Army plays, from which the semi-literate village youth returns home to his village an active political worker and reformer of rural social life, the radio waves, the steel threads of electrification; — all these instruments of the alliance play an extremely important role in Sovietising our countryside. Nor must we lose sight of an important channel of influence like the trade union work among the agricultural labourers, among workers in the sugar industry, forest workers, etc. And, finally, the great political work that is carried on among the rural poor is also of considerable importance in the alliance with the rural population.

This wide-flung and well-thought out plan of alliance, which has been tested by experience in the relations between the proletariat and peasantry maintained during the eleven years of the existence of proletarian dictatorship in our country, is set up by our Party against the feeble and profoundly pessimistic schemes of Trotskyism which are based on the premise of inevitable class conflicts between the working class and the peasantry.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE PERIOD OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP.

The third question that must be dealt with and which partly also concerns the problem of the alliance with the peasantry is the question of the class struggle in the period of the proletarian dictatorship. Is there a class struggle in the period of the proletarian dictatorship? Clearly, as long as classes exist the class struggle cannot disappear, no matter what the social regime may be. This indisputable truth was most strikingly demonstrated under the proletarian dictatorship during the period of civil war. Civil war is the "purest" form of class struggle completely robbed of the "democratic" conventionalities and phrases about social peace. Here everything is clear. Nothing needs to be explained. The situation in the second phase of the proletarian dictatorship, however, the period of N. E. P. is somewhat different and more complicated. Here, arms are laid down, the exploiting class is suppressed. One section of it is physically destroyed, the other has emigrated, the third has flung itself on the mercy of the victorious proletariat, and has become reconciled with and adapted itself to the conditions of the new system, has entered the service of the Soviet State. The military specialists, the technical intelligentsia, and finally the new bourgeoisie which has been temporarily legalised by the regime of the proletarian dictatorship recognise the Soviet government and "co-operate" with it. The proletariat utilises these elements in its work of building up socialism in the same way as the bourgeoisie utilised and now utilises the technical forces in the period of its domination for building up and fortifying capitalism. But all this confuses the issues. It is liable to create illusions about the cessation of the class struggle, about the complete harmony of class interests under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The state of "peace", the absence of civil war, and the absence of serious class conflicts with anti-Soviet elements, are liable to give rise to too idyllic moods until a Shakhty sabotage case comes and hits us on the head. It also confuses the issue about the alliance with the peasantry (smytchka). Smytchka means co-operation between the working class and the peasantry. Therefore, it might be argued co-operation means an end of the class struggle. Away with class struggle which only makes the situation more complicated! In its victorious march socialism in our country will bring larger and larger numbers of the peasantry under the influence of the proletariat, class antagonisms will become more and more

obliterated and the community of class interests will come more and more to the forefront. In this argument a correct perspective is confused with facts as they are at the present day by the tendency which many of us betray to idealise. Finally we are confused by our predilections, in analysing class relationships under the proletarian dictatorship, for drawing vulgarised opposite analogies from the class relationships existing under the bourgeois dictatorship. We take the question of class struggle and class co-operation in the period of capitalism, we turn the social pyramid upside down, and on this basis make our analysis of class relations under the dictatorship of the proletariat. It would be very useful therefore, first of all, to note what Lenin said about the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He wrote:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is also a period of class struggle, which is inevitable until classes are abolished. This struggle changes its form; in the first period after the overthrow of capitalism it becomes particularly fierce and assumes a very peculiar form. The proletariat does not cease the class struggle when it captures political power but continues it until classes are abolished. Of course, the class struggle is continued under different circumstances, in another form and by other means." (Lenin, Complete Works, Vol XVI. "The Great Initiative." P. 249. Russian Edition.)

What has Trotsky done with this absolutely correct Leninist view of the nature of the class struggle under the dictatorship of the proletariat? He made a caricature of it, and could not help doing so considering that his view is that class conflicts with the peasantry are inevitable. According to his theory the civil war, which the working class waged jointly with the peasantry against the landlords and the capitalists, must inevitably become a civil war between the working class and the peasantry. Thus the civil war becomes transformed into a normal condition of the proletarian dictatorship. The fact that the class struggle in the period of N.E.P., in the period of socialist construction, after the liquidation of white guard revolts, and after the capitulation of the capitalist classes, is conducted, as Lenin said, **under other circumstances, in another form, and by other means**, — is a thing that the Trotskyist Opposition regarded as a Right wing deviation.

First of all they fail to understand the character of the co-operation between the proletariat and the masses of the peasantry in the period of N.E.P.; that it was an **economic co-operation**, representing the continuation of the co-operation at the civil war front against the landlords and the capitalists. Can an analogy be drawn between this co-operation and the class co-operation observed in capitalist society? History gives us many examples of class struggles and of class co-operation among the propertied classes in capitalist countries. The struggle between the Whigs and Tories in England, which resulted in a class compromise and in the merging of British landlordism with the British capitalist system, the merging of the German Junkers with finance capital in Germany both before and after the revolution of the 9th of Nov.

These represent a form of class co-operation which resulted in the sharing of political power between co-operating classes. This division of power was possible because these classes, manufacturers, financial magnates and large landlords stand on the common basis of **private property and exploitation**. Such co-operation between the working class and the propertied class is impossible in capitalist countries because the social bases of these classes differ. The upper stratum of the working class represented by the Citrines and Thomases may co-operate, but not the working class as a whole, because the social gulf that divides them from the capitalist system is enormous and cannot be bridged by any coalition policy that may be advanced by the Social Democrats.

The proletariat is a uniform, collectivist class which cannot share power with any class that stands on the basis of private property and exploitation. The proletarian dictatorship is a form of government which is based on co-operation with the peasantry but not on the basis of "democratic" sharing of

power. The proletarian dictatorship is not a democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. The former stands on the basis of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, on the basis of the socialist transformation of society, on the basis of the dictatorship of one class. The latter remains on the basis of capitalism, on the basis of sharing power between the proletariat and the peasantry. The slogan — a "workers' and peasants' government", which the V. Congress of the Comintern interpreted as a synonym for proletarian dictatorship, means that in the name of the Workers' State in our country a policy is being conducted of close attention and care for the interests and requirements of the basic mass of the peasantry. In capitalist society, as well as under the proletarian dictatorship, the peasantry represents the class that stands closest to and is most friendly to the proletariat. The fundamental task of the proletariat prior to as well as after the proletarian revolution is to win the peasantry over to its side. But in view of its social position two natures contend with each other within the peasant:

"The peasant as a toiler gravitates towards Socialism, preferring the dictatorship of the workers to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The peasant as a seller of grain gravitates towards the bourgeoisie, to free trade, i. e. back to the 'recognised' 'old-established' capitalism."

(Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVI, "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers", p. 227, Russian Edition.)

The essence of our co-operation with the peasantry is not that we foster its prejudices, or that we are steering a course for the preservation of the small producers, but that the proletariat helps the peasantry to rise, to develop its productive forces and strives to direct its productive efforts along the channels of collectivism. Speaking at the All-Russian Conference of the C. P. S. U. in May 1921, Lenin said:

"What does leading the peasantry mean? It means first of all, to steer a course for the abolition of classes and not a course for the preservation of the small producer. If we adopted the latter course we would cease to be Socialists and would find ourselves in the camp of the petty-bourgeoisie, in the camp of the Socialist Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who are the bitterest enemies of the proletariat at the present time."

(Lenin, Vol. XVIII, p. 270, Russian Edition.)

But from this correct Leninist postulate the Trotskyist Opposition has drawn a totally false and pernicious conclusion. It interpreted the postulate "not to steer a course towards small producers, but towards the abolition of classes" as meaning that the Socialist forms of economy do not transform the small individual farms into collective farms, but merely swallows them up (**Preobrazhensky**); that the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry are the same as those between the capitalist countries and the colonies; that the more economically backward the country is which finds itself in the process of transition to Socialist organisation of production, the more Socialist accumulation in that country will take place as a result of the exploitation of pre-Socialist forms of economy. If we ponder over the economic programme of Socialist accumulation as advanced by the Trotskyist economist, Preobrazhensky, we will find that this is a completely worked out and logical conception of class relationships between the proletariat and the peasantry under the dictatorship of the proletariat which makes these relationships appear to be exactly like those which developed in the period of primitive capitalist accumulation, between the knights of profit and the paladins of capital on the one hand, and the exploited masses of pre-capitalist small producers, whose tragic fate Marx so strikingly describes in his chapter on primitive capitalist accumulation.

The Trotskyist Opposition does not understand that the reason why we, from time to time, experience economic difficulties arising from the lack of basic capital in the period of reconstruction is that we cannot adopt the methods of the capitalist company founders in the epoch of accumulation; that

as a proletarian State building up Socialism, we cannot resort to the methods by which all capitalist countries acquired their capital accumulations. The Trotskyist Opposition also fails to understand that their comparison between the rate of our development and the rate of development in capitalist countries, is sheer nonsense because they compare two totally different quantities. Capitalist industry does not provide a 7-hour day and all the forms of social insurance and workers welfare schemes that are provided in our relatively poor country for the purpose of raising the physical, moral, and cultural level of the working class.

But it is not an accident that the Trotskyist economic programme draws these parallels. They emerge logically from the Menshevik interpretation of our Socialist construction as a form of capitalism, and an uncultured and backward capitalism at that, and which therefore regards the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry through "capitalist" spectacles. If we take the question of the differentiation among the rural population we will find that Trotskyism makes the same fundamental error of interpreting this differentiation in the Stolypin sense, i. e. the formation of two poles: on the one hand a class of rural paupers and on the other hand a class of kulaks, while the middle peasant disappears. They fail to take into account however, firstly, that under the proletarian dictatorship we are able to paralyse such processes; and secondly, that the differentiation among the peasant population under the proletarian dictatorship takes place on the background of the general raising of the level of nearly all strata of the rural population. Thus, in regard to the relations between the working class and the peasantry, Trotskyism killed the idea of the special form of co-operation which our Party advocated. In regard to the various social groups among the rural population, Trotskyism drifted towards the forms of class struggle (dekulakisation) which were characteristic of the year 1918, the period of liquidation of the survivals of serfdom in our rural districts. It failed to understand that the correct Leninist slogan: "rely on the poor peasants, strengthen the alliance with the middle peasants, but do not for a moment cease fighting the kulak", in conditions in which the State of the proletarian dictatorship is becoming stronger, must be carried out through the State, through its organs. The case was altogether different in 1918, when the foundation of the proletarian dictatorship was undermined by counter-revolutionary conspiracies, when the proletariat directly roused the poor peasants for civil war against the kulaks, precisely for the reason that it did not yet possess the channels of State and economic influence by which to restrain the kulaks.

What are the relations between the working class and the new bourgeoisie (N. E. P. men), the representatives of concession capital under the dictatorship of the proletariat? What are its relations with the technical intelligentsia? Can these relations be regarded as similar to the class co-operation that exists in capitalist countries between homogeneous social groups, all of which stand on the basis of capitalism? In an article entitled "How Shall we Reorganise the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection" Lenin speaks of our social system being based on the "co-operation between the workers and the peasants" and goes on to say that "on certain conditions the N. E. P. men, i. e. the bourgeoisie, may also be permitted to participate in this co-operation". It would never enter anyone's head, however, to draw the conclusion from this that Lenin was in favour of the co-operation of three classes under the dictatorship of the proletariat. To permit, on certain conditions to be laid down by the class which grants this permission, means to utilise (the other class). This is the kind of co-operation that exists between a horseman and his horse. The fact that the worker is permitted to work in the factory on certain conditions laid down by the capitalists does not convert the relations between the capitalists and the worker into those of co-operation, nor does it become class co-operation when this takes place on a mass scale. The relations of class co-operation reveal themselves when certain elements, which have isolated themselves from the working class, take their stand upon the basis of capitalism and then turn their backs on the working class. Can we say that the new bourgeoisie, or the representatives of concession capital, have abandoned the position of capitalism and that they have turned their backs upon their own class? Such an argument would be absurd. In the above-mentioned article Lenin, a few lines lower down, reminds the Party of its old slogan in regard to the new bourgeoisie: "Who will win, we or they?" and says:

"In the last end, the fate of our republic will depend upon whether the peasantry will march with the working class and loyally maintain its alliance with it, or whether it will permit the "Nepmen", i. e. the new bourgeoisie, to cause disunity between it and the working class." (Vol. XVIII, Part 2, p. 124, Russ. Ed.)

Only the technical intelligentsia can turn its back on the bourgeoisie and adopt the point of view of the working class, and then only with extreme difficulty, as the Shakhty case proved.

But to deny that the proletariat can re-educate a section of this social group and to fail to see the creative power of the working class, which by its example infects other wavering intermediary classes, means to under-estimate the strength of the proletariat, to fall into the most stupid spetsophobia (hatred of specialists) with which our Party was never infected. Our class struggle against the new bourgeoisie which, as is evident from the example of the Kondratyev group is striving to consolidate itself on the ideological front, is now being conducted "under other circumstances, in other forms and by other means", than it was conducted against the old capitalist class. On certain conditions we have permitted the new bourgeoisie to participate in economic life, we are utilising its organising abilities, paying tribute for the lesson, but we do not for a moment lose sight of the fact that this bourgeoisie represents a sly and dangerous class enemy which "co-operates" with us only because it is not big and strong enough to fight against us. Taken by itself, this class represents an insignificant group in our country, but it is strong, not by its own class strength, but by the strength of others. It is dangerous because it is striving through the medium of the kulak upper stratum of the village to break up the alliance between the working class and the peasantry. But it is still more dangerous for the reason that behind its back stands the whole power of world capital.

The forms of the class struggle in our country are not only determined by our own will, but also by the correlation of forces in the international arena. An attack upon the U. S. S. R. by world capital will inevitably affect the correlation of forces within our country. It will rouse all the social groups hostile to the regime of the proletarian dictatorship to political activity. It would be sheer weakness on our part if we failed to take the fact into account that with the growing activity of world capital the class struggle in our country may assume other forms besides that of economic rivalry between various economic systems.

THE ROLE OF THE STATE IN THE PERIOD OF THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP.

The fourth question which arises from the problem of the class struggle under the proletarian dictatorship is the question of the role of the State. The State of the proletarian dictatorship in the period of transition from capitalism to Socialism, apart from its class content, differs from the capitalist State in that it assumes economic functions of a dimension that no other State in the world assumes. These functions emerge from the social character of production and under no circumstances can they be identified with the State capitalist tendencies in those countries where the whole of industry is based upon private property. Under the proletarian dictatorship the State assumes the function of "the administration of things" in addition to the government of men"; i. e., functions of administering, planning and regulating industry. Our State Planning Commission and our Supreme Economic Council are equally organs of the proletarian dictatorship as is the administrative apparatus of the Soviet government. No single bourgeois State has such organs, pursuing such aims and such a class policy. Under Socialism, when classes will have disappeared, the political functions of the State will die out; but the functions of social planning and control will not die out, on the contrary they will increase in importance.

The question as to which functions assume predominant influence in the transitional period depends on concrete circumstances, on the correlation of class forces inside the country as well as on the international arena. It is perfectly obvious that the Hungarian Soviet Republic for example, besieged by enemies on all sides, had no time for planning and for economic work. In

the early months and years of the proletarian dictatorship, when the class struggle assumes the form of an armed struggle, political functions, functions of administration come to the forefront in the politics of the Workers' State. When we were fighting against Kaledin, Kornilov and Koltchak, we administered, or rather we tried to administer our economic life by commands, mobilisation, compulsory labour, labour armies, special campaigns and coercion. Amidst conditions of decline and disorganisation of industry we tried to solve the problem of under-production by Communist Subotniks (voluntary labour on Saturdays); nor could we do otherwise, for the whole country was under arms, and the bony hand of famine was clutching at the throats of the workers and peasants. It would be sheer pedantry to declare today, judging from our experience in the second period of the proletarian dictatorship, that the period of war Communism was a system of stupidity. From the point of view of Trotskyism however, which is based on the theory of permanent war against all classes including the peasantry, this period in the proletarian dictatorship is not merely a stage in that dictatorship corresponding to a certain correlation of forces existing at that time, but a normal regime of the proletarian State in the transitional period between two waves of proletarian revolution. Was not the fact that in 1921, when the system of War Communism was coming to an end, when we were in the midst of the Kronstadt mutiny and on the eve of a very serious class crisis, Trotsky proposed that our Party should proceed further along the road of coercion, centralisation and absorption of the trade unions by the proletarian State, typical of the whole system of Trotskyist views?

The proposal that the State should absorb the trade unions in the period of proletarian dictatorship represented a complete programme of forcing the country towards Socialism by exceptional methods of class violence, which ignored the correlation of class forces that arose in the new stage of the revolution. This proposal later on was reflected in the discussion which Trotsky led against the Party on the question of the plan. Trotsky's "plan" was based upon the principle of forcibly destroying the peasant's cart-horse and substituting for it the charger of machine industry. The way he put it was: Either Socialism built from above against the temper, the wishes and the will of millions of the people, or inevitable doom. The historical period of time in which peasant farming was to be transformed, or as Lenin put it, the period of "co-operative Socialism", found no place in Trotsky's plan. Trotskyism failed to understand that the civil war having been brought to an end, and in so far as the proletarian dictatorship became consolidated, and the Socialised sector of our economy acquired greater importance in the whole economic system of the country, class coercion in the policy of the Workers' States acquired other forms than those prevailing in the period of War Communism. To plan and regulate economic life does not mean to drift along the economic tide, merely adapting oneself to prevailing conditions; it means deliberate intervention in economic processes in a land of small peasant farming — which sometimes reveals a tendency to turn against the interests of the workers and peasants — and to regulate and change the course of these processes in the direction favourable to the working class.

In this period of N.E.P. the State does not and cannot take up the free trade point of view, i. e., non-interference in the class struggle, which finds expression in the form of the fight between the Socialist and private sectors of economy. The prices policy, taxation policy and our financial measures are based on the same class policy that was conducted in the first years of the proletarian dictatorship, but this policy is being conducted in another form and by other means. Even insofar as the Trotskyist Opposition accepted the new relationships that arose under N.E.P. and accepted the new forms of our class policy, they could not avoid monstrously disturbing all proportion in values; they distorted the relationships between various economic forms so that the Trotskyist "new policy" inevitably grew into the Trotskyism of the period of War Communism. This policy failed to take into account the fundamental measure which Lenin, in regard to the peasantry on the question of "distributing sacrifices", regarded as the sole guiding principle, namely, the preservation of the proletarian dictatorship.

Does it follow from this, however, that because we defeated Trotskyism on this point of giving predominance to methods

of class coercion, which were necessary in a given period of the proletarian dictatorship, that we on principle reject these methods. May not the changed conditions in the present stage compel us, for the very reason that we base ourselves on the principle which Lenin bequeathed to us of preserving the proletarian dictatorship, to adopt measures of class coercion which may go beyond the functions of planning? No one would for a moment deny that this is possible, for otherwise it would mean that we take it for granted that the capitalist world could live peacefully, side by side with the U. S. S. R. right up to the moment when we shall have completed the building up of Socialism in our country. War, for example, may compel the proletarian State to adopt certain measures that were characteristic for the first period of the proletarian dictatorship. And apart from war, extraordinary internal situations may arise which will demand extraordinary measures. For example, the normal measures of economic planning may prove inadequate in the event of sullen resistance of certain classes, in the event of the revival of activity of political groups hostile to the proletarian dictatorship, or because certain social groups are striving to change our planning and regulation, which develop on the basis of a certain correlation of forces, by means and methods not anticipated by the Soviet Constitution. Under such circumstances, the extraordinary measures, while differing in character and degree of intensity in accordance with the seriousness of the situation, will serve the proletarian State as a means of self-defence. Take for example the extraordinary measures we had to adopt during the recent difficulties in connection with the grain collections. Why did we resort to these measures? We resorted to them because by January 1st, 1928 there was a shortage of 128 million poods of grain; because the whole of our economic plan stood in danger of being disrupted; because the food supply of the working class was in doubt and that would mean that we would have to quarrel with the workers; because, after the discussion, after a number of years of peaceful respite our Party was in too "peaceful" a mood and had allowed the collection of grain to proceed in its own way. We would not have been Bolsheviks able to remove obstacles, we would not have been revolutionaries able to overcome difficulties if under these conditions we had merely folded our arms and placed all our hopes solely upon the Planning Departments. But from the very outset we regarded these measures merely as extraordinary measures.

When we achieved the necessary results in the collection of grain, when we observed that these measures, which were intended to be used against the kulak upper stratum of the rural districts showed the tendency to hit the middle peasant, we repealed them. We repealed these measures because they threatened to run counter to the very aims for which they were introduced. But the application of extraordinary measures gave the kulak elements in the rural districts, and the merchants and speculators in the cities a pretext for spreading malicious rumours to the effect that N.E.P. was being abolished and that our Party had adopted the policy recommended by the Trotskyist Opposition. This legend was systematically cultivated by the capitalist press abroad. The N.E.P. which international capital, the kulaks in the rural districts and the N.E.P. men in the towns, would like to see established is not the N.E.P. which on very definite conditions our Party has permitted to exist. The N.E.P. they want is not only the "dictatorship" of the market over planned economy, but also the abolition of the monopoly of foreign trade, the selling out of our Socialised industry, with all the changes in class relationships that would logically follow from this. That kind of N.E.P. means to curtail the rights and the gains of the working class. That N.E.P., however, will never be established in our country, in which Socialism is being successfully built up.

THE FORMS OF PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP AND LABOUR DEMOCRACY.

The fifth question is the question of the forms of proletarian dictatorship and labour democracy. From what has been said above it follows logically that according to Trotsky the forms of proletarian dictatorship must always be severe with a predominating element of coercion. They cannot be otherwise, according to Trotsky, because the proletarian dictatorship is the war of one class against all the other classes. In the transi-

tion period these forms always remain the same, for there is no "respite" in the "permanent" class war and no intervals. Proletarian dictatorship and labour democracy are two opposite things, according to Trotskyism, because Trotskyism conceives the proletarian dictatorship as being diametrically opposite to bourgeois dictatorship. Under the dictatorship of capital, bourgeois democracy is only a fig leaf to cover this dictatorship. The proletarian dictatorship does not stand in need of such fig leaves. Trotskyism fails to take into account the special character of the proletarian dictatorship as the dictatorship of the minority acting in the interests of the majority of toilers, whereas the dictatorship of the propertied classes is the dictatorship of the minority acting in the interests of the minority of exploiters. It fails to take into account also the second feature of the proletarian dictatorship, namely, that it rests on the alliance with the peasantry.

These two fundamental features of the proletarian dictatorship which distinguish it from the dictatorship of the propertied classes, result in that the proletarian dictatorship and proletarian democracy not only do not eliminate each other but that the one is inconceivable without the other. Extraordinary circumstances like war and counterrevolutionary movements may curtail the operations of proletarian democracy, but they can never eliminate it entirely, for otherwise the proletarian dictatorship would assume the form of a dictatorship of a handful of leaders operating without the masses. A dictatorship like that would not last 10 months let alone 10 years. Could we have fought against the whole of the capitalist world, which sent its expeditionary forces against the proletarian revolution and provided the counter-revolutionary generals with war supplies, had we not assured ourselves of the local support of the millions of the toilers of our Union? Could we build up Socialism, break down ancient traditions and customs and the individualistic system inherited from the past by means of a dictatorship that stood above the masses and that operated without them? Lenin in his pamphlet: "The Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky" wrote:

"The Proletarian Democracy is a million times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy; the Soviet Government is a million times more democratic than the most democratic bourgeois republic in the world."

But the proletarian democracy is class democracy, it is not democracy for all but for the proletariat primarily, and for all those strata of the peasantry which support the proletarian dictatorship. Under proletarian democracy the leading role of the proletariat does not disappear, for if it did it would cease to be proletarian dictatorship and become workers' and peasants' democracy. All the features which distinguish the proletarian dictatorship from the democratic dictatorship of proletariat and peasantry remain in force in regard to these two forms of democracy. The question as to which element are more prominent in the proletarian dictatorship, the elements of dictatorship or the elements of proletarian democracy is a question of the form of the proletarian dictatorship.

What determines the form of the proletarian dictatorship? It is determined by the correlation of forces between the land of the proletarian dictatorship and the capitalist world which surrounds it. If the capitalist world would not exert pressure upon the proletarian State the processes of development of proletarian democracy would be much more rapid than they are under present conditions when this State is surrounded by enemies on all sides. Secondly, the form of the proletarian dictatorship is determined by the alignment of class forces within the country. If, theoretically, we can imagine a situation in which all classes unreservedly follow the lead of the proletariat and unhesitatingly began to transform their individual economic forms in a socialist spirit, began to re-educate themselves in the spirit of Socialism and permitted themselves to be utilised in the work of building up and consolidating Socialism (the technical intelligentsia, concession capital, the new bourgeoisie), then the growth of proletarian democracy would go on uninterruptedly and without class conflicts we would reach the point of the disappearance of classes and the transformation of the proletarian dictatorship into the most extensive form of labour democracy.

But we are still living in conditions of acute class struggle in the world arena, we are living in the epoch of wars and revolutions, which make such development impossible. We are entering a period in which the influence of the international situation will more and more have the effect of intensifying the class struggle in the U. S. S. R. Hence, the forms of the dictatorship may change as a result of the influence of internal and international factors.

Thirdly and finally, the form of the proletarian dictatorship is determined by the extent to which the vanguard of the proletariat, as represented by its Party, has by its untiring work, managed to train the masses politically, raise the main masses of the working class and the poor and middle strata of the peasantry, which follow it, closer to the level of the vanguard. If for example, the Spartacists had managed to seize power in Germany in January 1919 at a time when considerable sections of the working class supported Noske's Party it is perfectly clear that the forms of the proletarian dictatorship would have been altogether different than they will be now, when the Communist Party of Germany is one of the largest mass Parties affiliated to the Communist International. The dictatorship in Germany of that time would have more closely resembled "Jacobine" forms than the dictatorship of a Communist Party that leads the main and decisive strata of the working class. The characteristic feature of the relationships that existed between the vanguard and the toiling masses in our country in the years that followed after the conclusion of the civil war is that the contacts between our Party and the working class and the broad masses of the peasantry were continuously being strengthened.

What is the significance of our latest slogan: self-criticism? The significance is that the process of the Party "growing together" with the masses of the toilers is to be accelerated; it means that the mistakes and deviations of our State and economic apparatus, which sometimes also reflect the pressure of alien classes upon it, will be rectified and the bureaucratic distortions of our system will be ruthlessly exposed with the immediate participation of the masses. We contrast this broad and genuine mass proletarian democracy to the democracy which desires freedom for certain groups of intellectuals, for Trotskyist "fractions", — which should be the embryo of political parties that were to prepare the way the transition to bourgeois democracy.

The Russian White Guard press and the capitalist press of all countries prophesied that a crisis was developing in the relations between our Party and the peasantry as a result of the difficulties we experienced recently in connection with the grain collections. But one must be an absolute idiot and not a Statesman to fail to see that if a crisis had set in in the relationships between the working class and the peasantry, the political Party, which governs the largest country in the world, would have been mad at such a moment to advance the slogan of self-criticism and invite the millions of non-Party workers and peasants to hurl their criticism at the government. What bourgeois government would dare to stimulate a wave of criticism, to crystallise discontent and to give instructions to the governing party not in any way to restrict the criticism of the masses of the toilers if it were confronted with a serious political crisis in class relationships? Will not every non-Party working man abroad who every day reads the reports of Scheffer (the Moscow correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt") and other bourgeois press correspondents who are abusing the hospitality of the Soviet Union, say to himself: "Well, these Bolsheviks must be devilishly bold not to fear the criticism of their peasants in a period of crisis. Apparently their's must be the most stable government in the world".

We know that one of our neighbouring States recently experienced a crisis with their peasantry which was reflected in the Alba-Julia movement. Things reached the point when it was necessary to mobilise the land and air forces to prevent the peasants from marching on Bukharest. Would the Roumanian boyars dare to open the channels of criticism for their peasant masses? Why are not the Bolsheviks afraid of it? The White Guards of all countries are trying to raise a "scare" about a crisis between the proletariat and the peasantry in the U. S. S. R. in order to stimulate the interventionist appetites of the capitalist governments, but there is no other Party in the world which so staunchly defends the interests of the proletariat and the broad masses of the peasantry and

which has such great confidence in the creative abilities of the masses of the toilers as the Communist Party. There is not a democracy in the world that is broader and more genuine than Soviet Democracy.

We have roused such strata of the population to political life as the "Labour Government" in Great Britain, the Social Democratic Government in Sweden, or any government in the capitalist countries have never dreamed of doing. The face of our country is now unrecognisable. The land of pogroms, of illiteracy and of ignorance is day by day becoming more and more a land of Socialist culture. A new generation of free men and women is growing up; a powerful army of builders of the new life is arising. Take our rural and worker correspondent movement, for example. In the most remote corners of our land a new type of Soviet social worker is arising who is watching vigilantly to see that our work of construction does not become overgrown with the barnacles of the past, with the corruption and stagnation inherited from the period of slavery. Take our system of promotions. In 1925 alone our Party promoted 7459 rank and file workers to leading economic and administrative posts. There is hardly a single Party organisation which cannot claim important achievements in this field. And this movement has only just commenced.

Have we any reason to be afraid of self-criticism? Under present conditions self-criticism is an instrument of initiative, a school which trains millions and millions of the toilers for active participation in the work of Socialist construction. This work of construction is not only the task of the one million members of our Party, or the work of the managers of our trusts, of our administrators, of our co-operators and of our Soviet workers. It is becoming the work of the masses of the toilers themselves. We must strive to eliminate from these masses the old mentality which separated society into rulers and ruled, which regarded the work of Socialist construction as work that is carried out "from above" by people who are all-knowing. We must strive to make the people understand that this work of construction, with all its achievements and its defects, is their work. Self-criticism must serve us as a means for imbuing the masses with the sense of Socialist citizenship.

Lenin once wrote about the participation of the masses in the work of Socialist construction as follows:

"Just as hundreds were the creators (i. e. of the regime) in the period of serfdom, just as thousands and tens of thousands build up the State in the period of capitalism, so today, the Socialist transformation can be brought about only with the active and direct participation of tens of millions in the administration of the State" (Lenin, Vol. XVI, p. 23. Russian edition).

THE ROLE OF THE PARTY AND ITS HEGEMONY IN THE PERIOD OF THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP.

The sixth and last question is that of the role of the Party and its hegemony in the period of the proletarian dictatorship.

Does not the fact that the proletarian democracy tends to expand in the period of the proletarian dictatorship logically lead to the conclusion that the Party will become "absorbed" by the masses and that its position as leader in all spheres of Socialist construction must become weakened in the present period? Is not the weakening of the hegemony of the Party due to the growing complexity of the problems of economic and political leadership and to the increasing specialisation of these problems, demanding not only general political knowledge but also a close acquaintance with the details of the problems of the political and economic administration that confront the Party?

It is a characteristic fact that all the oppositions, no matter whether they came from the "Right" or from the "Left" always opened fire on the hegemony of the Party in which they always pretended to see the "coercion" of the Party ma-

chine, "incompetence", suppression of initiative, the "dictatorship" of the Polit. Bureau, persistent interference, etc. This shows that the question of the hegemony of the Party in circumstances when it has the monopoly, in the period of proletarian dictatorship, has been, is and will continue to be the point towards which all non-proletarian influences will strive, and it is around this question that oppositions have crystallised and will crystallise in the future. The Trotskyist Opposition contrasted the hegemony of the Party to the proletarian dictatorship on the pretext of fighting the internal Party regime and the bureaucracy of the Party machine. In attacking the hegemony of the Party all the opposition tendencies as a matter of fact were fighting against the proletarian dictatorship. For the proletarian dictatorship cannot exist without the leadership of the class-conscious vanguard of the working class as represented by the Party, which absorbs all that is best, most loyal and capable in the proletariat. History knows no case of a dictatorship that was not guided by the political party of the class that was the bearer of that dictatorship.

The hegemony of the Party and proletarian democracy are not antagonistic to each other; the one does not eliminate the other; both represent the component elements of the proletarian dictatorship. The hegemony of the Party without the proletarian democracy would convert the proletarian dictatorship into a dictatorship isolated from the class. Proletarian democracy without the hegemony of the Party would not be proletarian dictatorship but a transitional regime to bourgeois democracy. It would be as brief an episode as the government of people's deputies in Germany after the November revolution, or the rule of the Social Democrats in Hungary after the Communists surrendered power to them. The old French syndicalism fell into shameful bankruptcy for the very reason that it denied the role of the political party of the working class. The Italian proletariat displayed such complete impotence when they seized the factories for the very reason that they lacked a Party capable of leading them into battle and to victory.

In the period of proletarian dictatorship, however, the role of the Party becomes considerably more important than in the period preceding the capture of power; not only during the civil war but also and more particularly in the period of Socialist construction, when the proletariat has to solve the most complex problems amidst class antagonism. Having destroyed the bourgeoisie and the landlords the proletariat is confronted by a class of small commodity producers who cannot be dispersed or crushed. It has to live side by side with them, re-educate them by prolonged, persistent organisational work. Lenin said:

"They surround the proletariat on all sides with the petty bourgeois spirit, saturate it and corrupt it, give rise to relapses into petty bourgeois feebleness of character, disunity, individualism and to changes of mood from the height of enthusiasm to the depths of depression. Strict centralisation and discipline must be maintained within the political party of the proletariat in order to resist this, in order that the **organising** role of the proletariat — and this is its **principal** role — may be carried out correctly, successfully and victoriously. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a stubborn battle, a bloody and bloodless, a violent and peaceful, a military and economic, a pedagogical and administrative struggle against the forces and traditions of the old society. The force of habit of millions and tens of millions — is a most terrible force. Without a party iron-willed and tempered in the struggle, without a Party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in that class, without a Party able to watch the moods of the masses and influence them, it will be impossible to carry on this struggle. It is a thousand times easier to defeat the big centralised bourgeoisie than to "defeat" the millions and millions of small producers, and yet they by their everyday unseen, impalpable disintegrating activity bring about the very results that the bourgeoisie desire

in order to restore its rule. Whoever weakens the iron discipline of the Party of the proletariat (especially during its dictatorship) in the slightest degree actually assists the bourgeoisie against the proletariat." "Infantile Sickness of Communism." (Lenin, Vol. XVII., page 136, Russian Edition.)

Take the concrete example of the proletarian dictatorship in our country. Is not our proletariat being subjected to the constant pressure of the petty bourgeois elements on all sides? Our proletariat has contacts with the peasantry, as the proletariat in no European country has. The slightest discontent among the peasantry is registered as by a barometer in the moods of the workers. This we saw at the time we experienced the difficulties in connection with the grain collections and with the difficulties arising with the influx of seasonal workers from the country districts into the towns. Our proletariat is a proletariat in an enormous peasant country in which the developing industry creates a demand for labour-power. This labour power it obtains from the rural districts, and hence the proletariat is constantly changing quantitatively and qualitatively. It is made up of various strata: there is a very thin stratum of pure proletarians who have broken all contacts with the rural districts. Parallel with this there is an enormous mass of proletarians who have social, family and economic ties with the peasantry.

We could draw up a whole scale of types of such ties, from the peasants for whom seasonal work in the towns represents simply a subsidiary occupation to their main peasant occupation to those who have no other means of livelihood except their labour-power. In Western Europe such a structure of the proletariat i. e., a class with a number of sub-strata, serves as the basis for the formation of various tendencies in the labour movement. In Russia, however, where there is only one political party guiding the proletarian dictatorship, this structure of the proletariat serves as the ground for the maturing of various groups and tendencies within our Party. The Party which under such circumstances failed to regulate the social composition of its membership and the influx of new and raw strata of the working class would be overwhelmed by semi-rural and semi-petty bourgeois moods. This would be a policy of "khvostism", a policy of adapting the Party to passing moods and not a Bolshevik policy of raising the level of class consciousness of the proletariat and of bringing it nearer to the level of the vanguard.

During the past ten years we have enlarged our Party with the greatest caution. We have combated the fantastic proposals that the whole of the working class shall be absorbed in the Party within two or three years. We have not forgotten for a moment that the task of training our membership in the Communist, Leninist spirit, of making them hardened Bolsheviks and of training the new members that come into our Party is a very complicated task. At the present time only 0.3% of our membership represents the old underground membership that joined the Party prior to 1905. Those that joined prior to the February revolution, 1917, represent only 0.8%. That is to say, the old guard who fought in the great ideological battles and who were hardened in the conditions of underground Czarist Russia represent no more than 1% of the membership of our Party. Our second generation, the generation of the civil war, represents about one third of our membership (membership since 1917: 4%, 1918 — 6.4%; 1919 — 10.4%; 1920 — 11.8%). The other two-thirds of our Party represents the third generation which came into the Party after the close of the civil war and after the introduction of the New Economic Policy. Furthermore we must not lose sight of the fact that our Party which leads the proletarian dictatorship, differs from the Parties which are as yet only marching towards the conquest of power by the number and variety of the functions it fulfills. The principal field of activity of our brother Sections is agitation, propaganda and organisational work among the masses. We, however, must administer the State, organise industry, carry on trade, plan, arrest, sit on judgement and guard the proletarian State against

attacks by the counter-revolution. Our members must be Red directors, public prosecutors, university professors, army commanders, chiefs of militia, etc., etc. The members of our Party fill positions as directors and controllers of scores of trusts and cooperative societies; they hold positions on hundreds of provincial, regional and district executive committees, on the railways and waterways, in the post office and telegraphs, etc. We are compelled to break up our single Party into groups each having its own "corporative" and "departmental" interests.

To be able to remain a Communist, able at all times to bear in mind the interests only of one's own class and to resist the pressure of the specific interests of one's own apparatus and to subordinate it to the single will of the proletariat, demands stern Bolshevik persistence. That which unites all Communists scattered over hundreds of thousands of versts in the most varied branches of work, that which prevents them from swerving from the proletarian path is the control and leadership of the Party. Weaken this controlling leadership for one moment and you will have something in the nature of a pair of "scissors", the blades of which representing the various branches of work, will be pointing in different directions. The gap would leave the way open for the penetration of all sorts of class antagonisms. The proletarian dictatorship which is expressed in the unity of the Party leadership would be broken into fragments and we would have peculiar "Parties" springing up with narrow corporative interests coming into constant conflict with each other. Is not the Shakhty affair a glaring case in point? It was sufficient for the Party to slacken its vigilance at one point for a moment, it was sufficient for the local Party organisations to become dependent, if only to a very slight degree, upon the economic organisations for the whole line of the Soviet and trade union apparatus in that district to become distorted. The experience of the whole international labour movement teaches us that when members of the Party throw off the leadership and control of the Party they inevitably land into opportunism. All the Parties that work under capitalist conditions know this to be true.

That is why in developing and deepening proletarian democracy in the land of the proletarian dictatorship, the Leninist Party will determinedly resist every attempt at a Trotskyist-Menshevik revision of the idea of the hegemony of the Party.

CONCLUSION.

The XV. Congress of our Party showed by the resolutions it passed how wrong and distorted were all the assertions made by the opposition that our Party was being diverted to Thermidor lines. The resolutions passed by the XV. Congress and the course adopted by our Party after the Congress finally crushed the Opposition not only in Soviet Russia but also internationally. What could the Opposition propose as against these resolutions and the course adopted by the Party? Helpless lisping about zigzags. Malicious croaking about the Party not being able to maintain this course and its inevitably swinging to the Right. Ridiculous statements by people who have lost all sense of humour that they are ready to help the Party to zigzag to the Left". The Leninist Party does not need the aid of people who have lost all their intellectual baggage and who have gone to the utmost limits of Menshevism. The Leninist Party is sufficiently strong to carry out the decisions of the XV. Party Congress and its arm is sufficiently strong to crush any attempt to revise these decisions. This Party has led the land of the proletarian dictatorship through enormous difficulties and severe internal and international trials during ten years of revolution. It has fulfilled and will continue to fulfill this task until help arrives from the international proletariat, firm in the conviction that there is no path more to the Left than the Leninist path and that the Right path will divert the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern from the great proletarian road which leads to the victory of the working class and to Socialism. (Great applause.)

Forty-third Session.

Moscow, 23rd August, 1928 (Morning).

Declarations on the Reports of Comrades Varga and Manuilsky on the Situation and the Problems of the C. P. S. U.

Chairman: Comrade Bela Kun.

Declaration of Comrade THÄLMANN on Behalf of a Number of Delegations.

Comrades, we heard yesterday the reports of Comrades Varga and Manuilsky to the Plenum and believe that it is necessary to instruct the Presidium and the E. C. C. I. to issue these reports in pamphlet form with diagrams and tables as rapidly as possible to the various sections, because they can be of great help to us in the fight against the lies and the treacherous policy of the international social democracy against the Soviet Union and can be of great importance in the revolutionary movement.

As regards the discussion in the Plenum on the situation in the Soviet Union and the situation in the C. P. S. U. the various delegations have taken the initiative to submit their standpoint to the Plenum of the VI. Congress in a written declaration.

I have to make the following declaration on behalf of the German Delegation, the Communist Youth Delegation, the Czechoslovakian, Polish, Austrian, Hungarian, Swedish, Finnish, Norwegian, Danish, Lithuanian, Latvian and Esthonian Delegations:

The undersigned delegations have the following declaration to make on the report concerning the situation in the U. S. S. R. and the C. P. S. U.:

1. The Communist Parties and sections of the C. I. represented by the undersigned delegations fully and entirely approve the political and organisational line of the C. P. S. U. and of its Leninist Central Committee. This true Bolshevik policy led amidst tremendous difficulties of imperialist encirclement to mighty progress in the socialist construction, to the steady rise in the material and cultural level of the working and peasant masses, to the strengthening of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, to the security of the hegemony of the proletariat and of its Communist Party, to the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship, to the increased prestige of the Soviet Union as the hearth of the international revolutionary movement, the bulwark of the proletarian class struggle, and the tower of strength for the rising oppressed colonial peoples.

2. The following are to be noted as exceptionally important achievements towards the construction of socialism: the achievements of socialist industrialisation, the progress of the State industries above the pre-war level, the steady numerical growth of the industrial proletariat, the introduction of the 7-hour working day, the rise in the real wages and in the productivity of labour, and the fundamental reconstruction of the whole process of production. Along with the upward growth of the socialist state industries, there was also an increase in the importance of all the other portions of the system of the economic control by the proletarian state, to wit: the transport, the national budget, the net of banking and credit institutions, the trading apparatus, accompanied by the strict preservation of the foreign trade monopoly, and by the systematic ousting of private trading capital by state and cooperative trading organisations which have captured the commanding positions in the market. The policy of the Party has also achieved substantial successes in the domain of agriculture: the increased area under

cultivation, the increased output of agriculture in general, the introduction of improved technical methods in agriculture, and the strengthening of the alliance between town and village.

3. These successes do not signify, neither can they signify, the elimination of the difficulties, dangers and contradictions which arise from the objective conditions of the socialist construction, from the technical and economic backwardness of the country, from the attack of the class forces that are hostile to the proletariat, and from the counter-revolutionary anti-Soviet policies of all the imperialist powers. Among these difficulties are: the questions of imports and exports, of capital stock, of the curtailment of manufacturing costs and the reduction of prices on industrial goods, of unemployment, the commodity famine in rural districts on the one hand, and the supply of food stuffs for the towns on the other hand.

4. The whole of the policies of the C. P. S. U. is based upon the correct principle that the overcoming of these difficulties and the further progress towards socialism can be attained only by carrying on a determined, relentless Bolshevik fight against all the inimical class forces. As against the growing activity of the capitalist elements, the sabotage attempts of the counter-revolution, and the detrimental effect of bureaucratism, the working class and the C. P. S. U. at its head is strengthening the regime of the proletarian dictatorship, is striving for a still greater unfoldment of proletarian democracy, still greater activity, self-action, and revolutionary self-criticism of the large masses of the proletariat. To the anti-proletarian efforts of the kulaks in politics and in economics the Party responds by pursuing the staunch policy of the alliance of the working class relying upon the poor peasants and the middle peasants for a determined offensive against the kulaks. Of particular importance to this policy are the decisions of the 15th Congress of the C. P. S. U. regarding the transformation of the split up agriculture upon the basis of extensive cooperation among the peasantry along the lines of extensive cultivation (collective tilling of the soil, intensified agriculture with the use of machinery, cooperative organisation in the villages on socialist lines, accompanied by the overcoming of its capitalist elements and by a thorough development of the individual efforts of independent small and middle peasant producers).

5. The undersigned delegations declare on behalf of the Communist Parties and sections of the C. I. represented by them, that the erstwhile Trotskyist Opposition in the C. P. S. U., which started to revise the teachings of Lenin, has sunk down to the standpoint of Menshevism. Starting from a denial of the possibility of the victorious building of Socialism in the Soviet Union, the Opposition arrived at the denial of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union ("Thermidor"). The Trotskyist Opposition, as a result of its programme, tactics and organisational principles, became the tool of the petty bourgeois elements within the Soviet Union who rose in opposition to the proletarian dictatorship, and a subsidiary force of the international social democracy. On international lines the Trotskyists joined hands with the open enemies and traitors to Communism who had been expelled from the Comintern (Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Korsch, Souvarine, etc.). The undersigned

delegations approve all the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. directed against this Menshevik Opposition as well as their expulsion from the Party by the 15th Congress of the C. P. S. U. They declare themselves in agreement with all the measures applied against the activity of the opposition which undermines the proletarian dictatorship. At the same time the undersigned approve all the corresponding decisions of the plenary sessions of the E. C. C. I. since the 5th World Congress of the C. I. The consistent struggle of the C. I. and the C. P. S. U. against the petty bourgeois Trotskyist group has led to their total liquidation both in the Soviet Union and in the International. Allegiance to the Trotskyist Opposition, and the propaganda of its views is, and remains, incompatible with being in the ranks of the Comintern.

6. The undersigned delegations lay particular stress upon the growing danger of a new imperialist war of intervention against the Soviet Union. The greater the achievements of socialist construction, the more desperate the attacks of the imperialists against the Soviet state of the proletariat, the more imminent the outbreak of a counter-revolutionary war against the U. S. S. R. This war, the inevitability of which was foretold by Lenin, is suspended now, in the 11th year of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship as the menacing sword over the heads of the working masses of all countries. The Comintern must, and will, stand the fire test of history in this gigantic class war. It must unfurl the banner of transforming the war

of the exploiters into the civil war of the oppressed, for the triumphant establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in the citadels of capitalism. In the present situation it is the most essential task of all the Communists to gather all their forces, to mobilise the world proletariat and all the subjugated peoples for the defence of the Soviet Union as the only socialist fatherland of the working class, as the starting point, the basis, and the strongest citadel of the world revolution.

Signatures:

For the German Delegation: Thälmann.
 For the Y. C. I. Delegation: Schüller, Khitarov.
 For the Czech Delegation: Jilek, Zapotocky.
 For the Polish Delegation: Kostrzewa, Belewski.
 For the Austrian Delegation: Koplenik.
 For the Hungarian Delegation: Bela Kun.
 For the Lithuanian Delegation: Angaretis.
 For the Latvian Delegation: Anvelt.
 For the Swedish Delegation: Samuelson.
 For the Norwegian Delegation: Söderstroem.
 For the Finnish Delegation: Manner.
 For the Danish Delegation: Munsch-Peterson.

Declaration of Comrade SEMARD.

Comrades, the delegations of the French, Italian, Belgian, Spanish, Swiss and Dutch Parties fully endorse the policy and tactic laid down by the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. in the resolutions of its Central Committee, the conferences and congresses since the V. Congress of the C. I.

They endorse particularly, on the one hand, the decisions of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. which took all the necessary measures to keep up the indispensable connection between the proletariat, the poor and the middle peasantry for the purpose of strengthening the proletarian dictatorship; on the other hand, the energetic measures for the establishment and multiplication of collective Soviet farms and the continuation of the measures for the reinforcement of individual, small and middle homesteads with a view to developing their production capacity and to drawing them into the work of Socialist construction through the co-operative movement.

The systematic application of these decisions has effected an economic and political consolidation of the U. S. S. R. expressed by incontestable successes in the construction of Socialism, the improvement of workers' conditions of life and labour (wage increases, progressive application of the 7-hour day, construction of dwellings, etc.), by the development of industry, owing to the application of Socialist rationalisation which increases productivity of labour and is raising the total production above the pre-war level.

Owing to this policy it has also been possible to establish a closer and more effective connection between the proletariat and the peasantry which is greatly due to the active support of the poor peasants and to the alliance with the middle peasants for continuous struggle against the kulak elements. The result of all this is a reinforcement of the hegemony of the proletariat and a consolidation of its dictatorship.

This growing developing of the U. S. S. R. in the direction of Socialism, its beneficent rule over one-sixth of the globe, its growing influence throughout the world, make it appear more and more in the eyes of the exploited masses of the capitalist and colonial countries as the revolutionary stronghold, the fundamental basis of the world proletarian revolution.

But the more the U. S. S. R. consolidates itself, the more its influence over the international labour movement is growing, the more the imperialist powers are trying to annihilate it; today by the economic blockade, tomorrow by the war which they are feverishly preparing with the collaboration of the So-

cial Democrats. The bourgeoisie and Social Democracy are speculating on the inevitable difficulties which arise from the dire heritage of the old regime, from an undeveloped industry and backward technique, to prognosticate the fall of Bolshevism, endeavouring at the same time to support all the internal and external counter-revolutionary forces which attack the existing regime.

The C. P. S. U. has shown that it is well able to overcome these various difficulties (in the policy of the collection of grain, in the export and import problem, in the goods famine, in the struggle against unemployment, etc.), also that it is determined to put a stop to the criminal counter-revolutionary sabotage within the country and to offer a resolute resistance to the threats and attacks of the imperialists, with the full support of the workers and peasants of the U. S. S. R. and the energetic support of the world proletariat.

The measures which it has taken in the sphere of Party and trade union work, especially with the object of instituting healthy self-criticism from the bottom to the top, of carrying on an energetic struggle against red tapeism, conservatism and routine and of effecting an improvement in the whole machinery of the various Soviet institutions are bound to increase initiative, add zest to the work of the masses, and to help to overcome difficulties of all kind.

The undersigned delegations endorse in particular the energetic measures taken by the C. P. S. U. for the purpose of strengthening the offensive against the kulaks and Nepmen who were becoming in the present situation an economic as well as a political danger.

The Trotskyist Opposition alone, which has now fallen into Menshevism, denies the correctness of the policy of the C.P.S.U. and the International and offers demagogical opposition to the decisions and resolutions of these two responsible organs.

By its negation of the possibility of the construction of Socialism in one country, by its scandalous assertions re the Thermidor of the Russian Revolution, by its fractional work carried on on an international scale and especially by its activity within the C. P. S. U. which jeopardised the dictatorship itself, the Trotskyist Opposition has gone over to the side of the worst enemies of Communism and must be severely condemned.

Therefore, the delegations of the above mentioned parties fully endorse the decisions made against the Opposition by the

C. P. S. U. as well as the resolutions adopted by the C. I. on this point.

The delegations declare that it was the duty of the proletarian State to take energetic and severe measures against all those who by their criminal activity impede the development of Socialist construction and jeopardise the revolution; this is not an ordinary question of discipline, it is rather a question of life or death for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Opposition in the various sections of the C. I. is taking up the slanderous accusations of the bourgeoisie and Social Democracy and is dishing them up from a "Left" viewpoint. It opposes the policy of the C. I. in the most essential questions of theory and tactic.

Thus, the Belgian Opposition, after splitting the Party, accuses the C. I. and the R. I. L. U. of destroying trade union unity; it is carrying on a struggle against the Communists together with the Amsterdam leaders.

In Holland the Trotskyists have been instrumental in making the N. A. S. trade unions leave the Red International Labour Unions and in bringing them onto the path of reformist trade unionism.

In the Italian C. P. the small oppositional minority of the old Bordiga tendency carries on, especially among the emigrants, a systematic and criminal sabotage of the work of the Party, especially of the anti-Fascist work among the masses and the work for the defence of the Italian C. G. T. In this way

it objectively helps the counter-revolution and sometimes even its methods of provocation.

In France it has tried the same methods of splitting the Party and by its false and senseless accusations against the leadership of the C. P. S. U., it has revealed itself as the most effective auxiliary of the Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie in the struggle against Bolshevism. After the expulsion of its most active members it has gradually split up and deteriorated, and is now completely ignored by the masses.

The VI. World Congress must condemn severely the international Trotskyist Opposition whose work for the disintegration of Communist ranks does good service to all counter-revolutionary forces, encourages the Social Democrats in their struggle against Bolshevism and the U. S. S. R. and plays into the hands of the bourgeoisie in its war preparations against the Proletariat State.

The VI Congress calls upon the workers and peasants of the whole world to close up their ranks around the Russian revolution for its defence by every possible means against the imperialists and to trust the valiant Bolshevik Party and the III. International to lead them to victory over capitalism by the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Delegations of the Communist Parties of
France, Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Holland.

Declaration of Comrade BELL.

The delegations of Great Britain, the United States, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand and Latin America submit the following Declaration: The events of the period since the V. World Congress of the C. I. have confirmed the correctness of the decisive measures taken by the E. C. C. I. against Trotsky and his allies inside and outside the Soviet Union in the circles of the Communist International. The policy of the C. P. S. U. with regard to the peasant question is grappling successfully with a whole series of problems inherent in a country with an enormous agrarian population and an undeveloped economy. The fight against the kulaks and all those elements tending to revive a new bourgeoisie can only be brought to a successful conclusion, i. e., the achievement of collectivist agriculture, on the basis of a developed industry producing the means of production, and industrialisation of the countryside. This object the C. P. S. U. is steadily attaining despite the predictions of the Trotskyists.

The political line of the C. P. S. U. in taking all measures to foster on the basis of its own resources the development of State industry and large-scale industrial undertakings, in the teeth of a foreign financial blockade and counter-revolutionary sabotage from within, has been followed by remarkable successes. The Trotskyist allegation that the conditions of the working masses are going from bad to worse has been proven to be a base and lying slander. The introduction of the 7-hour day in a number of important industries, with an increasing volume of output, the increased facilities provided for social and cultural life are an evidence that the conditions of the workers are not worse, but on the upgrade.

The rate of further improvement is only limited by the meagre resources available in a country surrounded by a world of capitalist enemies. But all the class-conscious workers in all countries now know — if the Trotskyists do not know — that Socialism is steadily being built up in the U. S. S. R.

Bound up with the consolidation of the Soviet Union is the closer and closer alliance of the Russian workers and peasants with the proletariat abroad on the basis of the common fight against international imperialism. By the break up of the Anglo-Russian Committee the reformist trade union leaders exposed themselves as the disruptors of International Unity. This has still more clarified the minds of the active workers with

regard to the struggle for international trade union unity, and has given a new stimulus to the movement for unity, from below. Also in this connection, it has been the line of the C. I. that has been proven to be correct, and not the line of Trotsky.

The Trotskyist allegation of "National limitedness", of sacrificing the international revolution for narrow nationalist ends, was particularly refuted in the solid backing and support given by the Russian proletariat, under the inspiration of the C. P. S. U., to the British miners, the British General Strike and a number of industrial disputes of international importance. A further refutation is seen in the political support of the C. P. S. U. for all the oppressed peoples of the colonies, especially the Chinese Revolution.

In a similar way the charges against the Comintern of "degeneracy", of "petty bourgeois cliquism" and "opportunism" may be dismissed as vile slanders. Such charges ignore the increase in the numerical strength and growing influence of our Communist Parties, and the active role they have played and are playing in the tremendous movements which characterise the present leftward trend of the working masses. For example, the British Party in the mining, textile and woollen disputes; the American Party in the miners, textiles, needle trades, and in the championing of the Negro movement and of the colonial masses against American imperialism; and in the growth of the Communist movement in the Latin American countries into organised Communist Parties, which are now exercising an increasing influence in the working class and peasant movement in Latin America.

Finally, with the consolidation of the Soviet Union, side by side with the increasing contradictions of capitalism, imperialist rivalries, increased armaments, and manoeuvres for a bloc of the imperialists against the Soviet Union with a view to war on the Soviet Union as the centre of the world social revolution, the Trotskyist Opposition has been a source of strength to all enemies of the Communist International. By slanders of "Thermidorianism", of opportunism", of "national limitedness", on the part of the leaders of the C. P. S. U., by counter-revolutionary fractional activities towards building a second Party; by slanders of degeneracy and opportunism against the Comintern, the Trotskyist oppositionists have been a source of strength and renewed inspiration to our Social Democratic enemies. Thus, from the mouths of the Trotskyists

have come the same charges which the revolutionary proletariat has been accustomed to hear for years from the Social Democrats. A continuation of the Trotskyist propaganda is designed to create pessimism in the ranks of the C. I. and the international proletariat.

The Delegations from the British, American, Latin American, Canadian, South African and New Zealand countries consider that this VI. World Congress should endorse the decisions of the VII., VIII. and IX. Plenums of the C. I. and the line of the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U., in excluding and condemning the Trotskyist Opposition, and in rejecting any

approaches which are not an unconditional repudiation of their false accusations and political line.

(Signed)

Jay Lovestone, America.
Thos. Bell, England.
John Nairs, Canada.
Ramirez, Latin America.
S. P. Bunting, South Africa.
R. F. Griffin, New Zealand.

Declaration of Comrade **ROGIC**.

Comrades, on behalf of the Communist Parties of the Balkan, namely the Communist Parties of **Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Roumania and Greece**, I wish to make the following declaration:

On behalf of the Communist Parties of the Balkans, the C. P. of Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, Greece and Roumania, we declare as follows:

In consistently carrying out the policies of Leninism, the C. P. S. U. led by its tried and tested C. C., in spite of the imperialist anti-Soviet economic and political bloc, has achieved great successes in the domain of socialist construction. The alliance of the workers and peasants has been insolubly cemented by the C. P. S. U. and by the economic organs of the Soviet Union, serving as a source of strength to the world revolution. The proletarian dictatorship, thus strengthened, has achieved big results in the last four years.

The material and cultural level of the working masses in town and country rises day by day, the industrialisation is making big strides forward, the process of production becomes improved, and the productivity of labour increases. Private enterprise is being ousted more and more by the socialist economy. Tremendous successes may be recorded in all spheres of socialist construction.

The transition from capitalist to socialist economy, to socialism, is bound up with tremendous difficulties and dangers in this technically and economically backward country. Deprived of the necessary big investments of capital, the industry of the Soviet Union, despite its rapid growth, is still unable to cope fully with the commodity famine which exists in the country, whilst the prices of industrial products cannot be yet brought down to the corresponding level of the prices of agricultural products.

These and other difficulties of the transition period, which are quite surmountable, are being overcome through a determined fight against all the elements that are hostile to the socialist construction, and also through self-sacrificing activity. Relying upon and closely connected with the large masses of the workers, and the poor and middle peasants, with the cooperation and control of the large masses of all the toilers, the C. P. S. U. is waging a confident and determined fight against the hostile class elements within the country whilst defending the country against the imperialist powers.

Only a strong Leninist Party with a uniform leadership can overcome the difficulties of the transition period and avoid its dangers, building socialism in spite of all the internal and external class foes. We completely approve the expulsion of the Trotskyist Opposition from the C. P. S. U. because it has deserted the road of Leninism, the faith in the existence of the proletarian dictatorship and the building of socialism in the U. S. S. R. and has become enmeshed in the swamp of social democracy. The Trotskyist Opposition has found adherents in the Balkan countries only among an insignificant group of intellectuals, such as the liquidators in Greece, whom the C. P. of Greece has entirely eliminated without any damage to the Party. As in the past, so must all the Parties in the future relentlessly dispose both politically and organisationally of such oppositions who abandon the firm ground of Leninism.

In the imminent war which all the capitalist powers are aiming chiefly against the bulwark of all the exploited and oppressed, against the U. S. S. R., the Communists of all countries will give real effect to the Leninist slogan of transforming the imperialist war into civil war and proletarian revolution. The international proletariat is no longer without a fatherland, it has its very own fatherland to defend.

Under the leadership of the proletarian world party, the Communist International, the proletariat and the masses of the working peasants in the Balkan countries will defend their fatherland, the U. S. S. R., against the war danger and in the course of the war.

Signatures:

The Delegation of the C. P. of Jugoslavia:
Rogic, Lidin, Nakowanawic, Spheic.

The Delegation of the C. P. of Bulgaria:
H. Assif, I. Schairanov, Stefanov.

The Delegation of the C. P. of Greece:
A. Carris, A. Cifiszoe, Nikolay.

The Delegation of the C. P. of Roumania:
Petrulescu, Hanin, Balthario.

Declaration of Comrade **STRAKHOV**.

The undersigned are of the opinion that the question of the development of the Soviet Union and of the socialist construction of the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the proletariat throughout the world, is one of the most essential questions of the international Communist movement. The VI. Congress of the Communist International, ten years after the victory of the great October Revolution in Russia, in spite of all the calumnies and the counter-revolutionary propaganda of the imperialists, the socialists and the Kuomintang, may proudly and joyfully record the following facts:

1. The socialist construction of the Soviet Union has achieved considerable success under the leadership of the C. P. S. U.,

in spite of all the assertions of the Trotskyist Opposition, to the effect that it was impossible to build socialism in a single country. We record the fact that the Soviet Union has reconstructed the big industries in the course of 5—6 years with its own resources; that the productivity of labour in the Soviet Union has surpassed the pre-war level; that the pace of economic development in the Soviet Union is more rapid than in any capitalist country, and that the socialist economy of the Soviet Union begun a new period of reconstruction. Thus, for instance, the pace of growth in the output of iron and steel in the Soviet Union is faster than in England, United States, etc. All this knocks the bottom out of the argument of the

Trotskyist Opposition and the counter-revolutionary propaganda of the imperialists, of the social-traitors and the Kuomintang people, the traitors to the Chinese revolution who have made use of the assertions of the Trotskyist Opposition, shouting that Trotsky himself, the "leader" of the October revolution, had admitted that the October Revolution "had only paved the way of capitalist development".

2. The policy of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. towards the peasantry is the only proper policy. The latest difficulties in the collection of corn in the Soviet Union show quite plainly to what a state the opposition leaders would have brought the revolution if they had been put in charge of the socialist construction and if they had been allowed to carry out their policy which is based upon the idea that it would be better to break with the peasants for a couple of years longer in order to accelerate the pace of industrialisation. We observe that Trotsky in the course of a quarter of a century, throughout the development of the C. P. S. U., apart from brief intervals, has consistently made use of radical high-sounding phrases to disguise his opportunistic line of policy. Trotsky makes use of the idea of the world revolution in order to check the stormy forward march of the proletariat of the Soviet Union along the road of socialist construction; he sows scepticism and distrust in the ranks of the international proletariat as regards the Soviet Union at the very moment when the clouds of war are gathering over the Soviet Union. We declare that it is not only the right, but also the duty of the proletarian State to apply measures of reprisal against all those who take to the road of Menshevism, of the counter-revolutionary struggle against the proletarian dictatorship.

3. The prosperity and growth of the Soviet Union is all the more important to the proletarian world revolution, since the Soviet country has become the centre of the international revolutionary proletarian movement, of the national emancipation movement, and of the colonial revolts and wars against the imperialists. The Soviet Union, by its development and progress along the road of socialist construction, not only arouses the proletariat of the whole world and even the most backward countries to fight for their freedom, but also millions of peasants in the colonies, the millions of colonial toilers, to the decisive fight for the land, to the fight against the rule of the imperialists, of the capitalists and the landowners, to the fight against any national or other oppression, — because the working masses in the colonies can see with their own eyes that only in alliance with and under the leadership of the proletariat, just as it happened in the Soviet Union, can they achieve their emancipation through the struggle for socialism.

4. The Chinese revolution has developed under the influence of the victorious October Revolution, and with the strong support of the proletariat of the Soviet Union. The triumph of the October Revolution, the successes of the Soviet Union and the development of the Chinese Revolution, the unfolding of a plebeian agrarian revolution, — all these facts put together are a mighty force which threatens the imperialists throughout the world. It is for this very reason that the imperialists, and the Kuomintang people with them, are organising a simultaneous offensive against the Soviet Union and the Chinese revolution. Not only are the imperialists now carrying out an open intervention in China (the events at Tsinan) in order to crush the Chinese Revolution, but they are also making all preparations for a war against the Soviet Union. They are not only corrupting the social democracy by the merging of the yellow trade union bureaucrats with the state apparatus; not only are they training the social democrats to play the role of "hounds" in a war against the Soviet Union; but they are also trying to bribe the Chinese bourgeoisie, to create in China an atmosphere of hostility to the so-called "red imperialism". British imperialism in India is mercilessly endeavouring to crush and suppress the growing revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants. At the

same time it is feverishly strengthening its military preparations in order to make India the basis for a war against the Soviet Union. In this connection it is particularly important that the Indian workers and peasants should spontaneously rise for the fight against British imperialism, making the proper use of the lessons of the Russian and Chinese revolutions. The same holds good for Indonesia and the other colonial countries.

To stake everything on the war against the Soviet Union, on the war against the proletarian revolution, against the Chinese revolution, for the suppression of the revolutionary movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, — such is the very essence of the politics of the imperialists.

5. The Trotskyist Opposition, which tried to apply its theory of permanent revolution (condemned already in 1905) to China, has gone so far that it has described the Canton revolt as a pure adventure and a putsch, and it has even declared any organisation of the peasants on a national scale to be counter-revolutionary (even as regards the Chinese peasants). In this manner they are objectively supporting the imperialists, the social democrats and the Kuomintang in their struggle against the Chinese Revolution. The undersigned delegations, being thoroughly in agreement with the decisions on the Russian and Chinese questions carried by the 7th, 8th and 9th Plenums of the E. C. C. I., as well as with the decisions of the 15th Congress of the C. P. S. U., hereby declare that they fully support the policy of the C. P. S. U. on both internal and international questions.

Delegation of the C. P. of China.

Delegation of the C. P. of Japan.

Delegation of the C. P. of India.

Delegation of the C. P. of Indonesia.

Delegations of the remaining Eastern countries.

Chairman Comrade KUN:

Comrade Fachri has the floor on behalf of the delegations of the Near East.

Comrade FACHRI (Turkey):

The Turkish, Persian, Syrian, Palestinian, Egyptian and other Arabian parties declare themselves in agreement with the declaration made by the German delegation. They approve the line, the policy and the tactics of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the E. C. C. I. They approve the decisions of the 15th Congress of the C. P. S. U. and the decisions of the plenary meetings of the E. C. C. I. concerning the petty bourgeois, Menshevik, Trotskyist Opposition. The undersigned delegations know from their own experiences of many years that the Soviet Union is the only country of the international proletariat, the mightiest and the only stronghold of the international labour movement and of the liberation movements of the colonial countries. They are thoroughly in agreement with the declaration of the Communist Party of Germany.

Comrade KUN.

Comrades, there are no further speakers on the list. We shall now elect a committee to draft a resolution on this question. The Presidium proposes the following comrades for this commission: Thälmann, Semard, Bell, Strakhov, Rogitch, Fachri, and the reporters Manuilsky and Varga.

On a vote being taken the commission was elected unanimously.

(End of the Session.)

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. A.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39 East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent.

The Business Manager.