



REPORT OF THE  
XV CONGRESS

OF THE



COMMUNIST  
PARTY OF  
THE SOVIET  
UNION

21-



OFFICIAL REPORT  
WITH DECISIONS  
AND DISCUSSIONS

Published by the Com-  
munist Party of Great  
Britain, 16 King Street,  
Covent Garden, W.C.2



7231  
USSRB

1  
X

**REPORT OF THE FIFTEENTH  
CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST  
PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION**

**COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN  
16 KING STREET - LONDON - W.C.2**

*Published March, 1928*

THE DORRIT PRESS, LTD. (T.U.), 68-70, Lant  
Street, S.E.1.

## CONTENTS.

	Page
Foreword ... ..	5
Opening Session—Greetings ... ..	11
Political Report of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (Address by comrade Stalin) ... ..	21
Organisation Report (comrade Kossior's Speech) ... ..	84
Discussion on the Reports of comrades Stalin and Kossior ... ..	99
Stalin's Concluding Speech ... ..	151
Resolution on the Report of the Central Com- mittee ... ..	165
Report of Central Control Commission and Workers' and Peasants' Inspection by comrade Ordjonikidze ... ..	176
Discussion on comrade Ordjonikidze's Report	187
The International Situation and the Tasks of the C.I. (Report of the Delegation of the C.P.S.U. to the C.I.) N. Bukharin ...	196
Discussion on comrade Bukharin's Report ...	281
Concluding Speech by comrade Bukharin ...	305
Resolution on the Report of the C.P.S.U. Delegation to the E.C.C.I. ... ..	335
The Five-Year Plan of Development ... ..	340
The Opposition. Statements to the Congress	386
Report of the Credentials Committee ... ..	411

## Foreword

The 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U. is perhaps them most important congress since Lenin's death for the International proletariat and the proletariat of the U.S.S.R.

The 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U. definitely scotched the slander and falsehood which the agents of the bourgeoisie from the Social Democratic camp and the Trotskyist Opposition circulated about the U.S.S.R. and its leading Party the C.P.S.U.

Firstly: The Social Democrats and the Oppositionists falsified the facts and raised a hue and cry that not Socialism but Capitalism is developing in the U.S.S.R., and that the C.P.S.U. is adopting a course intended to develop capitalist elements in the national economy of the U.S.S.R. The reports and resolutions of the Congress on the Five Year Plan and the Tasks of Rural Work definitely repudiate this slander. The five-year plan of development of national economy is a five-year plan by which industry will develop more rapidly than agriculture, and the Socialist elements grow more rapidly than the capitalist elements. Throughout the five-year plan runs the red thread of the strategical task of the Party—the task of squeezing out private capital—the task of the building up of Socialism. The clearest and most concrete expression of this task is to be found in the chief slogan for the village: "Onward to Large Scale Collective Economy."

What do these decisions show? They show

that the talk about the growth of Capitalism in the U.S.S.R. is a falsehood invented by the agents of the bourgeoisie. If the building up of Socialism did not progress in the U.S.S.R., if the C.P.S.U. did not deem it its fundamental task to further the development of this construction, then how, in such conditions, could the Congress of the Ruling Party put forward the slogan of large scale collective economy in the form of leads for the Party, the Soviets, the Trade Unions and the Co-operatives? Only the lying Menshevik emigrés who found a place with the "Vorwärts," such as Peter Harvey and the ultra-Left renegades, can maintain that the policy of the 15th Congress is a manoeuvre of a bankrupt Party.

Secondly: The "orthodox Leninists," such as Ruth Fischer and Maslow, preached, and assured the Western workers that the C.P.S.U. had abandoned the world revolution, and that the U.S.S.R. is ready to come to terms with the League of Nations. The reports and decisions of the Congress on the International questions definitely smash these slanderous statements. The Congress gave a Marxian-Leninist analysis of the contradictions inherent in capitalist stabilisation. It emphasised the driving forces which lead to its downfall. It characterised the coming period as a period of new revolutionary storms. In contradistinction to the Oppositionist liquidators, the Congress emphasised the reviving militant spirit of the proletariat of all countries and the development of the revolutionary movement. As one of the main tasks in preparing for the coming struggles, the Congress recognised the intensification of the struggle against the Social Democratic agents of the bourgeoisie. That is how the "national limitation of the C.P.S.U." appears in practice, that is how the "rapprochement" (about which the renegades of

the C.I. have been shouting) between the main sections of the Comintern and the Social Democrats appears in practice.

Thirdly: The Social Democratic and bourgeois Press clamoured about the collapse of the C.P.S.U. owing to the departure of its former leaders, about the tremendous popularity of the Trotskyist Opposition. They predicted that the 15th Congress would show a split. The actual state of affairs thoroughly disappointed the bourgeoisie and its agents. The 15th Congress demonstrated that the Leninist Party is built of granite. The cherished hopes of the ex-Party members of collecting 30,000 signatures, of sending an ultimatum to the Congress, and, if necessary, of splitting it, have hopelessly vanished. They hardly collected 3,000 signatures, about one-third of which have been withdrawn by the people who gave them, both prior to and during the Congress. The Opposition leaders came to the Congress hoping to avert an expulsion by various manoeuvres. Instead of an ultimatum they submitted a pharisaical peace proposal. As a result we witnessed a split in the Opposition instead of a split in the Party.

The bourgeois and Social Democratic Press are indignant. How is that Zinoviev and Kamenev capitulate to the Congress? This is unworthy of "cultured" people. This is written by the very same Press which sells its opinions to the Deterdings, Stinneses, Loucheurs, and other plutocrats. This is written by the same Press which prays for the Briands, Mussolinis, Millerands and their ilk, prays for people who betrayed the cause of Socialism.

How low the Social Democratic Press has fallen when the capitulation of leaders of the working class (who committed such big mistakes) to

their Party is characterised by them as unprecedented disgrace and yet it greets Briand with sweet smiles.

The 15th Congress demonstrated to the whole world the iron unity of the C.P.S.U. By its firm policy in respect to the manoeuvres of the Opposition, by its reply in regard to the statements of repentance of the Zinoviev group, the Congress showed that the C.P.S.U. was, is, and will be, a Party of iron discipline, a Party irreconcilable on questions of principle. The 15th Congress made a résumé of the two years' discussion with the Opposition. It finished the Opposition. The Party will now devote all its attention to the building up of Socialism, to the strengthening of contact with the toilers throughout the world.

All sincere friends of the C.P.S.U. and the U.S.S.R. will welcome the end of the inner Party struggle. But the bourgeoisie and its Social Democratic and ultra-Left agents—let them cling to the hope that a new Opposition will appear and that the Sapronov group will undertake counter-revolutionary activities. These hopes will prove just as futile as the previous ones.

Fourthly: The Social Democrats and renegades of the Comintern shouted loudly that the C.P.S.U. is degenerating in its social composition, that it has broken away from the working masses, that it has degenerated into a clique of officials and business managers. The 15th Congress and all that happened in connection with the Congress showed how absurd and strange such beliefs of the enemies of the C.P.S.U. are. The platform of the Congress was occupied almost every day by special delegations from the factories and workshops. The metal workers of Leningrad, Moscow, Tula and Kharkov, the miners of Donbas, the Urals and Siberia, woodworkers of the North, and the



workers of many other trades, teachers, engineers, scientists, all of them took the platform of the Congress to greet the vanguard of the working class. They gave a résumé of the 10 years since the October Revolution, in enthusiastic speeches, condemning the Opposition as enemies of the Party and the class. We find it impossible to present even a tenth of what the representatives of the toilers of the U.S.S.R. said from the platform of the Congress. But even those speeches which the reader will find in this Report will show how the proletarians of the Soviet Union really regard the C.P.S.U.

A splendid and brilliant illustration of the spirit of these speeches is the spontaneous campaign for joining the Party which began among the masses in connection with the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, and the extent it attained by the 15th Congress.

Over 100,000 working men and women, advanced social workers, skilled workers, who have been working for dozens of years in industry, have now joined the ranks of the C.P.S.U. In the light of this fact how foolish and false the statements that the C.P.S.U. has broken away from the masses and that it has degenerated, sound. No falsehoods or perversion of arguments by the Social Democrats and the renegades of the C.I. can refute the main fact—the continuous growing confidence of the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. in the C.P.S.U., whose progressive sections are continuously joining the ranks of the C.P.S.U.

Fifthly: In the light of this fact, the talk about the fossilisation of the Party machine of the C.P.S.U., and the declining rôle of the workers in the leadership of the C.P.S.U., sound ridiculous and false. The report of the Credentials Committee here given fully explodes these fairy tales.

Never have the workers been so strong as at the 15th Congress. Half of the delegates at the Congress never participated at Congresses before (what is the situation at Social Democratic Congresses?), one-third of the Congress are workers from the bench and nuclei officials. About two-thirds of the delegates were young members of the Party who joined the Party after the October Revolution, and three-fourths of the delegates participated in the Civil War. Who can, after this, believe the slander about the bureaucratisation of the C.P.S.U.?

\* \* \* \* \*

This report is brief. It is an abridged report of the Minutes of the Congress. We have taken only the main reports and speeches, and even those not in full. But the principal and most vital part of the work of the Congress will be found here. We hope that the report will be of service in the struggle against the agents of the bourgeoisie, the Social Democrats and the ultra-Left renegades.

# FIFTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST (BOLSHEVIK) PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

---

## Opening Session

### Greetings

The first session was dedicated to greetings and the election of a Commission to examine the documents and material on the work of the Opposition. Comrade Rykov opened the Congress.

#### COMRADE RYKOV :

The International Communist movement and our Party lost a considerable number of their most prominent leaders during the last two years. Comrade Djerzhinsky, one of the greatest organisers of the victory of the proletarian revolution, an enthusiastic fighter for Socialism, a man who devoted his extraordinary capabilities entirely to the cause of the international revolutionary movement, is dead. Comrade Krassin, whom the Party got to know during his underground activities during the first years of the revolutionary movement, and later in his economic and diplomatic activities, also died. Comrade Voikov was murdered at his diplomatic post. Comrades MacManus and Ruthenberg, most prominent workers in the international Labour movement, died.

Comrades, the 15th Congress of the Party has been

convened immediately after the workers throughout the world have celebrated the tenth anniversary of the victory of the October Revolution, the ten years of the existence of the First Government in the world. The proletariat throughout the world during those ten years has gone through a phase of history tremendous in its significance. The proletariat accumulated experience of new struggles in numerous conflicts between proletarian detachments and capitalism, in victories and in defeats. The last ten years marked an important phase of development of the Socialist Revolution. The working class of our Union has accomplished a very difficult portion, of extraordinary scope and speed, of its task of construction of Socialism in our country.

The Opposition question, despite the tremendous significance at the present moment of creative endeavour in the sphere of Socialist construction and development of the international revolution, was the centre of attention in the pre-Congress discussion, attracting enormous attention—much more than the Opposition deserves either by reason of its importance or strength. The discussion with the Opposition has already ended. The Opposition succeeded in rallying altogether, 0.5 per cent. of all participants in the Party discussions; over 99 per cent. of the Party members proved to be against the Opposition. This demonstrates that in an ideological respect the Party has secured extraordinary unanimity. If a similar attack on the Party from within is not to be found in the history of our Party, if the Opposition went beyond everything that we ever saw before in the sharpness of attack on the Party, and the extraordinary methods of struggle against it, we have on the other hand never seen in the history of the C.P.S.U. the Party rebuff an Opposition with such unanimity and determination, and defend with such extraordinary solidarity Leninist politics and Bolshevik traditions. In this unity of the entire Party against the Opposition is manifested the many years of Bolshevik forging of our Communist Party.

Moreover, it is precisely the struggle against the Opposition which revealed how closely the Party is connected with the working class, with the toiling masses.

The campaign now in progress for recruiting fresh, active members of the working class into the Party has already resulted in 70,000 applications from workers anxious to join the C.P.S.U. (Stormy applause.)

Comrades, the Party was compelled to deal with Opposition questions at that historical phase in the history of the October Revolution when the Party had to resolve the most complicated problems of international and domestic policy. The tempo of creative work in the building of a new society has received an enormous impetus during the last two years. The chief point for our Party and the present Congress is the fact that the gigantic task of positive construction, the beginning of a complete cardinal reconstruction of our entire economy—the construction of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.—is threatened by the menace of war and is accompanied by new revolutionary class conflicts on an international scale. All of us remember the gigantic revolutionary class conflicts in Britain (the General Strike and the Miners' Lock-out) and the developing national liberation movement in China. New detachments of the international proletariat are entering the struggle. The strength of the outbreaks of revolutionary struggles of the working class and the subjected peoples is assuming an ever-greater international significance.

On the other hand, all of you know of the attempts to organise a hostile bloc and to provoke our Union, which our Party and the country fought during the last two years.

The building up of Socialist society in the U.S.S.R. proceeds under tense international conditions. We are now engaged in economic construction, but it seems to me that we must be ready to reorganise our ranks to meet certain events when they mature.

The main guarantee we have that the tasks facing the Party will be carried out, is such Party unity on the basis of Lenin's teachings and the Bolshevik organisational principles as would enable the Party fully to concentrate its forces and attention on the tasks of a Socialist reorganisation of society and the international proletarian revolution. The 15th Congress must free the Party forces to render possible a maximum development of its creative work.

ORDZHONIKIDZE (Chairman of the C.C.C. and Workers' and Peasants' Inspection):

Comrades, the Presidium of the Central Control Commission adopted on November 12th the following resolution:—

“To expel the following members and candidates from the C.C. and C.C.C.: From the C.C.: Comrades Kamenev, Smilga, Yevdokimov, Rakovsky, Avdeiev; from the C.C.C.: Comrades Muralov, Bakaev, Shlovsky, Peterson, Soloviev, and Lidzin. (Applause.) To consider it indispensable to remove the said comrades from leading Party and Soviet work—(applause)—to warn comrades Kamenev, Smilga, Yevdokimov, Rakovsky, Avdeiev, Radek, Muralov, Bakeiev, Shklovsky, Peterson, Soloviev, and Lidzin that the question of compatibility of fractional activity with membership of the C.P.S.U. will be brought up for consideration by the Presidium of the C.C.C.”

Comrades, this decision was adopted after all means of persuading the Opposition, with the object of their return within the boundaries of Party legality, had been exhausted. The Opposition, after pledging itself several times to abandon its fractional work and fractional organisation, always unceremoniously violated all its pledges the very next day, continuing the same objectionable activity in disorganising the Party ranks, violating Party decisions and Party discipline. That is what the Opposition did on the morrow of its declaration of October 16th, 1926; that is what the Opposition did after its declaration of August 8th, 1927. During the last few months, however, the Opposition resorted to action which actually placed it outside the Party. The organisation of underground printing establishments, the arbitrary seizure of buildings, the holding of conspirative meetings to which members of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Party were not admitted, and, finally, a thing which passed beyond all bounds, the attempt to organise a demonstration on the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution—it stands to reason that all these things combined place these comrades outside the Party.

(Applause.) By these acts they broke with the proletarian party. On these facts and actions the C.C.C. could not do otherwise than come to the decision, in agreement with the Central Committee, that I have just read here.

We think that the 15th Congress must put an end to the situation which hitherto existed in the Party. It is intolerable that an insignificant group of comrades, constituting altogether one-half per cent. of the Party, although there are amongst them comrades who have given good service in the past, no matter how great the services may have been, it is intolerable that they should undermine the unity of our Party and disrupt it. We are convinced that the Congress will adopt our decision, examine the material we have at our disposal, discuss it, and adopt a decision which will fully safeguard the unity of our Party and its peaceful creative work.

\* \* \* \* \*

RIUTIN (Krassnia Pressnaya District, Moscow):

Comrades, it is moved that a commission composed of 65 comrades be formed to make preliminary investigations on the questions concerning the disruptive work of the Opposition, and also to become familiarised with all material and documents which give evidence of and characterise this work. The commission will examine all material and will submit its conclusions to the Congress.

The motion is carried.

\* \* \* \* \*

Comrade CLARA ZETKIN is given the floor to greet the Congress. (Tumultuous applause and ovation.) The Congress greets Comrade Clara Zetkin by rising.

CLARA ZETKIN:

On behalf of the E.C.C.I. I bring sincere greetings to this Congress—(applause)—and fervent wishes for its successful work. The E.C.C.I. takes full account of the tremendous historical significance of your Congress now and in the future. This Congress must draw a line between the Leninist unified and solid Party and those elements which waver and doubt Lenin's path. By their activities these elements have themselves forfeited the right to be

in the ranks of our glorious Communist Party. (Applause.)

The Congress will have to confirm the decision, which has already been carried in the nuclei by a colossal and overwhelming majority of the Party members.

We have followed the nuclei discussions. The results of these discussions are not, as the Opposition maintains, a result of the gag of the bureaucratic apparatus. The decisions of the Party nuclei, the decisions of the broad masses of the Party members, have shown the maturity and the growth of Lenin's Communist Party. The masses rightly condemned the actions of individual Party members.

We still see before us the grand demonstration in the October days. That was not a demonstration such as we are accustomed to see in Western Europe. It was a triumphant march of workers who felt themselves builders of a great Socialist State. The demonstration on the day of the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution manifested the great faith of the working class in its own revolutionary strength and the confidence of the broad masses in their great leaders—the Leninist Communist Party and its C.C. (Applause.)

The masses have demonstrated before the world that they are the bearers of a victorious creative force. They demonstrated before the world their unshakable belief in the iron unity of the Leninist ranks. (Applause.)

Comrades, the deeds of your Party will appear in the annals of the history of the human race, not only as of a Party leading the proletariat to its October victory, but as a leader in the victorious construction of Socialism. We now see, it is true, only the first steps of this construction. The first steps of Socialist construction are so colossal that nothing can compare with them. But it is precisely the extent of these first steps which raise still greater tasks for the future, demanding complete and absolute unity of all forces of the working class and its general staff, the Party. Particularly now when the imperialist world is again plotting a blockade and another military invasion against the Soviet Union, which is engaged in the building of Socialism; we must rally with special energy all our forces to the Communist Party.

The conduct of the Opposition is either sacrilege or



madness. It raises its hand against the great immortal cause of Socialist construction. It threatens the unity of the Party. The Party masses, the vast masses of Party members, rebuffed the Opposition propositions and then the Opposition outrageously appealed to the non-Party masses. This shows that the Opposition has departed from Leninism. It has degenerated into Social Democracy, to Russian Menshevism. (Applause. Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.) Now they speak of Thermidor and of degeneration of the Party. The Executive Committee of the Comintern followed with close attention the activities of the Opposition, not only because these activities undermine the forces necessary for Socialist construction. The demoralising influence of the activities of the Opposition makes itself felt also internationally. Here we have before us a consolidated, strong, experienced and iron Party. In the West we have young growing Communist Parties being forged in their struggles. The work of the Opposition retards both the ideological and organisational healthy development of these parties. That is why we follow so closely the work of the Opposition. We think that now since the leaders of the renegade Opposition act together with the most reactionary renegades, unite with people expelled from the Communist Parties, there can only be one verdict against them. It is true the influence of the Opposition is extremely small, but every honest worker who may follow them is so dear to us that we must exert all our energy so that not a single honest worker should follow Souvarine, that not a single honest worker should follow Maslow, or the renegade Opposition. By its activities the Opposition adds grist to the mill of the Kautskys, Hilferdings and Can and Co. This takes place at an historical moment when the working masses of the Occident are becoming radicalised and are gradually being emancipated from their Right ideology. The Opposition activities are pernicious also for another reason. It so happens that the work of the Opposition generates new hopes amongst Imperialist groups of all shades. The Imperialist groups believe that once the Opposition demoralises and undermines the firm ranks of the Party it will be easier for them to smash the Soviet Union. The Congress must for that

reason say categorically to the Opposition: We will not allow you to take another step in demoralising the Party either ideologically or organisationally. We are firmly convinced that the Congress will say that which will be decisive not only here, but for all Communist Parties throughout the world. The Congress will demonstrate the iron unity of the ranks of the Leninist Party, adopt a firm decision, and will further continue with solid ranks the construction of Socialism. It is painful, of course, that certain leaders whom we formerly respected for their work have deserted the cause of Socialist construction. Worse than that, they hamper and interfere with this construction. We, revolutionary fighters, must not, however, approach these facts from the point of view of sentiment. For us, our cause stands above individuals. Let them go. The Leninist-Communist Party and the working class which has been imbued with an iron will and tempered in the struggle under the leadership of the Party, will guarantee a development of revolutionary consciousness, revolutionary will, and revolutionary action which will imbue us with the firm conviction of our final victory. Lenin's Party and the working class constitute that historical factor which will safeguard the Soviet and guarantee a respite for peaceful construction, will carry out its Socialist construction to the end, consolidate the toilers of all countries in the struggle against capitalism and bring about the victory of the world revolution. (Stormy applause.)

\* \* \* \* \*

Comrade MARTINOV is given the floor to greet the Congress on behalf of the Donbas miners.

COMRADE MARTINOV:

Comrades, allow me to greet the 15th Congress of our Party on behalf of the miners and metal workers of the Ukraine. The miners and metal workers, non-Party workers, sent me to the Congress to demonstrate their full solidarity, authorising me to present this banner to our Party, which is inseparably linked up with the non-Party workers. (Applause.)

Comrades, the miners and metal workers are very in-

dignant over the fact that at a time when the sharks of international capitalism want to crush the working class, at a time when our Party, together with the working class, restores the productivity of labour and at the same time observes what is happening abroad—in this difficult moment our Party is menaced with strife. The miners and metal workers sharply condemn the Opposition, which stubbornly refuses to admit its mistakes. In the workers' opinion this is nothing but betrayal of the working class.

Comrades, taking cognisance of these things, the miners and metal workers declare that there is no other but Leninist blood, which is as crimson as our crimson banner, flowing in the veins of the metal workers. (Applause.) And, therefore, they recommend that the disrupters be swept out from the Party. In their place hundreds of thousands of workers will join the Party.

Comrades, I have a lump of iron ore (he displays it) which is a symbol of solidity. The unshakable unity of our Party is a guarantee of the victory of Socialism throughout the world. (Applause.)

Comrades, in so far as there are people who, at this difficult moment for the Party and the working class, hamper and will hamper the consolidation of our Party, the miners and metal workers advise our Central Committee to pick them out with this pick. (Applause.)

Comrades, I conclude in saying: Long live the 15th Congress of our Party! Long live the leading staff of the Great October, the Communist International! Long live the Red Army! Long live its Donbas leader, Comrade Voroshilov! (Applause.) Long live the iron unity of our Party! (Applause.) Comrades, just as this lamp is dear to every worker who works with this instrument (he shows a hammer) which smites the gold ore in Donbas, just as dear is the Party, closely consolidated and working towards the advancement of our economy and leading towards the victory of Socialism throughout the world. (Applause.)

\* \* \* \*

Comrade MOROZKINA is given the floor to greet the Congress on behalf of the first Moscow Calico Factory.

She says: Comrades, allow me to give you fervent,

fraternal and proletarian greetings on behalf of 3,000 working men and women and employees of the First Moscow Chintz Factory. (Stormy applause.)

Comrades, I am not going to speak here about the achievements of our factory. All of you know the high quality of the goods produced in it. (Laughter, applause.)

Comrades, I have not brought you any gift either, but we working men and women of the First Moscow Chintz factory have presented our Central Committee with 60 skilled-workers who joined Lenin's Party, the C.P.S.U.

Comrades, working in industry with our sleeves rolled up, we at the same time watch the Central Committee of the Party, our Government, which was able to lead us through cold, famine, and desolation on to a good road, and was able to direct our work along proper channels, along the channels indicated by our beloved leader, Vladimir Ilyitch Lenin. (Stormy applause.)

Comrades, seeing that certain elements break away from the Party, we say to them, let them not look for support from the First Moscow Chintz Factory, because they will find none there. (Stormy applause.) At an open nucleus meeting, together with the non-Party workers (I am also non-Party), we decided that there must not be a single Oppositionist in our midst. (Applause.) We workers and peasants, all toiling people who suffered deprivation, will not allow anyone to split our Party at a moment when we are just really beginning to build. This will never be, never! (Stormy applause.)

Comrades, if there are any who find it unpleasant to work with us, if there are people who cannot see the workers tramping in with their filthy boots everywhere, let them not work with us, we are not interested in them. We will supply hundreds of workers to take their place. We will carry on our work properly in accordance with Lenin's behests and the leadership of the Central Committee, and will rebuff the foreign bourgeois as we did with the bourgeois who proudly said that we will never be able to work without them. We can, comrades, and you all see it.

In conclusion, I say, Long live the only Leninist Party, which rallies to its banner all non-Party toilers and all peasants. (Tumultuous applause.)

# POLITICAL REPORT OF CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE C.P.S.U.

## Address by Comrade Stalin

### I.

#### GROWING CRISIS OF INTERNATIONAL CAPITALISM AND INTERNATIONAL SITUATION OF THE U.S.S.R.

Comrades, our country lives and develops in the midst of capitalist surroundings. Its international situation does not only depend on its internal strength, but on the conditions of these capitalist surroundings, the situation in the capitalist countries surrounding our country, their strength and weakness, the strength and weakness of the oppressed classes throughout the world, the struggle and weakness of the revolutionary movement of these classes. I make no reference to the fact that our revolution is a part of the international revolutionary movement of the oppressed classes. That is why I believe that the report of the C.C. must begin with a description of the international situation of our country, a description of the situation in the capitalist countries and the position of the revolutionary movement in all countries.

#### 1. The Economics of World Capitalism and the Intensification of the Struggle for Foreign Markets.

(a) The first question is that concerning the state of production and trade in the largest capitalist countries.

The principal factor in this sphere, comrades, is that production in capitalist countries has exceeded the pre-war level, and has extended beyond the pre-war level during the last two years, during the period dealt with in the report. Let us examine some figures: The index of the world output of pig iron shows that the output in 1925 was

97.6 per cent. of pre-war; in 1926 already 100.5 per cent. of pre-war; for 1927 we have no complete figures, but there are figures available for the first half year, which show a further growth in the production of pig-iron. The index of the world output of steel shows that in 1925 it was 118.5 per cent. of the pre-war, and in 1926 122.6 per cent. The index of the world output of coal shows for 1925, 97.9 per cent. and for 1926 a slight drop, namely, 96.8 per cent. of the pre-war output, evidently the influence of the miners' lock-out in Great Britain. The world consumption of cotton was, in 1925-26, 108.3 per cent. and in 1926-27 112.5 per cent. of pre-war consumption. The world harvest of five cereals was in 1925 107.2 per cent., in 1926 110.5 per cent., and in 1927 112.3 per cent. of pre-war.

Thus, the general index of world production is slowly, step by step, extending beyond the pre-war level.

But there are some capitalist countries which do not march but jump forward, leaving the pre-war level behind them, as, for instance, the United States of America, and to a certain extent Japan. Here are figures on the United States of America: The manufacturing industries produced in 1925 148 per cent. of the pre-war level, and in 1926 152 per cent.; the extractive industries produced in 1925 143 per cent. and in 1926 154 per cent. of pre-war.

The development of world trade. The development of world trade is not as rapid as that of industry; usually it lags behind industry. Nevertheless, it has almost reached the pre-war level. The index for foreign trade throughout the world was in 1925 98.1 per cent. and in 1926 97.1 per cent. of pre-war. The index for the individual countries was: United States, in 1925 134.3 per cent. and 1926 143 per cent. of pre-war; France, 98.2 per cent. and 99.2 per cent. respectively; Germany, 74.8 per cent. and 73.6 per cent. respectively; Japan, 176.9 per cent. and 170.1 per cent. respectively.

On the whole, world trade has almost reached the pre-war level, and in some countries, as, for instance, the United States and Japan, surpassed it.

Finally, there is a third series of factors indicating technical progress, rationalisation of capitalist industry,

creation of new branches, growth of trustification, and development of the formation of industrial cartels on an international scale. I think everybody knows these facts. I will, therefore, not expatiate on them. I will merely point out that capitalism has succeeded not only in the sphere of production, not only in the sphere of trade, but also in the sphere of improved technique, in the sphere of technical progress, in the sphere of rationalisation of production which all in all led to the further strengthening of the largest trusts and the organisation of new powerful monopolist cartels.

Such, comrades, are the facts which must be taken into account and which must constitute our point of departure.

Does that, therefore, mean that the stabilisation of capitalism has become firmer and more stable? Of course not! It was pointed out in the report at the 15th Congress that capitalism may reach the pre-war level, may extend beyond that level, may rationalise its industry, but that this does not mean—not by a long way—that capitalist stabilisation can, as a result, become more entrenched, that capitalism can restore its former pre-war stability. On the contrary, from the very fact of stabilisation, from the fact that industry develops, from the fact that trade increases, from the fact that technical progress and industrial possibilities increase, while at the same time the world market, the limits of that market and the spheres of influence of various imperialist groups remain more or less stable, arises the most profound and sharpest crisis of world capitalism, pregnant with new wars and menacing the existence of any form of stabilisation.

From partial stabilisation develops an intensive crisis within the capitalist system, the developing crisis shatters stabilisation—such is the dialectic of capitalist development at the present historical moment.

(b) What is most characteristic in this growth of industry and trade of world capitalism is the fact that there is an unequal rate of development. Development does not proceed so that all capitalist countries march forward one after another smoothly and equally without interfering with each other and without upsetting each other, but, on the contrary, by some countries being crowded out and de-

clining, whilst others advance and make progress, and in other instances a life-and-death struggle takes place between continents and countries for supremacy on the market. The economic centre is drifting from Europe to America, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific. By this the relative strength of America and Asia increases in world trade to the detriment of Europe. Here are some figures: If the European share in world foreign trade constituted in 1913—58.5 per cent., the American share 21.2 per cent., and the share of Asia—12.5 per cent., we find in 1925 that the share of Europe has dropped to 50 per cent., that of America increased to 26.6 per cent., and that of Asia to 16 per cent. While some capitalist countries rush ahead (the United States and partly Japan) we have economic decline in some countries (Great Britain). Side by side with growing capitalist Germany and the newly progressing countries (Canada, Australia, Argentine, China, India), we have countries where capitalism is being stabilised (France, Italy). The number of rival sellers increase on the market, the industrial possibilities increase, the supply on the market increases, but the market limitations and the boundaries of spheres of influence remain more or less the same.

Such is the basis of the growing irreconcilable contradictions of contemporary capitalism.

(c) This contradiction between the growing industrial possibilities and the relative stability of markets lies at the bottom of the fact that the market problem now conducts the main problem of capitalism. Acute problems of market sales in general, especially acute problems of foreign markets and the acute problems of markets for export capital in particular, constitute the present state of capitalism. This essentially explains the fact that the phenomenon of factories and workshops not working at full capacity is becoming general. The raising of customs barriers only adds fuel to the fire. The extent of the existing markets and spheres of influence becomes too limited for capitalism. The peaceful attempts at a settlement of the market problem neither gave, nor could they give, any results. The famous declaration of bankers in 1926 concerning free trade ended, as you know, in failure. The economic con-



ference of the League of Nations in 1927, which set itself the task to unify the economic interests of capitalist countries, also ended in failure. The peaceful path of solution of the market problem remains closed to capitalism. There is only one "way out" for capitalism, namely, a new partition of the colonies and spheres of influence by force, by military encounters, by new imperialist wars. Stabilisation ensures the growth of the crisis within the capitalist system.

## **2. The International Policy of Capitalism and the Preparations for New Imperialist Wars.**

(a) In this connection the question of partitioning the world and the spheres of influence constituting the basis of foreign markets is now the fundamental problem in the policy of world capitalism. I have already said that the present division of colonies and spheres of influence, established as a result of the last imperialist war, has already become out of date. It does not satisfy now the United States, which is trying to penetrate into Asia (first of all into China), not being content with South America; it does not satisfy Great Britain, from whose hands the Dominions and several most important markets of the East are slipping away; it does not satisfy Japan, which is constantly "interfered" with by Great Britain and America in China; it does not satisfy Italy and France, which claim an inestimable number of "controversial subjects" in the Danube countries as well as on the Mediterranean Sea; it does not satisfy particularly Germany, which still remains without colonies. Hence the 'general' striving towards a new division of markets and sources of raw material. There is no need to prove here that the Asiatic markets and ways of communication are the main arena of struggle. From here arise the series of knotty problems providing numerous hotbeds for new conflicts. From this cause comes the so-called Pacific problem (the American-Japanese-British antagonisms) as a source of struggle for supremacy in Asia and its ways and communications. Hence also follows the problem of the Mediterranean (the British, French and Italian antagonisms) as a source of struggle for the domination of the shores of the

Mediterranean Sea, as a source of struggle for the shortest route to the Orient. From here follows the acute oil problem (the Anglo-American antagonism), because there can be no fighting without oil, and he who has the supremacy in oil has the chances of victory in the coming war.

The British Press recently published Chamberlain's "last" plan of "settlement" of the Mediterranean Sea problem. I can give no guarantee for the authenticity of this plan. But that the appearance of Chamberlain's plan in the Press is symptomatic, of this there can be no doubt. This plan consists in the transfer of the "mandate" over Syria from France to Italy, Tangiers is handed over to France for a financial compensation in favour of Spain, the Cameroons are restored to Germany, Italy pledges herself to cease "stirring up" the Balkans, etc. This is all done under the banner of struggle against the Soviets. It is well known that not a single dirty deal is now undertaken without implicating the Soviets. However, what is the true essence of the plan? The idea of the plan is to drive the French bourgeoisie out of Syria. Syria has of old been the gate to the East, Mesopotamia, Egypt, etc. From Syria, England can be injured through the Suez Canal and in the district of Mesopotamia. It is this embarrassing situation that Chamberlain evidently wants to put an end to. Needless to say that the appearance of this plan in the Press cannot be regarded as a mere accident. The value of this lies in the fact that it gives a striking picture of the rivalry, conflicts and military clashes with which the present relations between the so-called "Great Powers" are pregnant.

As far as the present state of affairs in the oil problem and the struggle around it is concerned, the famous American journal, "The World's Work," gives a grandiloquent description in its October issue. It says:

"Therein is a very real danger to peace and understanding between the Anglo-Saxon peoples. . . . The support of American business men by the State Department will inevitably become stronger as the need for it increases. If the British Government becomes identified with the British oil industry, sooner or later the American Government will become identified with the American oil

industry. The struggle cannot be transferred to the governments without vastly increasing the danger of war."

Doubts are impossible. It is a question of the formation of new coalitions of powers in preparation for new wars for foreign markets, for sources of raw material and the lines of communication thereto.

(b) Were there any attempts made during the period under review at a "peaceful settlement" of the developing military conflicts? Yes, there were. More attempts were made than might have been expected, but they resulted in nothing, absolutely nothing. Moreover, these attempts merely proved to be veils screening the preparatory work of the "powers" for new wars, screening with a view to deceive the workers and peasants.

Let us take the League of Nations, which, according to the lying bourgeois Press and the equally mendacious Social Democratic Press, is an instrument of peace. What good results has the chatter of the League of Nations had on the questions of peace, disarmament, and curtailment of armaments? It has had no results, except the deception of the masses, except new armed clashes, except a new accentuation of the ripening conflicts. Can it be regarded as a mere accident that, although the League of Nations has been chattering about peace and disarmament, and the so-called Second International has been supporting for three years this lying twaddle, the "nations" keep on arming and arming, increasing the old conflicts between the "powers" and piling up new ones, thus undermining the cause of peace? What does the failure of the Three Power conference on reduction of naval forces (England, America and France) indicate if not the fact that the Pacific problem is the source of new imperialist wars, that the "powers" do not want to disarm or reduce their armaments? What has the League of Nations done to avert this danger? Or let us take for instance the recent action of the Soviet Delegation in Geneva on the question of real (and not decorative) disarmament. How can we explain the fact that the straight and honest declaration of Comrade Litvinov on complete disarmament stunned the League of Nations and proved to be "absolutely unexpected"? Does this fact not show that the League of

Nations is not an instrument of peace and disarmament, but an instrument for the concealment of new armaments and preparations for new wars? The corrupt bourgeois Press of all countries, from Japan to Great Britain, from France to America, clamours about the "insincerity" of the Soviet disarmament proposals. In this case why not test the sincerity of the Soviet proposals and proceed now with practical disarmament, or at least with a serious reduction of armaments? What prevents that? Or for instance, the present system of "treaties of amity" of capitalist States, the agreement between France and Yugoslavia, the agreement between Italy and Albania, the "treaty of amity" now in preparation by Pilsudsky between Poland and Lithuania, the "Locarno system," the "spirit of Locarno," etc.—what is that if not a system of preparation of new wars and the allocation of forces for the coming military clashes? Or let us take for instance the following facts: the numerical strength of the armies of France, Great Britain, Italy, the United States and Japan increased between 1913 and 1927 from 1,888,000 to 2,262,000 men; during the same period the war budgets of the same countries increased from 2,345,000,000 gold roubles to 3,948,000,000 roubles; the number of aeroplanes in active service of these five countries increased from 1923 to 1927, from 2,655 to 4,340; the tonnage of cruisers of these five powers has increased from 724,000 tons in 1922 to 864,000 tons in 1926. The situation in respect to war chemicals is illustrated by the statement of the head of the Chief Chemical War Service of the United States, General Fries, that one aero-chemical bomb of 450 kilogram charged with Lewisite can make ten districts of New York uninhabitable, and 100 tons of Lewisite dropped from 50 aeroplanes can make all New York uninhabitable at least for a week.

What do these facts show if not that new wars are being prepared at top speed in all countries?

Such are the results of the "peace policy" and "disarmament" policy of the bourgeois States in general, the League of Nations especially and the Social Democratic capitalist lackeys in particular.

Formerly increased armaments were justified by the

fact that Germany was armed to the teeth. Now this "justification" falls flat. Is it not clear that the growth of these armaments is dictated by the inevitability of imperialist wars between the "powers," that the "war spirit" is the fundamental substance of the "spirit of Locarno"?

I think that the present "peaceful relations" could be compared with an old worn-out shirt consisting of nothing but patches sewn together with a thin thread. It is only necessary to pull the thread more or less roughly and break it in a few places, to make the shirt fall to pieces, and leave nothing but its patches. It suffices to shake up the present "peaceful relations" somewhere in Albania or Lithuania, China or North Africa, to cause the whole "structure of peaceful relations" to fall to the ground. That was the situation before the last imperialist war. Such is the situation now.

From stabilisation arises the inevitability of new imperialist wars.

### **3. The State of the International Revolutionary Movement and the Harbingers of a New Revolutionary Upheaval.**

(a) To carry on war neither increased armaments nor the organisation of new coalitions is sufficient. For this it is also necessary to strengthen the rear in capitalist countries. No single capitalist country can carry on a serious war without strengthening beforehand its own rear, without muzzling their "own" workers, without muzzling their own colonies. Hence, the gradual Fascisation of the policy of the bourgeois governments. The fact that the Right bloc is now in power in France, that the Hicks-Deterding-Urquhart alliance rules in Great Britain, the bourgeois bloc in Germany, the military party in Japan, and the Fascist Governments in Italy and Poland, cannot be regarded as purely accidental.

Hence the pressure on the working class, the anti-trade union law in Britain, the "national armament" law in France, the abolition of the eight-hour day in many countries, and the general bourgeois offensive on the proletariat.

Hence we see intensification of pressure on colonial and dependent countries, and strengthening the composi-

tion of the occupying imperialist forces which amount to about a million, of whom over 700,000 soldiers are located in British "spheres of influence" and "possessions."

(b) It is not difficult to understand that this beastly pressure of the Fascised governments could not remain unchallenged by the oppressed peoples in the colonies and the working class in the Metropol. Such facts as the growing revolutionary movement in China, Indonesia, India, etc., cannot but be of decisive importance for the fate of world imperialism. Judge for yourselves. Out of a total population of 1,905,000,000 throughout the world, 1,134,000,000 live in colonial and semi-colonial countries, 143,000,000 in the U.S.S.R., 264,000,000 in the intermediate countries and only 363,000,000 in the large imperialist countries subjugating the colonies and semi-colonies. It is clear that the revolutionary awakening of the colonial countries forecasts the end of world imperialism. The fact that the Chinese Revolution has not yet been victorious over imperialism cannot be of decisive importance from the point of view of the revolutionary outlook. Great popular revolutions are never completely victorious in the first encounters. They grow and strengthen in the form of ebbs and flows. Such has been the case everywhere, including Russia. This will also be the case in China. The most important result of the Chinese Revolution is the fact that it aroused from their age-long slumber and brought into action hundreds of millions of the exploited and oppressed, completely exposed the counter-revolutionary character of the military cliques, tore the mask from the Kuomintang servants of the counter-revolution, strengthened the authority of the Communist Party among the lower strata of the masses, raised the movement as a whole on to a higher plane, that of the organisation of Soviets, and aroused new hopes among millions of the oppressed classes of India, Indonesia, etc. Only blind and faint-hearted people can doubt that the Chinese workers and peasants are heading towards a new revolutionary upheaval.

As far as the revolutionary movement of the working class of Europe is concerned we see that also in this sphere we have clear symptoms of the radicalisation of the work-

ing masses and a revolutionary revival. Such facts as the general strike and miners' lockout in Great Britain, the revolutionary outbreak of the workers in Vienna, the revolutionary demonstrations in Germany and France in connection with the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, the election successes of the German and Polish Communist Parties, the clear differentiation in the labour movement of Great Britain where the workers turn to the Left and their leaders turn to the Right—the camp of open social imperialism, the degeneration of the Second International into a direct accessory of the imperialist League of Nations, the declining authority of the Social Democratic Parties among the broad masses of the working class, the general growth of the influence and authority of the Comintern and its Sections among the proletarians of all countries, the growing authority of the U.S.S.R. among the oppressed classes of the whole world, the "Congress of the Friends of the U.S.S.R.," etc.—all these facts undoubtedly show that Europe is entering on a new phase of revolutionary upheaval. If such a fact as the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti could serve as a ground for demonstrations of the working class, it undoubtedly shows that revolutionary energy has accumulated within the working class which seeks and will seek an opportunity, a chance, apparently perhaps a very insignificant one, a mere accident, in order to break through and challenge the capitalist régime.

We are living on the eve of a new revolutionary upheaval both in the colonial and imperialist countries.

From stabilisation arises a new revolutionary upheaval.

#### **4. The Capitalist World and the U.S.S.R.**

(a) Thus we have all the symptoms of an intense crisis and growing instability of world capitalism. If the temporary post-war crisis of 1920-21 with all its chaos within capitalist countries and the break-up of their foreign relations may be regarded as overcome and subsequently a period of partial stabilisation has set in, the main crisis of capitalism resulting from the victory of the October Revolution and the separation of the U.S.S.R. from

the world capitalist system has not only been overcome, but on the contrary, is getting more intense, shattering the very foundations of the existence of world capitalism. Stabilisation has not only not interfered with the development of this main crisis, but on the contrary, it has provided a basis for its further development. The growing struggle for markets, the necessity of a new partition of the world and the spheres of influence, the collapse of bourgeois pacifism and the League of Nations, the feverish work in the formation of new coalitions and alignments of forces in view of new wars, the frantic growth of armaments, the brutal pressure on the working class and the colonial countries, the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies and throughout Europe, the growing authority of the Comintern throughout the world, and finally, the strengthening of the Soviet Union and its authority among the workers of Europe and the toiling masses of the colonial countries—all these are facts which must shatter the very foundations of world capitalism.

Stabilisation of capitalism is becoming more and more rotten and unstable.

If two years ago we could and we had to speak about an ebb of the revolutionary wave in Europe we have now every grounds for claiming that Europe is definitely entering on a phase of new revolutionary upheaval. I do not speak here of the colonial countries, where the situation of the imperialists is becoming still more catastrophic.

(b) The capitalists' hopes were shattered as regards the taming of the U.S.S.R., its capitalist rebirth, its declining authority among the workers of Europe and the toiling masses of the colonial countries. The U.S.S.R. is growing and developing precisely as a country where Socialism is in process of construction. Its influence among the workers and peasants throughout the world develops and strengthens. The very existence of the U.S.S.R. as a country engaged in the building of Socialism is one of the greatest factors demoralising world imperialism and undermining its stability both in Europe and the colonial countries. The U.S.S.R. is definitely becoming a symbol for the working class of Europe and the oppressed colonial peoples. Therefore, in order to clear the ground for



future imperialist wars, to choke more thoroughly its "own" working class and muzzle its "own" colonies with the object of strengthening the capitalist rear—it is first of all necessary to muzzle the U.S.S.R., the heart and nursery of revolution, representing at the same time one of the greatest markets for capitalist countries. Hence the revival of interventionist tendencies among the imperialists, the policy of isolation of the U.S.S.R., the policy of encircling the U.S.S.R., the policy of preparing conditions for war against the U.S.S.R.

The strengthening of the interventionist tendencies in the imperialist camp and the menace of war (against the U.S.S.R.) constitute one of the main facts characterising the present situation.

The most threatened and affected party under the developing crisis of capitalism is the British bourgeoisie. It also has taken upon itself the initiative in intensifying the interventionist tendencies. It is clear that the aid given by the Soviet workers to the British miners and the sympathy of the working class of the U.S.S.R. with the revolutionary movement of China could not but add fuel to the fire. All these circumstances determined the breaking of relations between Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. and a worsening of relations with several other States.

(c) The struggle between two tendencies in the relations between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R., a military aggressive tendency (primarily Great Britain) and a tendency to continue peaceful relations (several other capitalist countries), is therefore the principal fact in the system of our foreign relations at the present time.

Here are facts showing a tendency of peaceful relations during the period covered by the report: the non-aggression agreement with Turkey; the guarantee pact with Germany; the customs agreement with Greece; the agreement with Germany on credits; the Uruguay recognition; the guarantee pact with Afghanistan; the guarantee pact with Lithuania; ratification of the guarantee pact with Latvia; the trade agreement with Turkey; the settlement of the conflict with Switzerland; the neutrality agreement with Persia; the improved relations with Japan; the growing business relations with America and Italy.

Here are facts showing a military aggressive tendency during the period covered by the report: the British Note concerning the money sent to the striking miners; the Peking, Tiéntsín and Shanghai raids; the raids on Arcos; the rupture between Great Britain and the U.S.S.R.; Voikov's assassination; the terrorist acts on the part of British agents in the U.S.S.R.; the strained relations with France on the question of the recall of Rakovsky.

If about two years ago it was possible and necessary to speak of a period of relative equilibrium and "peaceful cohabitation" between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries, we have now every reason to say that the period of "peaceful cohabitation" recedes into the past, giving place to a period of imperialist attacks and the preparation of intervention in the U.S.S.R. The British attempts to set up a united front against the U.S.S.R. have so far been unsuccessful. The causes of this failure are the contradictory interests within the imperialist camp, the interest displayed by some countries in having business relations with the U.S.S.R., the peaceful policy of the U.S.S.R., the counteraction on the part of the European working class, the imperialist fear of letting loose revolution at home in the event of war with the U.S.S.R. This, however, does not mean that Great Britain will give up its efforts in organising the united fight against the U.S.S.R., or that it will not succeed in organising it. The war menace is still in existence, despite the temporary failures of Great Britain.

From this follows the task of taking into account, the contradictions in the imperialist camp in order to put off the war, bribing the capitalists and taking all measures towards the preservation of peaceful relations. We cannot forget Lenin's words that much depends in the sphere of our construction on the question of whether or no we succeed in delaying war with the capitalist world, which is inevitable, but can be delayed either up to a point when the proletarian revolution in Europe will mature or when the colonial revolutions will fully ripen, or, finally, when the capitalists will plunge into war between themselves for a re-partition of the colonies. The preservation of

peaceful relations, therefore, with the capitalist countries is a necessary task for us.

The basis of our relations with the capitalist countries consists in the admission of a co-existence of two fundamentally different systems. Experience has fully justified it. The question of debts and credit is sometimes a stumbling block. Our policy on this question is clear. It is based on the formula "give and take." Give us credit to develop our industry and you will receive a certain part of the pre-war debts which we regard as additional percentage on credit. If you will not give, you will not receive. Facts show that we have certain achievements in the sphere of securing industrial credits. I refer here not only to Germany, but also to America and Great Britain. Wherein lies the secret? In the fact that our country constitutes a huge market for the importation of equipment and the capitalist countries need precisely such a market.

#### **5. Conclusion.**

To sum up, we have :

Firstly, growing contradictions within our capitalist environment; the indispensability of a re-partition of the world by capitalism through war; interventionist tendencies in one section of the capitalist world, headed by Great Britain, and a reluctance on the part of another section of the capitalist world to get entangled in a war with the U.S.S.R., preferring the establishment of business relations with it; the presence of a struggle between these two tendencies and a certain opportunity for the U.S.S.R. to utilise these contradictions for the preservation of peace.

Secondly, there is the breaking up of stabilisation; a growing colonial revolutionary movement; symptoms of a new revolutionary upheaval in Europe; growing authority of the Comintern and its sections throughout the world; an obvious growing sympathy of the working class of Europe for the U.S.S.R.; growing strength of the U.S.S.R. internally and the growing authority of the working class of our country among the oppressed classes throughout the world.

Hence, the tasks of the Party are :

1. Along the lines of the international revolutionary movement.

(a) A struggle for the development of the Communist Parties throughout the world;

(b) A struggle for the consolidation of the revolutionary trade unions and the united front of the workers against the capitalist offensive;

(c) A struggle for strengthening the friendship between the working class of the U.S.S.R. and the working class of the capitalist countries ;

(d) A struggle for a stronger alliance between the working class of the U.S.S.R. and the liberation movement of the colonial countries.

2. Along the lines of foreign policy of the U.S.S.R. :

(a) A struggle against the preparation of new imperialist wars;

(b) A struggle against the interventionist tendencies of Great Britain and a strengthening of the defensive capacity of the U.S.S.R. ;

(c) A peace policy and the preservation of peaceful relations with the capitalist countries;

(d) An extension of our trade relations with the outside world on the basis of strengthening the foreign trade monopoly.

(e) Rapprochement with the so-called "weak" and "unequal" countries suffering oppression and exploitation on the part of the dominating imperialist powers.

## II.

### SUCCESSSES OF SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION AND THE INTERNAL SITUATION OF THE U.S.S.R.

Allow me, now, comrades, to deal with the internal situation of our country, the successes of our Socialist construction, the question of the destiny of the proletarian dictatorship, its development, its consolidation.

The 14th Congress of our Party authorised the Central Committee to proceed with the development of our national economy on the basis of the following main objects: first, that our policy should advance the progressive growth of

the production of our national economy as a whole; second, that the policy of the Party should permit the acceleration of the rate of development of industry and secure the leading role for industry in national economy as a whole; third, that in the course of development of national economy, the growing importance of the Socialist sector of national economy, the Socialist forms of economy, to the detriment of the private commodity and capitalist sector, should be guaranteed; fourth, that our entire economic development as a whole, the organisation of new branches of industry, the development of certain branches of raw material, etc., should proceed in a manner that the general development would guarantee the economic independence of our country, safeguard our country from being converted into an accessory of the capitalist system of world economy; fifth, that the dictatorship of the proletariat, the alliance between the working class and the peasant masses and the leadership of the working class in that alliance should be strengthened; and sixth, that the material and cultural level of the working class and the rural poor should rise without fail.

What has been done by the Central Committee of our Party during the period dealt with in the report to accomplish these tasks of our party?

### **1. National Economy as a Whole.**

The first question is that of the development of national economy as a whole. I will quote here certain basis figures on the question of the development of national economy as a whole, and especially of industrial and agricultural development during the period under review. I take these figures from certain statistics of the Gosplan. I refer here to the control figures of the Gosplan for 1927-28 and the rough outline of the five-year plan.

(a) The growth of production of the entire national economy during the two years: if in 1924-25 the gross output of agriculture constituted according to the new figures of the Gosplan 87.3% of pre-war, and the output of industry, 63.7% of pre-war, now, two years later, in 1926-27, the output of agriculture is 108.3% and that of industry 100.9% of pre-war. According to the

control figures of the Gosplan for 1927-28 the agricultural output will further increase to 11.8% and that of industry to 114.4% of pre-war production.

The growth of the trade turnover in the country during these two years: if we take the turnover of 1924-25 as 100 (14,613,000,000 chervonny roubles) then we have in 1926-27 an increase of 97% (28,775,000,000 roubles) and in 1927-28 a prospective increase to 116% (33,440,000,000 roubles).

The development of our credit system during the two years: if we take the balance sheets of all our credit institutions for October 1st, 1925 as 100 (5,343,000,000 chervonny roubles), then we have on July 1st, 1927 an increase of 53% (8,175,000,000 roubles). There is no reason for doubt that 1927-28 will result in a further growth of our nationalised credit system.

The development of railway transport during the two years: If we had a freightage throughout our railway system in 1924-25 of 63.1% of pre-war, we had in 1926-27 a freightage of 99.1% and will have in 1927-28—111.6% of pre-war. I pass over the fact here that during these two years our network of railways has increased from 74.4 thousand kilometres to 76.2 thousand, which is an increase of 30.3% as compared with pre-war and 8.9% compared with 1917.

The development of the State budget during the two years: if the aggregate budget (the State budget plus local budgets) was in 1925-26—72.4% of pre-war (5,024 million roubles), it is at the present time, *i.e.*, 1927-28, 110-112% of pre-war (over 7 billion rbls.). An increase of 41.5% during the two years.

The development of foreign trade during the two years: If our general turnover of foreign trade of 1924-25 amounted to 1,282,000,000 rbls. *i.e.*, about 27% of pre-war, now, in 1926-27, we have a turnover of 1,483,000,000 rbls., *i.e.*, 35.6% of pre-war and in 1927-28, we expect to have 1,626 million rbls., *i.e.*, 37.9% of pre-war. The causes for the retarded rate of development of foreign trade are, first, the fact that the bourgeois States often put obstacles in the way of our foreign trade, sometimes taking the form of a secret blockade; second, the fact that we cannot do business on the bourgeois principles: "We will not eat our fill, but

we will export." Our gain here is a favourable balance in foreign trade of 57,000,000 rbls., in 1926-27. This is the first time since 1923-24 that we have had a favourable balance of foreign trade.

To sum up, we have the following picture of general development of our national revenue during the two years: if we consider that the national revenue in 1924-25 was in the U.S.S.R. 15,589,000,000 ch. rbls., we had in 1925-26 a revenue of 20,252,000,000 rbls., i.e., an increase of 29.9% in the course of one year, and in 1926-27, 22,560,000,000 rbls., i.e., an increase of 11.4% in the course of one year. According to the control figures of the Gosplan we shall have in 1927-28 a revenue of 24,208,000,000 rbls., i.e., an increase of 7.3%.

If we take into consideration the fact that the average annual increase of the national revenue of the United State does not exceed 3-4% (only once in the 80's of the last century, did the United States have an increase of about 7%), and the annual increase of the national revenue of other countries, for instance, Great Britain and Germany, does not exceed 1-3%, we must admit that the rate of development of the National Revenue of the U.S.S.R. during the last few years is record breaking as compared with the largest capitalist countries of Europe and America.

Conclusion: The national economy of our country develops at a rapid rate.

The task of the party: to advance still further the development of the national economy of our country on all branches of industry.

(b) The growth of national economy in our country does not proceed blindly, not in the order of simple quantitative output of products, but according to a certain strictly determined direction. The decisive factors in the development of national economy during the last two years are two main circumstances. First, the development of our national economy proceeds under the watchword of the industrialisation of the country, under the banner of the growing role of industry in relation to agriculture. Second, the development of national economy, the industrialisation of the country, proceeds in a direction increasing the relative strength and the leading role of the Socialist forms

of economy, both in the sphere of industry, and in the sphere of trade, to the detriment of the private commodity and capitalist sectors.

The figures concerning the growth of the relative strength of industry in the system of national economy (without transport and electrification) show that if the share of the gross output of industry in the entire output of national economy comprised 32.4% in 1924-25 at pre-war prices and the share of agriculture 67.6%, in 1926-27 the share of industry has increased to 38%, whereas that of agriculture declined to 62%. In 1927-28 the industrial share should increase to 40.2% and that of agriculture decline to 59.8%.

The figure concerning the growth of the relative strength of the production of tools (machinery) and means of production constituting the core of industry, in relation to the entire industry, during the two years are: in 1924-25, the production of means of production constituted 34.1%, in 1926-27, 37.6%, and in 1927-28, it will be increased to 38.6%. The figures concerning the growth of the relative strength of the production of means of production in the state large scale industry during the two years are: in 1924-25, 42.0%, in 1926-27, 44.0% and in 1927-28 it is proposed to raise them to 44.9%.

As far as the commodity output of our industry and its relative strength in the entire mass of commodities is concerned, the share of industrial commodities has increased during these two years from 53.1% in 1924-25 to 59.5% in 1926-27, and in 1927-28 it will be increased to 60.7%, whereas the commodity output of agriculture constituted in 1924-25—46.9% in 1926-27 it dropped to 40.5% and in 1927-28 will further decline to 39.3%.

*Conclusion:* Our country is becoming an industrial country. The tasks of the party: to advance the industrialisation of our country still further, by every possible means.

The figures concerning the growing relative strength and leading role of the Socialist forms of economy to the detriment of the private commodity and capitalist sector during these two years, show that whereas the capital investments in the Socialised branch of national economy (State and co-operative industry, transport, electrification,



etc.) increased from 231,000,000 roubles in 1924-25 to 2,683,000,000 roubles in 1926-27 and should increase to 3,456,000,000 roubles in 1927-28, which constitutes a growing investment of from 43.8 per cent. in 1924-25 to 65.3 per cent. in 1927-28—the investments in the private branches of national economy showed a continual relative decline and increased only negligibly in absolute figures from 1,577,000,000 roubles in 1924-25 to 1,717,000,000 roubles in 1926-27 and will increase to 1,836,000,000 roubles in 1927-28, which will signify a drop in the relative strength of the investments in the private branch from 56.2 per cent. in 1924-25 to 34.7 per cent. in 1927-28.

Whereas the gross output of the socialised branch of industry has increased from 81 per cent. in 1924-25 to 86 per cent. in all industry in 1926-27 and should increase to 86.9 per cent. in 1927-28, the role of the private branch of industry declined from year to year: from 19 per cent. in 1924-25 to 14 per cent. in 1926-27 and will further decrease to 13.1 per cent. in 1927-28. As far as the rôle of private capital in large (rated) industry is concerned it declined not only relatively (from 3.9 per cent. in 1924-25 to 2.4 per cent. in 1926-27) but also absolutely (169,000,000 pre-war roubles in 1924-25 and 165,000,000 pre-war roubles in 1926-27).

A similar crowding out of private capitalist elements is also taking place in the sphere of trade. Whereas the share of the socialised branch in the entire turnover amounted to 72.6 per cent. in 1924-25, 90.6 per cent. in wholesale and 57.3 per cent. in retail trade, in 1926-27 its relative strength has increased in the entire turnover to 81.9 per cent. in wholesale to 94.9 per cent. and retail to 67.4 per cent., whereas the share of the private branch has declined during the same period from 27.4 per cent. in the entire turnover to 18.1 per cent. in wholesale trade from 9.4 per cent. to 5.1 per cent., and in retail from 42.7 per cent. to 32.6 per cent., while in 1927-28 a further drop is expected in the relative strength of the private sector in all spheres of trade.

*Conclusion:* Our country marches towards Socialism surely and rapidly, relegating to a backward position and

crowding out step by step the capitalist elements in the national economy.

This fact opens before us the main question, namely, "Who—whom?" This question was formulated by Lenin in 1921 after the introduction of the New Economic Policy. Shall we be able to link up our Socialised industry with peasant economy, crowd out the private trader and the private capitalist, and learn how to trade, or will private capital beat us, cause a split between the proletariat and the peasantry?—that is how the question stood then. Now we can say that, in the main, we already have decisive successes in this sphere. Only the blind and the insane can deny this. Now the question "Who—whom?" assumes a different character. Now this question is transferred from the sphere of trade to the sphere of production to the sphere of handicraft production, the sphere of agricultural production where private capital has a certain relative strength and from where it must be systematically eliminated.

The task of the Party: to expand and consolidate our Socialist conquests in all branches of national economy, both urban and rural, pursuing a course of liquidation of the capitalist elements in national economy.

## **2. The Rate of Development in our Large Scale Socialist Industry.**

(a) The growth of large-scale nationalised industry constituting over 77 per cent. of the entire industry of the country: if in 1925-26 the increase of output (in pre-war roubles) of large-scale nationalised industry constituted 42.2 per cent. as compared with the preceding year, in 1926-27 18.2 per cent. and in 1927-28 it will constitute 15.8 per cent., the output will increase during five years, according to the rough and considerably under-rated five-year plan of the Gosplan, 76.7 per cent., with an average arithmetical annual increase of 15 per cent., doubling the industrial output in 1931-32 as compared with that of pre-war.

If we take the gross output of the entire industry of the country both large-scale (government and private) and small industry the average arithmetical annual increase according to the five-year draft of the Gosplan will constitute about 12 per cent., which will give an increase in

the entire industrial output of almost 70 per cent in 1931-32 as compared with pre-war.

The annual increase of the entire industrial output during the five years 1890-95 in America was 8.2 per cent.; the years 1895-1900, 5.2 per cent.; 1900-1905, 2.6 per cent.; 1905-1910, 3.6 per cent. The average annual increase in Russia during the decade of 1895-1905 was 10.7 per cent., and during the eight years 1905-1913, 8.1 per cent.

The percentage of the annual increase of output of our Socialist industry, and also the output of the entire industry is a record breaking percentage unknown in any large capitalist country of the world.

This is so in spite of the fact that both American industry and, particularly Russian pre-war industry were lavishly subsidised by a powerful influx of foreign capital, whereas our nationalised industry is compelled to depend on its own accumulation.

This is also in spite of the fact that our nationalised industry has already entered on the period of new construction when the re-equipment of the old factories and the building of new ones assumes decisive importance in the growth of industrial output.

According to the rate of its development our industry in general and our Socialist industry in particular overtakes and passes the development of industry of the capitalist countries.

(b) How can we explain this unparalleled rate of development in our large-scale industry?

First, by the fact that it is a nationalised industry in view of which it is freed from the covetous and the anti-social interests of capitalist groups and is able to develop from the point of view of society as a whole.

Second, by the fact that it is the largest and most concentrated industry of all existing industries in the world in view of which it is able to compete with private capitalist industry.

Third, by the fact that the State, by holding nationalised transport, nationalised credit, nationalised foreign trade and the general State budget in its hands, possesses all the means to guide nationalised industry according to

plan as a unified industrial enterprise, which gives it tremendous advantages compared with any other industry multiplying its rate of development several times.

Fourth, by the fact that nationalised industry, as the largest and most powerful industry, has every opportunity of pursuing a policy of continuously reducing the cost of production, reducing wholesale prices and cheapening its produce, expanding thereby the market for its products, raising the purchasing capacity of the home market and setting up for itself a continuously growing source for further industrial development.

Fifth, by the fact that nationalised industry can, for many reasons, and by the way, also because of its price-reduction policy, develop in circumstances of gradual rapprochement between the town and country, between the proletariat and the peasantry, in contra-distinction to capitalist industry, which develops under conditions of growing hostility between the bourgeois towns, which absorb the vitality of the peasantry, and the ruined rural districts.

Finally, by the fact that nationalised industry is based on the working class as the master of our entire development, in view of which it is able to develop more easily in technique generally and the productivity of labour in particular and rationalise its production and administration with the support of the broad masses of the working class which is not and cannot be the case under the capitalist system of industry.

The development of our technique within the last two years and the rapid development of new branches of industry (machine industry, the construction of turbines, automobiles, aircraft, chemistry, etc.) proves this beyond a doubt.

The same thing is also shown by our rationalisation of industry with the accompanying shortening of the working day (the seven-hour day) and the accompanying continuous rise in the material and cultural position of the working class which does not and cannot exist under the capitalist economic system.

The unparalleled rate of development of our Socialist industry is a direct and sure proof of the advantages of

the Soviet system of production compared with the capitalist system.

Lenin was right in saying, even in 1917, before the Bolsheviks took power, that we, by establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, can and should "catch up with the advanced countries and surpass them also economically." (Vol. XIV, Part II, p. 213, Russ. Ed.)

The task of the party is, to consolidate the rate of development of Socialist industry already attained and intensify it in the immediate future with the object of creating favourable conditions necessary in the matter of catching up and surpassing the advanced capitalist countries.

### 3. The Rate of our Agricultural Development.

(a) In the rural districts we have, on the contrary a comparatively slow growth in output. If the increase of the gross output (in pre-war roubles) was in 1925-26, compared with the preceding year, 19.2 per cent., in 1926-27, 4.1 per cent. and will constitute in 1927-28 3.2 per per cent. according to the rough and considerably under-estimated five-year draft of the Gosplan, the increase in the output during the five years will constitute 24 per cent. with an average arithmetical annual increase in output of 4.8 per cent., and an increase of agricultural produce in 1931-32 of 28.3 per cent. compared with pre-war.

This is a more or less satisfactory annual growth of agricultural produce. However, it can by no means be regarded as record breaking when compared with capitalist countries, nor as sufficient to safeguard the necessary equilibrium between agriculture and our nationalised industry in the future.

The annual growth of agricultural produce in the United States was during the decade of 1890-1900, 9.3 per cent., the decade of 1900-1910, 3.1 per cent.; the decade 1910-1920, 1.4 per cent. In pre-war Russia the annual increase in agricultural produce equalled during the decade of 1900-1911 from 3.2 per cent. to 3.5 per cent. True, the annual increase of our agricultural produce during the five years, 1926-27—1931-32 will comprise 4.8 per cent. and, as it is seen, the percentage of increasing agricultural out-

put under Soviet conditions is greater than the increase during the capitalist period in Russia. But it should not be forgotten that whereas the gross output of nationalised industry will double in 1931-32 as compared with pre-war large scale industry, and the output of the entire industry will show in 1931-32 an increase of about 70 per cent. as compared with pre-war, the agricultural output will by then exceed the pre-war level only by 28-30 per cent., i.e., less than a third.

In view of this, the rate of our agricultural development cannot be considered fully satisfactory.

(b) How can we explain this comparatively slow rate of agricultural development as compared with the rate of development of our nationalised industry? This is explained by the extreme backwardness of our agricultural technique and the exceedingly low cultural level of the villages and also, particularly, by the fact that our disjointed agricultural enterprises have not the same advantages which our large-scale amalgamated nationalised industry has. First of all, agricultural production is not nationalised and not amalgamated, but broken up and scattered. It is not carried on according to plan, and so far it is still largely small-scale chaotic production. It is not combined and consolidated along the lines of collectivity, as a result of which it is still a favourable ground for exploitation on the part of the kulak elements. These circumstances deprive agriculture of the colossal advantages of large-scale amalgamated industry such as our nationalised industry which is working according to plan.

What is the solution for our agriculture? Perhaps in a retarded rate of development of our industry generally, and our nationalised industry in particular? Under no conditions! This would be an arch-reactionary, anti-proletarian utopia. (Cries of "Hear, hear.") Our nationalised industry must and will develop at an accelerated rate. Herein lies the guarantee of our development towards Socialism. Herein lies the guarantee that agriculture itself will be industrialised eventually.

What then is the solution? The solution is the transformation of the small and scattered peasant enterprises into large amalgamated farms on the basis of social culti-

vation of land on the basis of a new and higher technique. The solution is that the small and dwarfish peasant enterprises should gradually and relentlessly, not under pressure, but from conviction and by example amalgamate into large farms on the basis of social, comradesly, collective cultivation of land with the manipulation of agricultural machines and tractors, the employment of scientific methods of agricultural intensification. There is no other solution. Without this our agriculture will not be able to catch up or surpass the most developed agricultural capitalist countries (Canada and others). All our measures towards the limitation of the capitalist elements in agriculture, the development of Socialist elements in the villages, the drawing in of the peasant enterprises into the vortex of co-operative development, the planned influence of the State in the villages along the lines of embracing peasant economy both from the point of view of supply and demands and the point of view of production, all these measures are, it is true, decisive measures, but nevertheless only preparatory for the placing of agriculture on the basis of collectivism.

(c) What has the Party done in this connection during these two years? A good deal has been done, but not as much by far as might have been done. As far as embracing agriculture, so to speak, from without, along the lines of supplying it with the necessary appliances and along the purchase of agricultural produce, is concerned, we have the following achievements: Agricultural co-operation now unites about one-third of all peasant households; the consumers' co-operatives have increased the extent of their supply to the rural districts from 25.6 per cent. in 1924-25 to 50.8 per cent. in 1926-27; the co-operative and State organs have increased the extent of their purchases of agricultural produce from 55.7 per cent. in 1924-25 to 63 per cent. in 1926-27. As far as the embracing of agriculture, so to speak, from within, along the lines of agricultural production, is concerned, we have done awfully little in this respect. Suffice it to say that the collective and Soviet farms contribute at the present time altogether a little over 2 per cent. of the entire agricultural produce and little over 7 per cent. of the agri-

cultural commodities. There are, of course, many reasons for this, both objective and subjective. An inefficient approach in the matter, insufficient attention to it on the part of our workers, backwardness and conservatism of the peasantry, lack of means necessary for the financing of the organisation of the peasantry for common cultivation of land, etc. And the means required for that are no trifle. Lenin said at the 10th Congress that we have not as yet funds necessary for the subordination of agriculture to government or collective cultivation. I think that now we shall have these funds, and they will increase in the course of time. However, the matter has taken such a turn that without the amalgamation of the disjointed peasant enterprises, without their organisation for common cultivation of land, it will be impossible to make any serious progress either in the intensification of agriculture, or the introduction of agricultural machinery, it will be impossible to organise matters so that agriculture may be able to catch up in the rate of its development with capitalist countries, such as Canada, for instance. It is therefore, our task to concentrate the attention of the rural workers on this vital question. I think that the hiring stations of the organs of the agricultural commissariats and agricultural cooperatives, should play a great role in this respect. Here is an example of how the Soviet farms sometimes help the peasants in organising collective cultivation of land to the tremendous advantage of the peasants. I refer here to the assistance given by the collective Ukrainian Soviet farms in supplying tractors to the peasants of the Odessa district and the letter recently published in the "Izvestia" from these peasants expressing gratitude for the aid they received. Allow me to read the text of the letter. (Voices: "Please do.")

"We settlers on farms named "Shevtchenko," "Krassin," "Kalinin," "Red Dawn," and "Rising Sun," express our deep gratitude to the Soviet Government for the enormous help given us in the restoration of our economy. Most of us are poor peasants possessing no horses, no equipment, and could not cultivate our holdings individually and were therefore compelled to let



them out to kulaks of long standing for a part of the crop. The crops are poor because it is well known that a tenant will not cultivate somebody else's land properly. The small credits received from the Government were swallowed up by us, and we became poorer and poorer every year. This year, a representative of the Amalgamated Ukrainian Soviet Farms came and proposed to us instead of money credit, the cultivation of our land with tractors. All settlers, except a few kulaks agreed, although they were not quite confident that the work would be done in a businesslike manner. To our great joy and to the dismay of the kulaks the tractors ploughed up all our virgin soil and the areas which have been lying fallow, ploughed it five to six times and harrowed it so as to clean it of weeds and finally sowed the whole field with selected wheat. The kulaks do not despise the work of the tractors any more. This year the peasants in our district, owing to lack of rain, sowed practically no winter crops, and those who did have no results as yet. On our settlers' fields hundreds of dessiatines of excellent wheat have sprung up on the lands which had lain fallow such as does not exist in the richest German colonies. Apart from sowing winter wheat the tractors prepared the whole ground for spring crops. There is not a single dessiatine of land now uncultivated or rented out. There is not a single poor peasant among us without several dessiatines of winter wheat on his holding. After this work done by the tractors we do not want to carry on our poor small farming individually any more but decided to organise a common tractor farm in which there will be no separate peasant plots. The Soviet farm named in honour of "Tarassa Shevchenko" has already undertaken our organisation and we have already made an agreement with it." ("Izvestia" No. 267, November 22, 1927.)

We need more such examples, comrades, and then we will be able to make great progress.

The task of the party is to extend the work of embracing peasant economy by co-operation and the State organs

by means of purchase and supply and make the immediate practical task of our construction in the villages the gradual transformation of the broken up peasant enterprises into amalgamated big farms, and common collective cultivation of land on the basis of the intensification and the employment of agricultural machinery as this is the only means of accelerating the rate of agricultural development and overcoming the rural capitalist elements.

\* \* \* \*

Such, on the whole, are the results and the achievements in the sphere of economic construction.

This does not mean that everything is perfect in this sphere. No, comrades, matters are still far from perfect.

We have for instance, elements of a commodity famine. This is a negative factor in our economy. But so far it is unfortunately still unavoidable. The fact that we develop the production of instruments and means of production at a more rapid rate than light industry, determines in advance that we will still have traces of a commodity famine in the course of the next few years. But we cannot act otherwise if we want to make general progress in the industrialisation of the country. There are people, for instance our Opposition, who gather material for their ideology in the queues of speculators and cry about the commodity famine, insisting simultaneously on "super-industrialisation." But this is nonsense, comrades. Only ignoramuses can speak like that. We cannot and must not reduce our heavy industry for the sake of the greatest possible development of light industry. And what is more, light industry cannot be developed to a sufficient degree without an accelerated development of heavy industry. It would be possible to increase the import of manufactured goods, and thus stop the commodity famine, and at one time the Opposition did insist on that. But this is such nonsense that the Opposition had to throw it overboard. It is another question as to how efficiently we are fighting to overcome the elements of the commodity famine, which is quite possible under our conditions and on which the Party always insisted. I think that not everything is perfect in this respect.

Further, we have such a fact as the comparatively large number of capitalists both in the sphere of industry and in the sphere of trade. The relative strength of these elements is not as small as some comrades are inclined to think. This is also a minus sign in our economic balance. I recently read Comrade Larin's book "Private Capital in the USSR" which is interesting from every point of view. I would advise the comrades to read it. You will find in that book how artfully and craftily the capitalist is hiding under the flag of handicraft co-operation, under the flag of agricultural co-operation, under the flag of the various commercial organs. Is everything being done in order to restrict, reduce and overcome eventually the capitalist elements from the sphere of national economy? I think not. I know, for instance that in the sphere of handicraft in general, in the leather and textile industries in particular, there are quite a number of new millionaires who exploit artisans and small producers in general. Is everything being done in order to encircle and crowd out economically these exploiting elements by linking up the handicraft workers with co-operatives or with the Government organs? There can hardly be any doubt that not everything by far is being done in this respect. Nevertheless, this question is of most serious importance for us.

We also have a certain growth of kulaks in the villages. This is a negative point in our economic balance. Is everything being done in order to restrict and isolate kulakdom economically? I think not. Those comrades who think that we can and should put an end to the kulak administratively, through the GPU, by ordering a seal to be put on and nothing more, are wrong. This is very easy to say, but far from practical. Economic measures must be taken against the kulak on the basis of revolutionary law. And revolutionary law is not an empty phrase. It does not exclude, of course, the application of certain necessary administrative measures against the kulak. But administrative measures must not substitute economic measures. Serious attention must be paid to the distortion of the Party line in the struggle against the kulaks in the practice of our co-operative organs, particularly along the lines of agricultural credit.

We also have such a fact as the exceedingly slow rate of reduction of the cost of production in industry, wholesale prices of manufactured goods and particularly retail prices of urban commodities. This is also a negative side in the balance of our economic construction. We must take cognisance of the fact that we have to deal here with tremendous resistance on the part of the machinery, both of Government, of co-operatives and of Party. Our comrades, evidently do not understand that the policy of reducing prices on manufactured goods is one of the main levers in the improvement of our industry, the expansion of the market and strengthening of the same source which constitutes the sole basis of which our industry can develop. Surely there can be no doubt that only by means of a merciless struggle with this inertia of the machine, with this resistance of the machine to the price-reducing policy will be able to liquidate this negative side.

Finally, we have such negative signs as vodka in the budget, the extremely slow rate of development of foreign trade and a shortage of reserves. I think that we should start the gradual curtailment of vodka, introducing in its stead such sources of revenue as the radio and cinema. After all, why should we not take into our hands these vital means and place there live wires, real Bolsheviks, who could successfully develop the business and finally make it possible to do away with vodka? As far as foreign trade is concerned it seems to me that quite a number of difficulties in our economy are due to inadequate exports. Can we increase our exports? I think we can. Do we do everything possible to develop our export to the utmost? I do not think we do. The same may be said about reserves. Those comrades who sometimes thoughtlessly and sometimes because of their ignorance of the business say that we have no reserves are wrong. No, comrades, we have some reserves. All our State organs beginning with the uyezds and the gubernias and ending with the territories and centres try to put by as much as they can for a rainy day. But these reserves are insufficient. This must be admitted. It is, therefore, our task to increase these reserves as much as possible even at the expense of reducing at times certain current consumption.

Such, comrades, are the shady sides of our economic construction, to which we must devote attention and which must by all means be liquidated so as to be able to move forward at a more rapid pace.

#### 4. Classes, the State Machine and Cultural Development of the Country.

Having dealt with the questions of the economic situation in the country we will now deal with questions of the political situation.

(a) The working class.—Figures concerning the numerical growth of the working class and wage workers in general: the number of wage workers (not including the unemployed) was in 1924-25 8,215,000, in 1926-27 10,346,000. An increase of 25 per cent. Of these, the number of workers engaged in manual labour, including agricultural and seasonal workers, in 1924-25 was 5,448,000, and in 1926-27 7,060,000. An increase of 29.6 per cent. The number of these workers in large-scale industry in 1924-25 was 1,794,000, and in 1926-27 2,388,000. An increase of 33 per cent.

The material situation of the working class: the share of wage workers in the national income of 1924-25 was 24.1 per cent. and in 1926-27 it increased to 29.4 per cent., which is 30 per cent. more than the share of wage workers in the national income before the war. At the same time the share of the other social groups in the national income, including the bourgeoisie, declined during that period (for instance,, the shares of the bourgeoisie dropped from 5.5 per cent. to 4.8 per cent.). Real wages of workers in all State industry, not including privileges, were in 1924-25 25.18 Moscow commodity roubles per month, and in 1926-27 32.14 roubles, which is an increase of 26.7 per cent. in the course of two years, and exceeds the pre-war level by 5.4 per cent. If the privileges are included (social insurance, cultural work, communal service, etc.) wages in 1924-25 were 101.5 per cent. of pre-war, and in 1926-27 128.4 per cent. The social insurance funds have increased from 46,000,000 roubles in 1924-25 to 852,000,000 roubles in 1926-27, *i.e.*, an increase of 85 per cent., which made it possible to send 513,000 people to health resorts and sana-

toria, pay unemployment relief to 460,000 unemployed, and pensions to 700,000 (disabled through labour and civil war), and full pay as sick benefit to workers during their illness.

Expenditure, *i.e.*, investments for workers' housing two years ago in 1924-25 amounted to a little over 132,000,000 roubles and in 1926-27 to 282,000,000 roubles, and in 1927-28 will amount to a little over 291,000,000 roubles, including the 50,000,000 roubles granted by the manifesto of the Central Executive Committee. Altogether the expenditure on workers' housing during three years, not including individual expenditure, by industry, transport, the Executive Committee and the Co-operatives, amounts to 644,700,000; together the allowances for 1927-28 amount to 1,036,000,000 roubles. These assignments for three years enabled us to build 4,594,000 square metres of housing space, accommodating 257,000 workers, which together with their families is about 900,000 people.

The unemployment problem: I ought to say that in this respect there are certain differences between the A.R.T.U.C. (All Russian T.U. Council) and the People's Commissariat of Labour. I will take the figures of the People's Commissariat for Labour because they really embrace the unemployed who are connected with the Labour Exchanges. According to those figures, the number of unemployed has increased during the past two years from 950,000 to 1,048,000. Of these, 16.5 per cent. are industrial workers and 74 per cent. unskilled and brain workers. Thus our unemployment has its main source in the surplus population of the rural districts, and only as a side issue, a certain incapacity of our industry to absorb adequate minimum of industrial workers.

*Conclusion*: An indisputable rise in the material standard of the working class as a whole.

The task of the Party is: To continue the policy of further improvement of the material and cultural conditions of the working class, further raising of wages of the working class.

(b) The peasantry. I think that there is no need to quote figures on the differentiation of the peasantry, because my report is already too long drawn out and the

figures are well known. There is no doubt that differentiation under the proletarian dictatorship cannot be identified with differentiation under the capitalist system. Under capitalism, the extremes—the poor and rich—grow in number, and the middle peasant is being wiped out. Here the contrary is the case: the middle peasant grows at the expense of a certain section of the poor, which develops into the middle group, the kulak grows, but the poor peasants become fewer. This fact goes to show that the central figure in agriculture was, and remains, the middle peasant. An alliance with him, with the support of the poor, is of decisive importance for the fate of our entire constructive efforts, our dictatorship of the proletariat.

The general growth of the material level in the countryside: we have figures concerning the growing increase in the peasants' income. The income of the peasantry was in 1924-25—two years ago—3,548,000,000 roubles, and in 1926-27 this income has increased to 4,792,000,000 roubles, *i. e.*, 35.1 per cent., while the peasant population increased during the same period only 2.38 per cent. This is an incontrovertable index of the fact that the material situation of the rural population is improving.

This does not mean that the material situation of the peasantry has improved in every district of the country. It is a well-known fact that we have had variable harvests during the two years, and the results of the bad harvest of 1924 have not yet been entirely overcome. Hence, we have State aid for the toiling peasantry in general, and especially for the poor peasants. The State relief for the toiling peasantry in 1925-26 amounted to 373,000,000 roubles, and in 1926-27 to 427,000,000 roubles. Special relief for the poor peasants in 1925-26 in the form of assignments for the poorest households amounted to 38,000,000 roubles, tax exemptions for poor peasants 44,000,000 roubles, insurance prerogatives for poor peasants 9,000,000, a total of 91,000,000 roubles. Special aid to the rural poor in 1926-27 for the same items was 39,000,000, 52,000,000 and 9,000,000 roubles respectively, a total of about 100,000,000 roubles.

*Conclusion:* An improvement in the material situation of the basic masses of the peasantry.

The task of the Party : To continue the policy of further improvement of the material and cultural conditions of the basic mass of the peasantry, primarily the poor peasants, and strengthen the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, raise the authority of the working class and its Party in the villages.

(c) The new bourgeoisie, the intellectuals. A characteristic feature of the new bourgeoisie is the fact that it, in contra-distinction to the working class and the peasantry, has grounds for being dissatisfied with the Soviet Government. Its discontent is not accidental. It has its roots in life. I told you about the growth of our national economy, I told you about the growth of our industry, about the growth of the Socialist elements of national economy, the decline of the relative strength of the private business-man, the squeezing out of petty-traders. But what does that mean? It means that if our industry and trade develop, tens of thousands of small and middle capitalists are ruined. How many small and middle shops have been closed down during these years? Thousands. And how many petty-industrialists have become proletarians? Thousands. And how many civil servants have been discharged during the curtailment of the staffs of our State apparatus? Hundreds and thousands. Thus progress in our industry, progress in our trading and co-operative organs, the improvement of our State apparatus, means progress and improvement favourable for the working class, favourable for the basic mass of the peasantry, but unfavourable for the new bourgeoisie, unfavourable for the middle strata in general and the urban middle strata in particular. Is it surprising, therefore, that dissatisfaction increases among these strata with the Soviet Government? Of course it is not surprising. Hence, we encounter counter-revolutionary elements in their midst. Hence, the Smyenovekhi\* ideology as a stylish commodity on the political market of the new bourgeoisie.

But it would be wrong to think that all civil servants,

\* The Smyenovekhi, white guard elements renouncing struggle against the Soviet regime, and working with it in the hope of its degeneration into capitalism. (Edit. Note.)



all intellectuals, are discontented, grumble or incite against the Soviet Government. Together with the growing discontent in the midst of the new bourgeoisie, we witness the phenomenon of differentiation among the intellectuals, the fact of deflection from the Smyenovskhi, deflection of hundreds and thousands of intellectual workers to the side of the Soviet Government. This fact, comrades, is a favourable phenomenon which must be taken into consideration. The initiators in this respect are the technical intelligentsia, because they, being close linked up with the industrial process, cannot but see that the Bolsheviks are leading the affairs of our country onward for the better. Such gigantic enterprises as the Volkhovstroi, Dnieprostroi, Svirstroi, the Turkestan Road, the Volga-Don Canal, the numerous new colossal plants, with the fate of which is linked up the fate of entire sections of the technical intelligentsia, cannot be passed by without having a certain beneficial influence on these sections. This is not merely a question of a piece of bread for them. It is also a question of honour, a question of creativeness, which naturally brings them closer to the working class, to the Soviet Government. I do not speak here of the rural toiling intelligentsia, particularly the rural teachers who have long since cover over to the side of the Soviet Government and who cannot but welcome the development of education in rural districts. Therefore we have, side by side with growing discontent among certain section of the intelligentsia, an alliance of the toiling intelligentsia with the working class.

The task of the Party is to continue the policy of isolation of the new bourgeoisie and strengthen the alliance of the working class with the toiling Soviet urban and rural intelligentsia.

(d) The State machine and the struggle against bureaucracy. So much is being said about bureaucracy that there is no need to expatiate on the subject here. There can be no doubt that we do possess certain elements of bureaucracy in the State, co-operative and Party machine. That a struggle against the elements of bureaucracy is necessary and that this task will face us as long as we have State power, as long as the State exists—this is also a fact.

Nevertheless, there must be certain limits. To carry on the struggle against bureaucracy in the State machine to the extent of elimination of the State machine, the extent of denouncing the State machine, to attempt to break it would mean to go against Leninism, it would mean to forget that our machine is a Soviet machine representing the highest type of State apparatus compared with all existing State machines in the world. Wherein lies the strength of our State machine. In the fact that it links up its power with the million strong masses of workers and peasants through the Soviets. In the fact that the Soviets are a school of administration for tens and hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants. In the fact that the State machine is not being divorced from the millions strong masses of people, but is merged with them through the innumerable mass organisations, all kinds of commissions, sections, conferences, delegates meetings, etc., organised around the Soviets and thereby supporting the organs of power. Wherein lies the weakness of our State machine? In the presence of bureaucratic elements therein which spoil and distort its work. In order to rid it of bureaucracy—and it cannot be got rid of in merely a year or two—it is necessary systematically to improve the State apparatus, bring it closer to the masses, renew it by new people who are loyal to the cause of the working class, remake it in the spirit of Communism, and not break it, nor denounce it. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said: "Without a machine we would have been ruined long ago. Without a systematic persistent struggle for the improvement of the apparatus, we shall be destroyed before the creation of the basis for Socialism."

I will not expatiate here about these shortcomings in our State apparatus which, as it is, are conspicuous. I refer here primarily to our old friend "red tape." I have in my hands a heap of material on "red tape" revealing criminal indifference on the part of many judicial, administrative, insurance, co-operative and other organisations. Here is the case of a peasant who travelled 21 times to an insurance office in order to obtain justice and nevertheless got no satisfaction. Here is the case of another peasant, an old man of 66 years, walking 600 versts to clear up a

certain matter in the uyezd social welfare office, nevertheless, he did not succeed. Here is a case of a 56-year-old peasant woman who walked 500 versts and travelled on horseback more than 600 versts on subpoena by the court without obtaining justice. There is an endless number of such cases. It is not worth while to enumerate them. But this is a disgrace, comrades! How can we tolerate such abominations? Finally, come the facts about those who are promoted. We find that apart from having the sabotage of those promoted workers, we also have sabotage by relegating promoted workers to the background by their own comrades, not because of inefficiency or incompetence, but for scrupulousness and honesty. Here is the case of a worker, a blacksmith, promoted to a certain position in his plant as a capable and incorruptable man. He worked a year or two, worked honestly, installed order, abolished disorder and waste. By working in this manner he infringing upon the interests of a certain gang of unscrupulous "Communists," disturbing their peace. What happened? The gang of unscrupulous "Communists" put a spoke in his wheel and thus forced his relegation. "You wanted to be smarter than ourselves, you would not let us live and grow fat peacefully—so now take a back seat." Here is a case of another worker, also a blacksmith, a maker of bolt-cutting machines, promoted to a certain position in the plant. He worked zealously and honestly. But working in that manner he interfered with the tranquility of certain people. What happened? They found an opportunity and dispensed with the "disturbing" comrade. How did that promoted comrade leave, how did he feel about it? Here it is. "Whatever position they gave me, I endeavoured to justify the confidence shown in me. But this promotion which played such a vicious trick on me I shall never forget. They vilified me. My desire to bring the matter to the surface remained a mere desire. Neither the factory committee nor the factory administration, nor the Party nucleus would hear me. I am done with promotion, even if they gave me gold; I will have no more of it." ("Trud" No. 128, June 9th, 1927.) But this comrades, is a disgrace for us. How can we tolerate such abominations?

The task of the Party is to fight against bureaucracy

and for the improvement of the State apparatus, destroying root and branch such abominations in our factories as I have just indicated.

(e) Lenin's slogan concerning the cultural revolution: The most reliable means of struggle against bureaucracy is to raise the cultural level of the workers and peasants. We can cure and fight bureaucracy in the State apparatus, we can expose and nail to the pillory bureaucracy in our midst, but if we have not a certain level of cultural development among the broad working masses, which creates the possibility, desire and ability to control the State apparatus from below by the forces of the working masses themselves, bureaucracy will remain in spite of everything. The cultural development of the working class and the toiling peasant masses not only in the sense of literacy, although literacy is the basis of all culture, but primarily in the sense of becoming accustomed and capable of dealing with the administration of the country, is therefore the main lever for the improvement of the State and every other apparatus. This is the essence of Lenin's slogan of cultural revolution. Here is what Lenin said on the subject in March, 1922, before the opening of the 11th Congress of our Party, in his letter to the C.C. addressed to Comrade Molotov:

"The main thing we lack is culture; the ability to govern N.E.P., economically and politically, fully enables us to build the foundation of Socialist economy. It is 'merely' a question of cultural forces of the proletariat and its vanguard."

These words of Lenin must not be forgotten, comrades. (Voices: "Hear, hear.")

Hence, the task of the Party is to intensify the struggle for cultural advancement of the working class and the toiling sections of the peasantry.

\* \* \* \* \*

What is the conclusion to be drawn concerning the internal political situation of our country?

The conclusion is that the Soviet Government is the most stable of all Governments in the world. (Stormy applause.)

But if the Soviet Government is the most stable Government of all existing Governments in the world, of which any bourgeois Government may be envious, it does not yet mean that everything in this sphere is satisfactory. No, comrades, there are unfavourable elements also in this sphere which as Bolsheviks we cannot and should not conceal. We have first of all unemployment. This is a shortcoming which we must overcome or at least reduce to a minimum at all costs. We have, secondly, shortcomings in the construction of dwellings for workers, a housing crisis, which we must also overcome, or at least reduce to a minimum, within the next few years. We have certain germs of anti-semitism, not only among certain circles of the middle strata, but also among certain sections of the workers, and even among certain circles of our Party. This evil we must combat ruthlessly, comrades. We also have such a weak point as the slackening of our anti-religious struggle. Finally, we also have terrible cultural backwardness, not only in the broad sense of this word, but also in its limited sense, in the sense of elementary literacy, because the percentage of illiteracy in the U.S.S.R. is still great.

All these and similar shortcomings must be liquidated, comrades, if we want to progress with a more or less accelerated pace.

To finish this part of my report, allow me to say a few words on the most characteristic appointments during the period under review. I will not deal here with the appointment to vice-chairman of Comrade Rykov, the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. Neither will I speak of the appointments of People's Commissars for the Supreme Economic Council, the People's Commissariat of Trade and the G.P.U. of the U.S.S.R. I should like to mention three appointments which are characteristic. You know that Comrade Lobov has been appointed chairman of the Supreme Economic Council of the R.S.F.S.R. He is a metal worker. You know that as chairman of the Moscow Soviet, Comrade Ukhanov, a metal worker, was elected in place of Kamenev. You also know that as chairman of the Leningrad Soviet, Comrade Komarov, also a metal worker, was elected in place

of Zinoviev. It follows that the "Lord Mayor" in each capital is a metal worker. (Applause.) True, they are not from the nobility, but they superintend the affairs of the capitals better than any nobleman. (Applause.) You will say that this is a metallisation tendency. I think that there is nothing wrong about that. (Voices: "On the contrary, it is all right.") We wish the capitalist countries, we wish London and Paris, to catch up with us at last and elect their own metal workers as "Lord Mayors." (Applause.)

### III.

#### THE PARTY AND THE OPPOSITION.

(a) The state of the Party: I shall not expatiate, comrades, on the numerical and ideological development of our Party. I shall not give you figures, as Comrade Kossior will deal with that in detail. Neither shall I speak of the social composition of our Party and the figures in connection with it, as Comrade Kossior will give you exhaustive data on the subject in his report. I should like to say a few words concerning the improvement in the quality of the leading work of our Party both in the sphere of economics and of politics. There was a time, comrades, two or three years ago, when one group of comrades, it seems to me under Trotsky's leadership—(Laughter and voices: "Very likely")—reproached our Gubernia executives, our Oblast executives and our C.C., claiming that the Party organisations are incompetent, and that they meddle in vain with the economics of the country. Yes, there was such a time. Hardly anyone now would find words to formulate such accusations. That the Gubernia executives and Oblast executives have mastered the administration of economy, that the Party organisations are at the head of economic construction and not at its tail, is such an obvious fact that only the blind or insane would dare to deny it. The fact alone that we have decided to take up at this Congress the question of a five-year plan of economic construction, shows that the Party has made great progress in the matter of planned leadership over economic construction, both locally and nationally. Some think that there is

nothing extraordinary about it. No, comrades. It is something extraordinary and vital, which must be taken into account. Reference is sometimes made to the American and German economic institutions, which supposedly also guide national economy according to plan. But, no, comrades, this has not yet been attained and will not be attained there as long as the capitalist order prevails. To guide, according to plan, it is necessary to have a different system, a Socialist and not a capitalist system of industry; it is necessary to have at least a nationalised industry, a nationalised credit system, nationalised land, a Socialist alliance with the rural districts, a workers' Government in the country, etc. True, they, too, have something in the nature of a plan. But theirs are prognoses, guess plans, which are not binding for anyone, on the basis of which it is impossible to guide the economics of the country. It is different with us. Our plans are not mere prognoses, they are not guess plans, but directive plans, which are obligatory for the leading organs, and which determine the direction of our economic development in the future on a national scale. We can see that there is a fundamental difference here. That is why I say that the mere fact of raising the question of the five-years' plan of economic development at this Congress, this fact alone, is a symptom of progress in our planned work.

I do not wish to go into details about the development of inner Party democracy in our Party. Only a blind man does not see that inner Party democracy—real inner Party democracy, a real increase of activity of the Party masses—grows and develops in our Party. They chatter about democracy. But what is democracy within the Party? Democracy for whom? If by democracy is meant freedom for a couple of intellectuals, torn away from the revolution, to chatter without end, to have their own organ, etc., such "democracy" we do not need, because it is democracy for a negligible minority, breaking the will of the vast majority. If, however, by democracy is meant freedom for the Party masses to decide questions of our construction, raising the activity of the Party masses, drawing them into Party leadership, the development in them of a feeling that they are the masters within the Party, such democracy

we have, we need it, and we shall incessantly develop it, despite everything. (Applause.)

I will not go into the fact, comrades, that parallel with inner Party democracy, collective leadership develops step by step. Take our C.C. and C.C.C. Together they comprise the leading centre of 200-250 comrades, who meet regularly and solve the most vital questions of our construction. This is one of the most democratic centres acting collectively that our Party ever had. What of it? Is it not a fact that the solution of the most important questions of our work passes more and more from the hands of a narrow group above into the hands of this broad centre, most closely connected with all branches of construction and all districts of our country?

I shall not expatiate on the growth of our Party cadres\*. It is an incontrovertible fact that during the last few years the old cadres of our Party have been permeated by new advancing cadres, primarily of workers. If, formerly, we counted our cadres by hundreds and thousands, now we should count them by tens of thousands. I think that if we begin with the very lowest organisations, the department and section nuclei, and go upward to the very top of the Union, our Party cadres, the vast majority of whom are workers, comprise now at least 100,000 people. This is the greatest growth of our Party. This is the greatest growth of our cadres, the growth of its ideological and organisational experience, the growth of its Communist culture.

Finally, one more question on which there is no need to expatiate, but which should be referred to. That is the question of the growing authority of the Party among the non-Party workers and the toiling masses of our country in general, and among the workers and oppressed classes generally throughout the world. There is hardly any doubt now that our Party is becoming the symbol of emancipation for the toiling masses of the whole world and that the name of Bolshevik is a name of honour for the best elements of the working class.

\* The word "cadre" has no English equivalent. It means, roughly speaking, a "skeleton" or "framework" (of organisation)—leading members of the Party in each organisation.—Ed.



Such, on the whole, comrades, is the picture of our achievements in the sphere of Party construction.

This does not mean, comrades, that we have no shortcomings in the Party. No, we have shortcomings, serious shortcomings at that. Allow me to say a few words concerning these shortcomings.

Let us take, for instance, the matter of guidance of economic and other organisations on the part of the Party organisations. Is everything satisfactory in this respect? No, it is not. Often questions are decided, not only in the locals, but also in the centre, so to speak, "en famille," the family circle. Ivan Ivanovitch, a member of the leading group of some organisation, made, let us say, a big mistake and made a mess of things. But Ivan Federovitch does not want to criticise him, show up his mistakes and correct him. He does not want to, because he is not disposed to "make enemies." A mistake was made, things went wrong, but what of it? Who does not make mistakes? To-day I will show up Ivan Ivanovitch, to-morrow he will do the same to me. Let Ivan Ivanovitch, therefore, not be molested, because where is the guarantee that I will not make a mistake in the future? Thus everything remains spick and span. There is peace and goodwill among men. Leaving the mistake uncorrected harms our great cause, but that is nothing! As long as we can get out of the mess somehow. Such, comrades, is the usual attitude of some of our responsible people. But what does that mean? If we, Bolsheviki, who criticise the whole world, who, in the words of Marx, storm the heavens, if we refrain from self-criticism for the sake of the peace of some comrades, is it not clear that nothing but ruin awaits our great cause and that nothing good can be expected. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.) Marx said that the proletarian revolution differs, by the way, from other revolutions in the fact that it criticises itself and that in criticising itself it becomes consolidated. This is a very important point Marx made. If we, the representatives of the proletarian revolution, shut our eyes to our shortcomings, settle questions around a family table, keeping mutually silent concerning our mistakes, and drive our ulcers into our Party organism, who will correct these

mistakes and shortcomings? Is it not clear that we cease to be proletarian revolutionaries, and that we shall surely meet with shipwreck if we do not exterminate from our midst this philistinism, this domestic spirit in the solution of important questions of our construction? Is it not clear that by refraining from honest and straight forward self-criticism, refraining from an honest and straight making good of mistakes, we block our road to progress, betterment of our cause, and new successes for our cause. The process of our development is neither smooth nor general. No, comrades, we have classes, there are antagonisms within the country, we have a past, we have a present and a future, there are contradictions between them, and we cannot progress smoothly, tossed by the waves of life. Our progress proceeds in the form of struggle, in the form of developing contradictions, in the form of overcoming these contradictions, in the form of revealing and liquidating these contradictions. As long as there are classes we shall never be able to have a situation when we shall be able to say, "Thank goodness, everything is all right." This will never be, comrades. There will always be something dying out. But that which dies does not want to die; it fights for its existence, it defends its dying cause. There is always something new coming into life. But that which is being born is not born quietly, but whimpers and screams, fighting for its right to live. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.) Struggle between the old and the new, between the moribund and that which is being born—such is the basis of our development. Without pointing out and exposing openly and honestly, as Bolsheviks should do, the shortcomings and mistakes in our work, we block our road to progress. But we do want to go forward. And just because we want to go forward, we must make one of our foremost tasks an honest and revolutionary self-criticism. Without this there is no progress. Without this there is no development. But it is precisely in this sphere where we still lag behind. Moreover, it suffices to make a few successes to forget our shortcomings and to become self-contented and vain. Two or three big successes and the ocean is only up to our knees. Another two or three big successes and we have already become vain and elated.

But the mistakes remain, the shortcomings remain, the ulcers are driven inside our Party organism.

Another shortcoming. This consists in the application of administrative methods in the Party; instead of the method of conviction which is of decisive importance for the Party, we apply administrative methods in the Party. This shortcoming is not less dangerous than the first one. Why? Because it creates the danger of converting our Party organisations, which are organisations of self-activity, into hollow, bureaucratic institutions. If we take into consideration that we have at least 60,000 most active workers scattered throughout all economic, co-operative, and State institutions, fighting there against bureaucracy, it must be admitted that some of them, in fighting against bureaucracy in these institutions, sometimes become affected themselves with bureaucracy, which they bring into the Party organisation. This is not their fault, but our misfortune, because as long as the State exists this process will continue to a greater or lesser extent. It is precisely because of this that this process has certain roots in life, and precisely because of this it is necessary to take up arms for the struggle against this shortcoming, raising the activity of the Party masses, drawing them into the solution of questions of our Party leadership and instituting systematic inner Party democracy.

A third shortcoming. This shortcoming consists in the desire on the part of many of our comrades to drift with the stream smoothly and peacefully without any vision, without looking ahead, that there may be an eternal holiday feeling of triumph, that every day we would have festive sessions, that everywhere we should receive applause, and that every one of us should become an honourable member of some Presidium or other. (Laughter. Applause.) This uncontrollable desire to see everywhere a holiday mood, this gravitation to decorativeness, to all kinds of jubilees, necessary and unnecessary, this desire to drift with the stream without looking whither—(laughter, applause)—all combined constitutes the substance of the third shortcoming in our Party experience, the basis of shortcomings in our Party life. Have you ever seen oarsmen rowing honestly with sweated faces without seeing, however, whither the

stream carries them? I have seen such oarsmen on the Yenisei river. They were honest and tireless oarsmen. The trouble with such oarsmen is that they do not, and will not, see that the wave may carry them to a rock, where they would meet with destruction. The same is true of some of our comrades. They row honestly, not folding their arms, but drift smoothly with the current, but they not only do not know whither they drift, but do not even want to know it. It is work without vision, work without a rudder and without sails—this is what their desire to drift with the stream leads to. And the results? The results are clear. At first they grow musty, then they become gray, then they become absorbed into the mire of philistinism, and then they become ordinary philistines. This is the path of real degeneration.

Such, comrades, are some of the shortcomings in our Party experience and Party life about which I wanted to say a few bitter words to you.

Now allow me to take up the questions of the discussion and what is termed our Opposition.

(b) Results of the discussion. Has a discussion any sense or any value? Sometimes we hear people say, "What the devil did they raise up a discussion for? Who needs it? Were it not better to settle controversial questions inside, without taking the dirty linen out into the open?" This is wrong, comrades. A discussion is sometimes absolutely necessary and without doubt useful. It is only a question as to what kind of a discussion. If a discussion takes place within comradely limits, within Party limits, if its aim is honest self-criticism, a criticism of Party shortcomings, if consequently it improves matters and arms the working class, such discussion is necessary and useful. But there is another kind of discussion, not aimed at improving matters, but at worsening them, not at strengthening the Party, but at weakening it. Such discussion usually does not lead to the arming of the proletariat, but to its disarmament. Such discussions we do not need. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

When the Opposition demanded the opening of a national discussion about three months before the Congress, before the elaboration of the C.C. Theses, before the pub-

lication of these Theses, it endeavoured to force upon us such a discussion which would have inevitably facilitated matters for our enemies, the cause of the enemies of the working class, the cause of the enemies of our Party. It is precisely because of this that the C.C. was opposed to the Opposition plans. And it is just because it was opposed to the Opposition plans that we were able to put the discussion on a proper basis, giving it a foundation in the form of the C.C. Theses for the Congress. Now we can say, without hesitation, that, on the whole, the discussion was favourable. As far as washing our dirty linen in public is concerned, this, comrades, is nonsense. We never feared and never shall fear open self-criticism and criticism of our mistakes before the whole Party. The strength of Bolshevism, properly speaking, lies in the fact that it does not fear criticism and draws energy for further progress in the criticism of its own shortcomings. The present discussion is thus a sign of strength of our Party, a sign of its power.

We must not forget that in every great Party, particularly in a Party such as ours, which is at the helm of the Government, and which contains a certain section of peasants and civil servants, certain elements accumulate in the course of time indifferent to and unconcerned about questions of Party practice, voting with their eyes shut and drifting with the stream. The presence of a large number of such elements is an evil which must be combatted. These elements comprise the morass in our Party. A discussion is an appeal to this morass. The Oppositionists appeal to it in order to win part of it. And they really do win its worst part. The Party appeals to it in order to win the better part and draw it into active Party life. As a result, the morass is compelled to self-determination, in spite of its inertia and it really does determine its attitude as a result of these appeals, one part going over to the Opposition and another to the Party, thus ceasing to exist as ballast workers. In the general balance-sheet of our Party development this is a favourable feature. As a result of the present discussion our morass has become smaller; it has ceased or is ceasing to exist. This is the favourable side of the discussion.

What are the results of the discussion? The results are known. Until yesterday 724,000 comrades voted for the Party and a little over 4,000 for the Opposition. Such is the result. Our Oppositionists kicked up a row about the C.C. being torn away from the Party, the Party torn away from the class, and if pigs had wings they, the Oppositionists, would surely have 99 per cent. of the Party on their side. But as pigs have not got wings, hence the Opposition have even less than 1 per cent. Such is the result.

How could it happen that the entire Party as a whole, and after it the working class, should have so definitely isolated the Opposition? After all, certain people with names, people who know how to advertise themselves—(Voices: "Hear, hear.")—people who do not suffer from modesty—(applause)—knowing how to praise themselves and to display their goods, are at the head of the Opposition. This happened because the leading group of the Opposition proved to be a group of petty bourgeois intellectuals torn away from life, torn away from the revolution, torn away from the Party and from the working class. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.) I spoke a short while ago about the successes in our work, our achievements in the sphere of industry, in the sphere of trade, in the sphere of economy as a whole, and in the sphere of foreign policy. But the Opposition is not concerned with these achievements. It does not see them, partly owing to its ignorance, partly owing to a degree of stubbornness of the intellectuals torn away from life.

(c) Fundamental differences between the Party and the Opposition. You will ask: After all, what are the differences between the Party and the Opposition, on what questions do these differences occur? On all questions, comrades. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") I recently read a statement of a non-Party worker in Moscow who is about to join, or has already joined, the Party. Here is how he formulates the question concerning the differences between the Party and the Opposition:

"Formerly we had to search for the disagreements between the Party and the Opposition. Now it is hard

to find where they agree. (Laughter. Applause.) The Opposition is against the Party on all questions, and, if I were a follower of the Opposition, I should, therefore, not join the Party." (Laughter. Applause.) See "Izvestia," No. 264.

This shows you how concisely and to the point workers can sometimes express themselves. I think that this is the most concise and best characterisation of the Opposition attitude to the Party, to its ideology, its programme, its tactics. Precisely because the Opposition disagrees with the Party on all questions, precisely because the Opposition is a group with its own ideology, its own programme, its own tactics, its own organisational principles. The Opposition already possesses everything necessary for a new Party. Only a "trifle" is lacking, namely, strength. (Laughter. Applause.)

I could enumerate seven main questions on which the Party and the Opposition disagree.

First, the question of the possibility of the victory of Socialist construction in our country. I will not refer here to documents and statements of the Opposition on this question. Everyone knows them, and they need no repetition. It is clear to all that the Opposition denies the possibility of victorious construction of Socialism in our country. But denying such possibility, it declines directly and openly to the Menshevik position. This orientation of the Opposition in the given question is not new for its present leaders. Kamenev and Zinoviev proceeded from this orientation when they opposed the October insurrection. They said at that time directly that by raising an insurrection we were heading to ruin, that it was necessary to await the Constituent Assembly, that the conditions for Socialism had not matured, and would not mature, so very soon. Trotsky proceeded from the same orientation when he was for the insurrection. He said directly that if a victorious proletarian revolution in the West does not speed up its support in the more or less immediate future, it would be foolish to think that Revolutionary Russia will be able to hold out against Conservative Europe.

Let us now see what impelled Kamenev and Zinoviev

to make up their minds in favour of the insurrection on the one side, Trotsky on the other, and Lenin with the Party on the third. This is a very interesting question about which, comrades, it would be worth while to say a few words. You know that Kamenev and Zinoviev made up their minds under the whip. Lenin drove them on with a whip, threatening them with expulsion from the Party—(Laughter, applause)—and they were compelled to drag after the insurrection. (Laughter, applause.) Trotsky was voluntarily for the insurrection. But he was for it not so simply, but with a "slight" reservation which already then made him akin to Kamenev and Zinoviev. It is interesting that just before October—in June, 1917—Trotsky found it opportune to republish in Leningrad his old pamphlet, "The Programme of Peace," as if to say that he is for an insurrection under his own banner. What does he speak of in that pamphlet? He polemises against Lenin on the question of the possibility of victory of Socialism in one country, regarding this idea of Lenin as wrong. He maintains that power will have to be taken, but that if rapid assistance on the part of the victorious West European workers does not come, it is hopeless to think that revolutionary Russia will be able to stand up in the face of Conservative Europe, and that whoever does not believe Trotsky's criticism suffers from national narrowness. Here is a quotation from that pamphlet :

"Without waiting for others we begin and continue a struggle on national grounds, fully convinced that our initiative will give an incentive to a struggle in other countries. Should that not come off, it is hopeless to think—historical experience and theoretical deduction bear this out—that, for instance, Revolutionary Russia would be able to hold out in face of Conservative Europe. . . . To consider the prospect of social revolution within national limits would mean to fall a victim to the same national narrowness which is the substance of social patriotism." (Trotsky "1917," Vol. III., Part 1, p. 90.)

This, comrades, is Trotsky's "slight" reservation,



which largely explains to us the roots and background of his present bloc with Kamenev and Zinoviev.

And how did Lenin and the Party take up the insurrection? Was it also with reservations? No, Lenin and his Party were for the insurrection without reservations. Here is an extract from one of Lenin's remarkable articles, "The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution," published abroad in September, 1917 :

"Socialism being victorious in one country, does not at all do away with all wars at once. On the contrary, it presupposes them. The development of capitalism takes place in the various countries to a large degree unequally. This cannot be otherwise in a system of commodity production. Here comes the unalterable conclusion that Socialism cannot be victorious in all countries simultaneously. It will be first victorious in one or several countries, and the others will, after some time, remain either bourgeois or pre-bourgeois countries. This must cause not only friction but also a direct striving on the part of the bourgeois countries to smash the victorious proletarian Socialist State. In such cases a war on the part of our country would be legitimate and just. It would be a war for Socialism, for the emancipation of other nationalities from the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, "The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution," published in "Notes of the Lenin Institute," No. 2, p. 7.)

You can see here an entirely different conception. If Trotsky was for the insurrection with a reservation which made him akin to Kamenev and Zinoviev, maintaining that in itself proletarian power cannot represent anything out of the ordinary without timely assistance from without, Lenin, on the contrary, was for the insurrection without reservations, maintaining that proletarian power in our country must serve as a basis to help the proletarians of other countries to become emancipated from the bourgeois yoke.

This is how the Bolsheviks were in favour of the October insurrection, and this is why Trotsky with Kamenev and

Zinoviev found a common language in the tenth year of the October Revolution.

We can picture in the form of a dialogue the conversation between Trotsky on the one hand and Kamenev and Zinoviev on the other in forming their Opposition bloc.

Kamenev and Zinoviev say to Trotsky: "You see, dear comrade, we were right, after all, in saying that it was not necessary to have recourse to the October insurrection, but that it was necessary to await the Constituent Assembly, etc. Now everybody can see that the country degenerates, that the Government degenerates, we are heading towards ruin, and Socialism in our country is out of the question. We should not have undertaken the insurrection. You were voluntarily in favour of the insurrection. You committed a big mistake."

Trotsky replies: "No, dear friends, you are wrong. I was in favour of the insurrection, but you forgot to say how I favoured it. I was not directly in favour of it, but with a reservation. (General laughter.) But in so far as it has become manifest that we cannot expect any help from without, it is clear that we are heading towards ruin, as I predicted at the time in the "Programme of Peace."

Zinoviev and Kamenev: "Yes, that may be so. We had forgotten the 'slight' reservation. It is now clear that our bloc had an ideological foundation." (General laughter, applause.)

That is how the Opposition conception leading to the denial of the possibility of victorious Socialist construction in our country developed.

What does this conception mean? It means capitulation. Capitulation before whom? Evidently before the capitalist elements in our country. And before whom else? Before the world bourgeoisie. And what about the Left phrases, the revolutionary mimics—what has become of them? They were scattered to the winds. Just shake the Opposition up a bit, shake off their revolutionary phraseology, and you will find that at the bottom they are infected with defeatism. (Applause.)

Second, the question of the proletarian dictatorship. Have we got a proletarian dictatorship, or not? This is rather a strange question. (Laughter.) Nevertheless, the

Opposition raises it in every one of its statements. The Opposition says that we are experiencing Thermidorian degeneration. What does that mean? It means that we have no proletarian dictatorship, that we fail in everything and that our economy and politics digress, that we are not heading towards Socialism, but towards capitalism. This is a little strange and foolish. But the Opposition insists on it. This, comrades, is another divergency. It is on this that Trotsky's famous Clémenceau theses is based. But if our Government has degenerated or is degenerating, is it worth being spared, defended and fought for? Of course, it is not. If a favourable situation arises for the "removal" of such a Government, let us say if the enemy will be some 80 kilometres from Moscow, is it not clear that the situation will have to be utilised to sweep away this Government and set up a new Clémenceau, *i.e.*, Trotsky Government? Clearly there is nothing Leninist about that. It is pure Menshevism. The Opposition has come to Menshevism.

Third, the question of the alliance of the workers with the middle peasants. The Opposition always concealed its negative attitude to the idea of such an alliance. Its platform, its counter-theses, are remarkable not so much because of what is said in them, as by what the Opposition tried to conceal from the working class. But there is a man, I. N. Smirnov, also an Opposition leader, who had the courage to say the truth concerning the Opposition, and to expose it in broad daylight. What do we find? We find that we are heading towards ruin, and if we want to be rescued we must pick a quarrel with the middle peasants. This is not very wise. But it is clear at that. Here the Menshevik ears have cropped up for everyone to see.

Fourth, the question of the character of our revolution. If the possibility of building up Socialism in our country is denied, if the fact of the proletarian dictatorship is denied, and the necessity of a working-class alliance with the peasantry is denied, what is there left of our revolution, of its Socialist character? It is clear that absolutely nothing is left. The proletariat seized power, it completed the bourgeois revolution, and now the peasantry has nothing

more to do with it, as it has already received land, and, hence, the proletariat can withdraw, clearing the place for other classes. If we go into the roots of the Opposition views, this is their conception. These are the roots of the defeatism of the Opposition. Abramovitch does not praise them in vain.

Five, the question of Lenin's conception of leading colonial revolutions. Lenin proceeded from the distinction between imperialist countries and oppressed countries, between Communist policy in imperialist countries and Communist policy in colonial countries. Based on this distinction, he said, even during the war, that the national defence idea is unacceptable and counter-revolutionary for Communism in imperialist countries, but fully acceptable and just in oppressed countries fighting against imperialism. It is just because of this that he allowed at certain stages and for a certain period the possibility of a bloc and even an alliance with the nationalist bourgeoisie of imperialist countries, if the latter carries on war against imperialism, and if it does not prevent the Communists from educating the workers and poor peasants in the spirit of Communism. The transgression of the Opposition here consists in the fact that it definitely breaks with this Leninist conception, declining to the conception of the 2nd International, denying the expediency of supporting the revolutionary wars of the colonial countries against imperialism. It is precisely this that explains all incorrect conclusions arrived at by our Opposition on the question of the Chinese revolution. This is one more disagreement.

Six, the question of the united front tactic in the international labour movement. The Opposition transgression in this respect consists in breaking with Lenin's tactics in the question of gradual conquest of the millions of the working-class masses for Communism. The millions of the working-class masses can be gained for Communism not only through a correct Party policy. A correct Party policy is a great thing, but it is far from being everything. In order to win the millions of the working-class masses for Communism, it is necessary that these masses themselves become convinced through their own experience of the correctness of the Communist policy. In order that the

masses should become convinced, time is necessary; it is necessary to carry on skilful and clever Party work to win the masses to its positions, skilful and clever work in convincing the millions of the masses in the correctness of its policy. We were right in April, 1917, because we knew that we were heading towards the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of a Soviet Government. But we did not call then upon the broad masses of the working class to revolt. Why? Because the masses had not yet had the opportunity of being convinced of the correctness of our really correct policy. Only when the petty bourgeois parties of the S.R.S. and Mensheviks became discredited in connection with the fundamental questions of the revolution, only when the masses were beginning to realise the correctness of our policy, only then did we call upon the masses to revolt. And just because we issued a timely call to the masses to revolt we were then victorious. That is the root of the idea of a united bloc. The united front tactic was, properly speaking, brought forward by Lenin to make it easier for the millions of the working-class masses of the capitalist countries, who are infected with prejudices of Social Democratic compromise, to come over to the side of Communism. The Opposition digression in this respect consists in the fact that it flatly denies this tactic. Being fascinated at one time, foolishly and unjudiciously fascinated, with this tactic, it greatly welcomed the agreement with the General Council in Great Britain, assuming that that agreement "is one of the most important peace guarantees," "one of the most important guarantees against intervention," "one of the most important means of making reformism in Europe harmless." (See Zinoviev's report at the 14th Congress of the C.P.S.U.) But being terribly disappointed in their hopes of making reformism harmless with the help of the Purcells and Hicks, it swung completely to the other extreme, definitely denying the united front tactic. This, comrades, is another point of difference demonstrating the complete abandonment by the Opposition of the Leninist united front tactics.

Seven, the question of the principles of the Leninist Party and Leninist unity in the C.P.S.U. and the Comin-

tern. The Opposition definitely breaks here with Lenin's organisational principles, choosing the path of organising a second party, the path of organising a new International.

Such are the seven fundamental questions showing that in every one of them the Opposition has declined to Menshevism.

Can we regard these Menshevik views of the Opposition as compatible with the ideology of our Party, the programme of our Party, its tactics, the tactics of the Comintern, the organisational principles of Leninism? Under no conditions and not for one moment?

You will ask, how could such an Opposition arise in our Party, and what are its social roots? I think that the social roots of the Opposition are concealed in the fact of the ruination of the urban petty bourgeois sections in the conditions of our development, in the fact of the discontent on the part of these sections with the regime of the proletarian dictatorship, in the yearning of these sections to change the regime, to "improve" it in the spirit of establishing bourgeois democracy. I already said earlier that, as a result of our progress, as a result of the growth of our industry, as a result of the growing relative strength of our Socialist economic methods, one section of the petty bourgeoisie, particularly the urban bourgeoisie, is being ruined and going to the bottom. The Opposition reflects the murmur of these sections, and discontent with the regime of the proletarian dictatorship.

Herein lie the social roots of the Opposition.

#### 4. What Next?

What will we do with the Opposition in the future? Before taking up this question, I would like to tell you the history of an experience of joint work with Trotsky on the part of Kamenev in 1911. It is a very interesting point. Particularly because it can give us a certain clue to a correct approach to the question before us. A Plenum of our C.C. was held abroad in 1910. It considered the question of inter-relationship between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks, particularly Trotsky (we were then a part of one Party together with the Mensheviks, and considered ourselves a faction). The Plenum was in favour of concilia-

tion with the Mensheviks, and hence with Trotsky, in spite of Lenin, against Lenin. Lenin was in the minority. And how about Kamenev? Kamenev took upon himself the establishing of co-operation with Trotsky. He realised that co-operation not without the knowledge and consent of Lenin, as Lenin wanted to show Kamenev on his own experience the injury and inadmissibility of co-operation with Trotsky against Bolshevism.

Listen to what Comrade Kamenev had to say about it :

“A majority of our faction made an attempt in 1910 to conciliate and come to terms with Comrade Trotsky. Lenin was sharply opposed to that attempt, and, ‘as a punishment’ for my insistence in the attempt to come to terms with Comrade Trotsky, he insisted that I should be delegated to the Central Committee as its representative on the editorial board of Comrade Trotsky’s paper. In the autumn of 1910, after several months of work on that editorial board, I was convinced that Lenin was right in his negative attitude to my ‘conciliatory’ policy, and with his consent I withdrew from the editorial board of Comrade Trotsky’s organ. That break of ours with Comrade Trotsky was marked by a series of sharp articles in the central organ of the Party. It was precisely then that Lenin suggested that I should write a pamphlet, summarising our differences both with the liquidatory Mensheviks and with Comrade Trotsky. ‘You have had the experience of an agreement with the Left (Trotskyist) wing of the anti-Bolshevik group, you have become convinced of the impossibility of an agreement, and you should write a pamphlet to summarise that,’ is what Lenin said to me. Naturally, Lenin particularly insisted that the relations between Bolshevism and what we then called Trotskyism should be made clear . . . to the end.” (L. Kamenev’s preface to his pamphlet “Two Parties,” May, 1924.)

And what were the results? Listen further :

“The experience of joint work with Trotsky—I dare say an experience which I sincerely tried, and which the only fact proved by my letters and private

conversations Trotsky now exploits—showed that conciliation inexorably leads to a defence of liquidatorship, and definitely comes over to its side.” (Kamenev: “Two Parties,” 1911, p. 136).

And further:

“Oh, if ‘Trotskyism’ had been victorious as a Party tendency, what a paradise would that have been for the liquidators and Otzovists and all other conflicting tendencies in the Party.” (Ibid, p. 143.)

Such, comrades, is the experience of joint work with Trotsky. (Voices: “Instructive experience.”)

The results of that experience were then described by Comrade Kamenev in a special pamphlet issued in 1911, entitled “Two Parties.” I do not doubt that that pamphlet was very useful to all those comrades who still cherished illusions concerning co-operation with Trotsky. And now I have the following question: Would not Comrade Kamenev try to write another pamphlet, also entitled “Two Parties,” dealing with his present experiment at collaboration with Trotsky? (General laughter. Applause.) Perhaps this would be useful. Of course, I cannot guarantee Comrade Kamenev that Trotsky will not use, as he did then, his letters and intimate conversations against him. (General laughter.) But it is hardly necessary to fear that. At any rate, one must choose, either the fear that Trotsky will use Kamenev’s letters and proclaim his secret conversations with Trotsky and then the chance of remaining out of the Party, or spurning every fear and remaining within the Party. That is how the question stands to-day, comrades. Either one or the other.

It is said that the Opposition intends to present some kind of statement to the Congress, to the effect that they, the Opposition, submit and will submit to all Party decisions—(Voice: “Just as in October, 1926.”)—that they will dissolve their fraction—(Voice: “We have heard that story twice.”)—and defend their views, which they cannot discard—(Voices: “Aha, aha! Leave it to us to do the dissolving.”)—within the limits of the Party statutes. (Voices: “With reservations. Our limits are not elastic.”) I think, comrades, that nothing will come of that. (Voices: “Hear,



hear." Prolonged applause.) We also have some experience, comrades, with statements—(applause)—the experience of two statements—(Voices: "Hear, hear.")—of October 16, 1926, and of August 8, 1927. What has that experience brought? Although I do not intend to write a pamphlet entitled "Two Parties," I nevertheless dare say that this experience brought most undesirable results—(Voices: "Hear, hear.")—a double deception of the Party, the weakening of Party discipline. What basis has the Opposition now for demanding that we, the Congress of a great Party, the Congress of Lenin's Party, should take their word after that experience? (Voices: "That would be stupid. Whoever believes it should be kicked.")

It is also said that they are raising the question of reinstating those who have been expelled from the Party. (Voices: "That will not work out. Let them go to the Menshevik morass.") I also think, comrades, that it will not work out. (Prolonged applause.)

Why has the Party expelled Trotsky and Zinoviev? Because they are the ringleaders of the Opposition. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") Because they made it their object to violate Party rules; because they got an idea that no one would dare touch them; because they wanted to create for themselves a privileged position in the Party. But do we want aristocrats in our Party who enjoy certain privileges, and peasants who are deprived of these privileges? Is it possible that we, Bolsheviki, who have destroyed the aristocratic caste root and branch, will now restore it in our Party? (Applause.) You want to know why we expelled Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Party? Because we want no aristocrats in the Party. Because there is one law for all and all Party members have equal rights. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Prolonged applause.) If the Opposition wants to live in the Party, let it submit to the will of the Party, to its rules and its instructions, without reservations and unequivocally. If they do not want that, let them find a better place. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.) We do not want to, and will not create any new rules specially for the Opposition. (Applause.)

The question is raised concerning conditions. We have one condition, and that is that the Opposition disarm

entirely and completely, both ideologically and organisationally. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Prolonged applause.) The Opposition must discard their anti-Bolshevik views openly and honestly within the hearing of the whole world. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Prolonged applause.) They must denounce the mistakes they have committed, mistakes which have turned into crimes against the Party, openly and honestly, in the hearing of the whole world. They must hand over to us all their nuclei, so that the Party would be able to disband them completely. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Prolonged applause.) Either this or let them clear out. And if they will not clear out, we will kick them out. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Prolonged applause.)

That is how matters stand with the Opposition, comrades.

#### IV.

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

I shall now conclude, comrades. What is the general conclusion for the period covered by the report? It is as follows:—

1. We maintained peace with the surrounding States despite the greatest difficulties, despite provocative attacks of the bourgeoisie of the Great Powers;

2. We have strengthened the alliance between the working class of the U.S.S.R. and the workers of the imperialist countries and the colonies, despite the endless obstacles, despite the sea of slander of the corrupt many-tongued bourgeois Press;

3. We have raised the authority of the proletarian dictatorship among the millions of the toiling masses throughout the world;

4. We, as a Party, helped the Comintern and its Sections to strengthen its influence in all countries of the world;

5. We have done everything one country could do for the development and acceleration of the world revolutionary movement;

6. We have raised our socialist industry, establishing

for its development a record-breaking pace, and consolidated its hegemony in the entire national economy;

7. We have established an alliance between Socialist industry and peasant economy;

8. We have strengthened the alliance of the working class with the middle peasants, keeping the poor peasants as our base;

9. We have strengthened the proletarian dictatorship in our country despite hostile international surroundings, showing the workers of all countries that the proletariat is able not only to destroy capitalism but also to build up Socialism;

10. We strengthened the Party, we stood by Leninism and completely smashed the Opposition.

Such is the general conclusion.

What deductions can be derived therefrom? Only one deduction. We are on the correct path, and our Party policy is correct. (Voices: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

From this it follows that, progressing along this path, we will surely arrive at the victory of Socialism in our country, the victory of Socialism in all countries. (Prolonged applause.)

This does not mean that we shall have no difficulties in our path. Difficulties there were; but we did not fear them, because we are Bolsheviks forged in the fire of revolution. Difficulties there will be; but we shall overcome them as we have done up till now, because we are Bolsheviks forged by Lenin's iron Party to be able to fight against difficulties and overcome them, and not whimper and cry.

Precisely because we are Bolsheviks, victory will surely be ours.

Comrades! Onward to the victory of Communism in our country, onward to the victory of Communism throughout the world!

(Stormy and prolonged applause. All rise to their feet to give Comrade Stalin an ovation and sing the "International.")

## ORGANISATION REPORT

### Comrade Kossior's Speech

#### I.—TRADE UNIONS.

Comrades! The economic growth which Comrade Stalin described so vividly in his report, the fact that our country is advancing at a tremendous pace, under the leadership of the Party, on the road of Socialist construction, and, finally, the enormous and unprecedented increase in working-class activity which necessarily accompanies the advance of Socialist construction—all this is bound to find definite expression in the work of all the mass organisations of the working class, the trade unions, the Soviets, the co-operatives, etc. Furthermore, it is bound to lead to those greater demands now being made on our Party leadership by these organisations, to a call for alterations in the methods of leadership, for their adaptation to the present situation which has changed so considerably.

The organisational work of our Party and of the C.C. was carried out during the last two years under difficult conditions. We have had no possibility of quietly considering questions of the utmost importance. The incessant discussion, the Opposition fever, the disorganising activities of the Opposition, often enough calculated to undermine all that the Party has already achieved—all this, Comrades, has left its mark on our work, and has thrown many obstacles in the way. But, despite all these difficulties, during these two years the Party has accomplished much of which it can be proud; in every field of work success may be recorded, and in every direction great progress has been made.

I shall begin with the mass organisations of the working class. The activity of the working class is bound

to give an impetus to the work of all mass organisations, above all of the trade unions. About 10 million workers are organised in the trade unions at the present time. During the past two years the number of organised workers has increased by 30 per cent., the industrial trade unions by 28 per cent., and the employees' trade unions, etc., by 25 per cent. Agricultural and forest workers' trade unions and those of the building workers have grown most rapidly of all. This is quite comprehensible, since at present these categories contain considerable reserves hitherto untouched by the trade union movement.

In all trade unions, without exception, the workers are much better organised than formerly. For us the improved quality of trade-union work is of greater importance than the purely numerical growth of the union; for us the really important thing is the closer contact between trade-union work and the broad non-Party masses, the establishment of close connection between the unions and the masses in the workshops and factories. Were we to deal in detail with the whole of the work being done by the trade unions, we should find increased activity in every sphere of work—with regard to organisation, tariffs, and the general work of cultural work. I shall not, however, go further into this, but confine myself to the following: The improvement in trade union work has begun at the very foundation, a point of special importance to us. The factory councils, the workshop bureaux, etc., and all basic trade-union organs have begun to work more efficiently, to establish better contact with the masses, whilst the working masses themselves have begun to adopt an attitude towards the unions showing that they recognise these as organisations directly and immediately defending their interests.

In workshops and factories increased attendance is noticeable at the workers' meetings. Two years ago the workers' meetings of a number of trade unions were attended by only 20 to 30 per cent. of the workers employed in the works or factory concerned, but now a much higher percentage may be recorded, especially when local questions are under discussion. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the number of workers speaking at public meetings has increased. Another characteristic feature is

the steady increase in the number of speakers taking part in the discussion at trade union congresses, these speakers being chiefly recruited from workers engaged in the process of production.

I must also record an improvement in the trade union work in connection with the organisation of the less advanced categories of workers: seasonal workers, agricultural labourers, building workers, etc. Work among those employed in factories and workshops, but still living in rural districts, has also made progress. Here only the first steps have been made, but these themselves are a sign of progress.

This extension of the work of the trade union mass organisations has necessarily led to an increase of the staff of subordinate active trade union workers. The A.R.T.U.C. pointed out that we have 1,400,000 active workers, of whom about one million are non-Party. It is not likely that this number is exaggerated. The growth of active trade union workers is doubtless promoted by the circumstance that new strata and new cadres of workers from the process of production are being continually absorbed in trade union organisations. This means that the leading organisations of the trade unions are actually becoming a school for the training of new cadres of trade unionists.

On every rung of the ladder of union organisations we find a renewal of the membership of these organs through the fresh forces streaming in from year to year; the number of non-Party workers in all trade union organisations is continually increasing.

This renewal of the trade union organisations has some disadvantages. It may be observed at times that the renewal of elected bodies has become an aim in itself, so that the trade union organisations do not set sufficient value on the persons elected, who change frequently, and give themselves little trouble to retain even capable persons in suitable positions, or to help them to advance further. The trade unions do not pay sufficient attention to their active workers; this section is badly organised, inadequately instructed, and utilised too little.

There are very few women in the leading trade union organisations: 4 per cent. in the A.R.T.U.C., 8 per cent.

in the Plenum of the separate union committees, 2 per cent. in the presidiums of the union committees, etc. Even in such trade unions as those of the tailors and textile workers, where women constitute the majority of the membership, the proportion of women in the leading trade union organs is almost half that of the proportion of women workers in the industry. These defects are felt all the more because during the last two years there has unfortunately been an obvious increase—in the A.R.T.U.C. and in the trade union C.C. and its presidiums—of the number of one-time members of other parties. This is a further confirmation of the insufficient speed at which fresh cadres of trade unionists are recruited from the ranks of the working class.

In some places the trade unions have not quite done away with the old methods of commanding: I could cite a number of cases in which the active participation of the workers themselves has been so negligible that election meetings could not be held, either for trade union or Soviet elections, because the workers from various factories and workshops did not appear in sufficient numbers at the election meetings. All this shows that our very considerable achievements in the work of the trade union organisations are still accompanied by grave faults. The old methods and forms of work, which must be completely superseded in the near future, have not yet been completely laid aside.

## II.—CONFERENCES ON PRODUCTION.

There is no doubt whatever that these conferences are making progress. The very fact that this institution has struck firm roots in the workshops, and has extended its influence to the smallest unit of production, shows that here we have fundamental progress. Besides this we may observe, in every branch of production without exception, greater regularity in the holding of consultations on production, the appointment of commissions, and the organisation of conferences on production. The number of workers taking part in consultations on production increases almost everywhere. In the Moscow metal industry, for instance,

the number of participants in the meetings has increased by 40 per cent. during the last two years, in ten Moscow Trusts by 20 per cent., in Leningrad by 35 per cent., and in Nizni-Novgorod by 64 per cent. The A.R.T.U.C. is of opinion that about 15 per cent. of all workers take part in the work of such production consultations. I believe this estimate to be approximately correct.

This fact bears witness to the tangible progress in this sphere. It must be remembered at the same time that the quality of the work done by the consultations on production has greatly improved. The consultations on production have advanced, or are advancing, from dealing with casual questions of systematic work, and are focussing their main efforts on the improvement of production and of the organisation of labour.

The Moscow Party Committee reports that the overwhelming majority of the proposals brought forward at consultations on production deal with repairs and re-equipment of the enterprise. The second place is taken by questions of rationalisation and mechanisation.

The proposals made by the workers at the consultations on production run into thousands. One sign of the better work being done with the aid of these consultations is the fact that only 10-15 per cent. of the proposals submitted are rejected, whilst 80 to 90 per cent. are as a rule accepted and put into practice. Ninety per cent. of the proposals discussed at the consultations are usually questions advanced on the initiative of the workers themselves. This is a point of the utmost importance.

There is at the same time much improvement in the method of putting into practice the proposals accepted by the production consultations. I have endless figures in this connection, but I shall only mention two cases. In Leningrad the percentage of proposals put into practice has increased from 40 to 60 per cent., in Moscow from 53 to 63 per cent. Similar data comes from Nizhni-Novgorod, etc.

In the course of these two years the participation of the workers in the control of production has also increased and taken new forms. After consultations on production had been instituted in the various workshops, these were



followed by regular conferences on production for the whole works or factory. Control Commissions for the consultation of production have been organised in accordance with the decisions of the Party Conference, and these have begun work in some places, although a general survey of the experience gained in this work has not yet been made. What are termed "production inspections" have also been introduced.

Such facts show, comrades, that there is an indisputable livening up in the work of consultations on production. The trade unions and the Party must devote even more attention to this matter, and take it more firmly in hand. The same applies to economists. Although the attitude adopted by our economists towards the consultations on production has greatly improved, there are still many cases in which the attitude is still contemptuous, or at least displays a lack of interest in this work and of inclination to take part in it.

During the last two or three years the trade unions have placed this work on a sound basis, and have raised it to a position of the greatest importance in the life of the working class. During this period the membership of clubs has not grown to a very great extent numerically—from 900,000 to 1,000,000—but the system of voluntary membership has been instituted, and the methods of work have been greatly improved. It is a characteristic feature of this advance that the number of "Red Corners" in the shops and factories has increased during this period from 7,000 to 42,000. These "Red Corners" are, however, precisely in those clubs in which real political and social work is done both throughout the whole factory and in the separate departments. In the majority of cases these are the clubs in which the workers gather together and where they spend every minute of their leisure.

In the future we must strive to make greater use of the cinema and the wireless both in factory and other clubs, and to employ these more to establish closer contact with the masses.

A further advance made in this period is the increased circulation of the newspapers mainly read by the workers. In accordance with the figures given by Comrade Molotov

at the 14th Party Congress, there were 10 newspapers to 27 workers on this basis; at the present time there are 10 newspapers to 21 workers.

Mention must also be made of the tremendous desire for education displayed by the workers. The number of evening schools, universities, and circles in the clubs is increasing daily.

### III.—WORK IN THE VILLAGE.

In the course of the last two years the Party has accomplished a gigantic task in the village.

In the first place, with regard to making the village Soviets more active, it must be pointed out that the figures of the last election campaign show that the activity of the peasantry as a whole grows comparatively slowly. But if we take the individual social groups, we find a certain increase of activity among the agricultural workers and poor peasants. At the same time we must remember our last election instructions, which increased the number of those deprived of the right to take part in the elections.

The influence of the Party in the village Soviets is becoming gradually stronger, both among the presidents of the village Soviets and in these Soviets themselves, and in the district Soviets. This applies equally to the influence of the Young Communist League. The social composition of our village Soviets is improving. Taking exemption from taxation as a basis, we find that the percentage of village Soviet members exempt from taxation has doubled—from 8 to 16 per cent. At the same time it must be remembered that the figures for 1925-26 are on the same level as those for 1924-25, and the first really noticeable change has taken place since then, thanks to our increased work among the village poor last year. The proportion of agricultural labourers and other workers in the village Soviets has increased, and we can record a certain advance here, although not a very great one.

It is worth noting that the percentage of persons exempt from taxation among the presidents of the village and district Soviets is greater than the percentage among the total membership of the village Soviets. This is of fundamental importance.

Work in the village Soviets has improved in every respect. The village Soviet is in many places beginning to become the real public centre in the locality, and is an organ with real power, possessing the confidence of the peasantry.

The village Soviets work entirely under the guidance of the Party, and are already beginning to put up energetic resistance to the kulaks.

Co-operation in the village.—The consumers' co-operative societies have grown rapidly as far as the number of members is concerned—an increase of 83 per cent. The agricultural co-operatives have not grown so rapidly, and even now comprise no more than 32 per cent. of the farms as compared with 24 per cent. two years ago. This more moderate growth of the agricultural co-operatives is fully explained by the special difficulties encountered here. It is only in very recent years that this type of co-operative has been able to make any progress at all. With regard to the social composition of the co-operatives, it must be stated definitely—without referring here to exact figures—that all the data at our disposal go to show that at least nine-tenths of the members of the consumers' and agricultural co-operative societies are middle and poor peasants.

Much importance is attached to our present work in the handicraft co-operatives. One reason for this is the more intense fight against the kulaks, and another the fact that private capital exercises its greatest influence amongst handicraft workers. Although the handicraft co-operative is growing, up to now it only comprises 13 per cent. of the handicraft workers. This is inadequate, and shows the imperative necessity for greater attention to the co-operatives.

During these two years the peasants' aid committees have made but little progress. There has been, however, a certain numerical growth, the work has been placed on a sound basis, and the committees have come into closer touch with the population. But there are still a number of objective difficulties which hamper this work in the village. The chief difficulty is the dispute arising out of the uncertainty as to the relations between the peasants' aid committees and the land societies. Besides this, the most

important fact is that the village nuclei devote very little attention to this field of work.

The organisation of the poor peasants has constituted the centre of attention of the C.C. and the local Party organisations during the period under review. Although we first took up this work at the time of the 14th Party Congress, still the organisation of the poor peasants has really been set going, and more or less established. There is no doubt that this department of our work has exercised enormous influence in the campaigns for Soviet and co-operative elections, and upon the whole public life of the village. In 1925-26, for instance, we convened 1,500 meetings of poor peasants in ten gubernias and districts, whilst last year 18,000 such meetings were held in these same ten gubernias. Last year, for the first time, meetings of the poor peasants have been held as part of the campaign for the co-operative elections; such meetings, however, have not yet become very general. Typical of our work in the organisation of the poor peasants is the fact that we have succeeded not only in preventing a deterioration of relations between the poor and middle peasantry, but have been able to strengthen the alliance between these two groups. As a rule, 10 to 30 per cent. of middle peasantry have been present at the meetings of the poor peasants. It must, however, be observed that only a very small number of agricultural workers have attended these meetings. We must make it possible for the organised poor peasants to exercise influence on the practical daily work of the Soviets and co-operatives.

Just a few words about the agricultural and forest workers' trade union. This trade union numbers 1,200,000 members. Of these, 350,000 are working on independent peasant farms. A certain improvement in the mass work of this trade union may be recorded. But although the importance of the agricultural labourer has increased in the Soviets, the staff of functionaries is not yet being adequately recruited from the ranks of agricultural labour. Measures must be taken to ensure that the work done among the poor peasants, the general meetings of the poor peasants, and the work carried on in their groups should be brought into closest contact with the Soviets and the

co-operatives, so that the organisations of the poor peasants may find expression in the daily work of the Soviets and co-operatives, so that the poor peasants may utilise their organisations and meetings to learn how to defend their interests in the Soviets, and to carry out those Soviet decisions which safeguard these interests, and so that our Party may be enabled to secure to a larger extent influence in the Soviets and to carry out its proletarian policy there.

#### IV.—PARTY AND STATE APPARATUS.

I need not dwell on the question of retrenchment of the State apparatus and the suppression of bureaucracy, since this has already been dealt with in the report of the Central Control Commission and the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. I should like, however, to touch upon a part of this question which is of paramount importance. I refer to the decision passed on November 15th, 1926, calling upon Communists in our organisations to take a really active part in the struggle against bureaucracy and in the work of retrenchment of the State apparatus. In this respect absolutely intolerable conditions have prevailed up to the present. It must be admitted that the decision of the C.C. on this question has given a new impetus to the work of the Soviet nuclei. This is confirmed by the investigation of 500 Soviet nuclei by the Central Control Commission. This enquiry has, however, shown that the Soviet nuclei, although certainly more active than before, still fail to work independently enough, and wait for commands from the centre. The composition of the nuclei often hinders the work.

The Party nucleus in the State apparatus itself has grown during the last two years. We have instituted a number of enquiries into the apparatus of the Supreme Economic Council, trusts, syndicates, co-operatives, trade and credit services, etc. The management of trusts, for instance, are composed of 75 per cent. Party members, of whom one-third were already members of the Party whilst it was still illegal, and more than one-half are workers, one half of whom have already been working in the economic field for five years and upwards. The managing

directors, their representatives and assistants are four-fifths Communist and to the same extent (that is, four-fifths) workers. Hence the middle strata of the apparatus of the People's Supreme Economic Council and a number of trusts contain 22 per cent. Communists and 6 per cent. workers out of the total of responsible workers (3,000). A characteristic feature of our present system of promotion is that it is no longer based on campaigns, but proceeds in the course of practical everyday work. But although some success may be recorded with regard to the promotion system, it must be admitted that our Party and Soviet organisations are still devoting too little attention to this question.

I should like to deal especially with the question of promotion in our industrial undertakings. We have made inquiries in 26 large factories employing 126,000 workers, and find that within the last two years 1,300 workers have been promoted, about 1,000 to positions in the undertakings themselves and the others outside. Twenty-five per cent. of these do not belong to the Party. Who is responsible for the promotions in all these undertakings? The nuclei recommended 46 per cent. of these promotions, the factory councils and other trade union organs 26 per cent., and the management 21 per cent. The trade union organs have shown very little initiative here. The role played by the production consultations in the promotion question is very considerable.

The role and influence of the trade unions in training the leaders of our industries is a question of extraordinary importance. There are no accurate and definite data obtainable on this question. Some few trade unions can furnish a few incomplete and generally out-of-date figures. All this shows that up to the present no systematic work has been done by the trade unions towards the training and promotion of the leading cadres for our industry. The existing system of appointment ensures, however, the influence of the trade unions in the selected leading cadres. We in the C.C. have special commissions which regulate this question as a rule, and it is characteristic that the trade unions show very little initiative in securing the promotion of candidates to definite positions in economic life.

Out of 794 persons appointed to various positions in economic undertakings during these two years, 300 were selected from non-economic organs; the trade unions proposed only 22 persons from their own ranks. Even among those engaged in industrial enterprises we find few who have been promoted to higher positions on the initiative of the trade unions, although the trade unions have a first-hand knowledge of industrial work. They must make it their duty to give exact judgments and provide for the promotion of those deserving it.

There are two trade unions which have come especially to the fore in the promotion question—the C.C. of the metal workers and the C.C. of the miners. These play a really important part in this work, and have been successful in having many of their candidates promoted to positions. All the other trade unions take very little part in this work.

The promotion of workers and peasants to leading positions in the State apparatus is proceeding more satisfactorily than before the 14th Party Congress, but on the whole there is but little progress in this direction, especially with respect to promotion to the central organs. The role of the trade unions in the work of training and promoting workers for industrial positions is undoubtedly insufficient, and they must devote considerably more thought and effort to this matter.

## V.—THE YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE.

The Young Communist League can undoubtedly boast of many achievements and positive results: the growth of mass work, the progress of political enlightenment, the increased participation of the Young Communist League in public life, in the Soviets, co-operatives, etc.

There is, however, one point to which due attention must be paid, and that is the slowing down in the growth of the Young Communist League. It is quite comprehensible that this slowing down should take place with regard to the influx from the village. This is normal. But that the rate of growth should have slowed down with respect to workers is not quite normal. The period under review has witnessed certain changes in the social com-

position of the Young Communist League. These are not very considerable, entailing only a falling off in the number of workers and an increase in the number of peasants and day labourers to the extent of 1 to 1½ per cent. These changes are, as a rule, of no essential importance, and involve no danger.

I must further raise a few critical questions about the work of the Young Communist League, a few problems which the Young Communist League will not be able to solve for itself without the aid of the Party.

One very conspicuous point is the great fluctuation in the Young Communist League. In 1925, for instance, 11 per cent. of the members left the League, and now again 14 per cent. This fluctuation is greatest among the agricultural labourers and least among the workers in the towns. It is of importance to investigate the causes of this; the Young Communist League must strive to abolish this fluctuation, and the Party must aid it in their task.

Forty-five per cent. of the working-class youth are organised in the Young Communist League. In the large towns this percentage rises to 70 per cent. But the fact that the larger half of working youth is still outside the Young Communist League, and that the League is growing but slowly, must induce us to devote more attention to this question. The Young Communist League needs here the help of the Party, help enabling it to improve its working methods, and especially its methods of economic mass work.

I need not dwell on the subject of the Party core existing in the Young Communist League. I need only observe in passing that this core is growing steadily. The percentage of Young Communist League members accepted as members of the Party has now reached 40, and in the Army even 75. The number of workers in the leading organisations of the Young Communist League is also increasing.

In the country the Young Communist League is developing considerable activity. It plays an important part in the public and political life of the village, especially in questions concerning the raising of the level of agriculture and its adoption of co-operative methods. All that is necessary is for the Party to lend its aid to the Young



Communist League in this work, and support it by its guidance.

The most important task of the Young Communist League is the work of political enlightenment. But it is just here that the greatest shortcomings of the Young Communist League are to be seen. This work does not by any means keep pace with the general growth of the activity and demands of the working masses in the Young Communist League. The Young Communist League cannot cope with its task without the aid of the Party, and the Party must help in this work.

#### VI.—INNER PARTY WORK.

During the period just passed the C.C. devoted much attention to organisational questions, especially to questions dealing with the regulation and ascertainment of the social composition of the Party.

What processes have been going on in the Party during this period? In the course of six months the Party membership rose by 195,000, whilst the number of candidates fell by 73,000. In this manner the sum total of the members and candidates of the Party rose by 121,000, and the Party now has a membership of 1,200,000.

The social composition of the Party has changed as follows:—The percentage of workers has fallen from 58.1 to 56.3 per cent., the number of peasants from 24 to 22 per cent., whilst the number of employees has risen from 17.3 to 21.4 per cent. We need not be alarmed at this decline of the peasantry and advance of employees, for it is only the result of the recount which has been made of the whole Party membership, and merely signifies certain regroupings, reclassification of members of one category into another.

#### **The Actual Proportion of Party Members from the Bench.**

In a year and a-half the percentage of workshop and factory workers in the Party has sunk from 40.8 to 37½. But here we must remember our new instructions, according to which many Party members really working in workshops and factories, and hitherto classified in this category, are no longer to be regarded as workers but are transferred to the group of the employees. An examination of our recount

shows that whilst this records a 6 to 7 per cent. decline in the number of workers, there has in reality been no decline but merely a reclassification.

The re-registration of the Party membership has been seized upon by the Opposition as an opportunity for loud outcries about alleged mass withdrawals from the Party.

What is the truth of the matter? The new registration showed in the first place that our lists contained about 10,000 "deadweights" still figuring in the statements of the gubernia committees but no longer existing in the nuclei. We then formally ascertained the withdrawal of those who had in reality left the Party long ago, during the years which have elapsed since 1924. The number of such withdrawals was ascertained at 35,000, of whom 20,000 were workers from the bench.

If we examine the composition of the factory nuclei bureaux or the composition of nuclei secretaries, we again find a considerable increase in the number of workers acting as nuclei secretaries or in the nuclei bureaux. This does not apply only to the factory nuclei. If we take all the nuclei together, there is an increase of the worker element from 38 to 41 per cent. The factory nuclei contain 80 to 85 per cent. workers. An especially characteristic fact must be mentioned here. At the time of the 14th Party Congress the majority of the members of the bureaux (more than one-half) in the factory nuclei had been in the Party since 1917 to 1920. At the present time we find a regrouping tending more to younger Party members. The majority of the nuclei secretaries and members of the bureaux are comrades who joined the Party after 1924—that is, after the Lenin enrolment. Nine-tenths of all these tens of thousands of subordinate functionaries are actually fresh cadres, and are not only working in the nuclei and carrying on mass work, but are also taking part in the work of leadership of our Party committees and in the work of the gubernia and district committees. In this manner the Party has trained fresh cadres during the last two years. It need scarcely be emphasised that only the widest application of the methods of an actually existing inner Party democracy, and not of a merely pseudo-democracy, have enabled such new cadres to be formed.

## DISCUSSION ON COMRADES STALIN'S AND KOSSIOR'S REPORTS

### COMRADE KRUPSKAYA'S SPEECH:

Comrades, I will not deal here with the great political and organisational mistakes which the Opposition has made. Enough has been said already on the subject. It seems to me that the main cause of these mistakes is the fact that the Opposition lost contact and understanding of what interests the working class and what interests the advanced sections of the working class. (Manuilsky: "Hear, hear!") The Opposition has lost all understanding of the colossal tasks now confronting the Party. That is the misfortune of the Opposition. We are now confronted with an actual split. I think that the Party has by now, during the last five years, grown to such an extent, sunk its roots so deeply into the ranks of the masses, and begun so much to express what the mass feels and experiences that it will be able to survive even this difficult experience. But, of course, we must not shut our eyes to the fact that we are faced with a split and that if the Party has to pass through a certain difficult moment—and there are naturally many such moments in the course of struggle—the Opposition platform, already in print, may serve as an instrument to rally those sections who do not really value the Party and the ideals which it is fighting for. This difficulty must naturally be kept in view.

Lenin said, in 1919, that when we have in mind a group which consists of extremely heterogeneous elements, that group cannot act sincerely. There will always be a false note in their utterances and it seems to me that many wrong assertions made by the Opposition, rallied to it certain elements which impelled them to take steps exceeding all limits.

If asked whether or no an agreement is at the present time possible between the Party and the Opposition, I

think that such agreement would have no foundation. The Opposition cannot come to terms with the Party as a unit because it consists of extremely heterogeneous elements. It cannot be denied that there are comrades in the Opposition who already realise hazily the mistakes they made, who want to return to the Party and work with it. But there are also elements among them who think that it suffices to put on a Party mask. Hence, there is no unified common thinking element in the Opposition, and any agreement would be devoid of significance. But it seems to me that the Party must facilitate the return to its fold of those elements who sincerely realise their mistakes, who feel that they were wrong and want to keep in step with the Party. The Party is strong, not because of its numbers; it is strong because of its inner unity and, naturally, we cannot speak about its inner unity when some of its members stay in it only because of some pressing necessity.

We must have harmony—and this harmony, solidarity, internal discipline, is more indispensable now than ever before, because the Party is now facing a series of extremely important problems. We have now actually approached the task of Socialist construction. If we are to listen to what the masses say we will hear continuous suggestions of new tasks, essentially Socialist tasks, and new tasks facing us now can, naturally, be solved only by joint harmonious work.

Having made these few remarks on what may be called our sore point, I would like to deal with one of those problems which now faces the Party and which cannot be solved without active work by the Party. Many speakers said here that a tremendous cultural development among the masses and a yearning for knowledge is noticeable. We all know this, and it is perfectly comprehensible.

In the economic sphere we have reached such a level that further economic construction, building with the participation of the masses and the rationalisation of production, necessitate a much higher cultural level among the masses than we have at the present time. That is precisely why we now observe a desire for knowledge among the workers.

If we take agriculture, we shall find that the new methods of husbandry also necessitate a considerably higher level of education.

Finally, Soviet construction, the intensification of the work of the Soviets and the organisation of the masses through them, also requires knowledge on the part of Soviet Deputies. All combined, these facts give rise to that movement among the people which impels us to say that we are on the threshold of a cultural revolution. However, we cannot imagine that the cultural revolution can take place without the Soviet Government, and that the masses can acquire the necessary knowledge, which is to be applied in the process of Socialist construction, without the help of the Soviet Government. In this respect very much help is necessary on the part of the State. But if we take a glance at the present state of affairs we shall find that in many respects things are not everywhere as they should be.

Our network of educational institutions is in a very bad state. We know that even in such gubernias as Pskov, which is a border gubernia, someone suddenly gets the idea that it is necessary to close all libraries, that in many gubernias we see the closing down of schools and that in some cases they even close down first-grade schools. We know that our school construction proceeds very slowly and that life demands from us something more. We have done a good deal of work in curtailing our educational apparatus, we wanted to bring it nearer, through inspection, to the masses, but so far the inspection still remains to be organised and the necessary Communist influence which must come through the educational apparatus does not exist. Our Communist Party influence must become greater among the teachers. In this respect much work has still to be done. It is necessary, as Lenin said, to inspire the teachers with our enthusiasm—a thing we are not doing.

\* - \* \* \* \*

#### **COMRADE RAKOVSKY'S SPEECH:**

Comrades! The sphere of international relations is that sphere which necessitates the greatest unity in the Party. Our foreign enemy is the most dangerous of all

enemies both for our Party and the proletarian dictatorship. (Voices: "That is why you are breaking up the Party. You should have known this before! You should have remembered that on November 7th!") Although we occupy one-sixth of the globe our enemy has five-sixths of it. In his hands there is state power, in his hands there is capital, in his hands there is a higher technique, in his hands there is a colossal amount of political experience in exploiting and oppressing the proletariat and the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

The Minority of the Party made a statement at the August Plenum (Voices: "Not the Minority, but a handful!") the essential part of which I must repeat to-day.

We will support unconditionally and without reservations the leading organs of the Party and the Comintern in face of the foreign foe who will attack the Soviet Union, the proletarian government, the workers' and peasants' government. (Voices: "You do the attacking!" Noise, laughter. Voices: "Shame! shame! how low you've fallen!" "What about the Clemenceau thesis? You support the Party like the rope supports the hanged man!") Comrades, this is so, regardless of the common or individual fate of the Minority. (Voice: "A handful! a handful! and not the Minority!") But in so far as the external danger is for us the greatest one we, as every Communist, every Party member, are in duty bound to give the signal about things unobserved or omitted, and the mistakes made by the Party.

Comrades, first of all, allow me to throw some light on a legend which has been created in connection with my speech at the Party conference of the Moscow Gubernia. (Voices: "Your counter-revolutionary speech. . . . And how about Kharkov?") Laughter.) A mad, or, I should say, an idiotic thought was ascribed to me, namely, that in my opinion we should retaliate on the provocations of Shanghai, Paris and London by a declaration of war. (Commotion.) I will take the liberty to read from the uncorrected verbatim report the sentence which served, with absolutely no ground whatever, as the starting point for the creation of that legend. I repeat, it is from the uncorrected verbatim report:—

“Comrades, when the opponent feels our weakness it does not do away with and does not postpone but hastens war. If we should tell the truth—no one hears us here—with a different correlation of forces, in a different situation, half of what has been done would have been sufficient to cause war long ago. When we were driven out of Peking, when we were provoked in London, when we were provoked in Paris—do you not think that, if our situation were different, this would have served as a cause for rebuffing these acts in a deserving revolutionary manner? I was asked here: ‘How, by war?’ Yes, Comrades, even by war—(laughter, commotion. Voices: “He has made some correction!”)—because we are a proletarian revolutionary state and not a Tolstoyan sect.”

Yesterday, we could have read in the “Isvestia” a statement by Comrade Cachin, Communist member of the French Parliament, that peace has been maintained only thanks to the “Patience” of the Soviet Government. We must tell the bourgeois world: “Your provocations are such that under different circumstances, were it not for our policy and our patience, they would cause war.” (Commotion.)

When Comrade Rykov said in Kharkov that the complications in our foreign relations have become so accentuated that there was a time when we feared military encounters, he said essentially the same thing.

I will now return to the main subject. Having heard Comrade Stalin’s speech and read the speeches of our other comrades of the C.C., I have come to the conclusion that the C.C. repeats the same error at the 15th Congress which was made at the 14th on the international situation. What did we say at the 14th Congress? The following was said in the resolution of that Congress:—

“In the sphere of International relations, the consolidations and extensions of the ‘respite,’ which has become an entire period of so-called peaceful co-habitation of the U.S.S.R. with the capitalist states, is obvious . . .”

Scarcely a few months had passed after that estimation

was given and we witnessed a stormy and rapid development of the Chinese revolution, ending in its defeat; subsequently we had the breaking off of relations with Great Britain; later we had a conflict with France, and now we read every day about the inevitability, or, at any rate, the probability, of serious military complications in our immediate vicinity which may change the actual correlation of forces, making the situation rather unfavourable for us. (Levandovsky: "You are helping to bring that about.")

I will not return, owing to lack of time, to the speeches of Comrades Rykov, Tomsky, and Bukharin in Kharkov, Leningrad, and Moscow. I will refer only to Comrade Stalin's speech, which, unfortunately, owing to acoustics I could not hear in full. (Laughter.) I listened to it and I can quote only what I could hear. First of all, I find that Comrade Stalin's very formulation of the question was fundamentally wrong. On the one hand he enumerated the achievements of the last two years, including also the liquidation of the Swiss incident, and, on the other, as if to balance the first, he spoke of the defeat in China, the Anglo-Soviet rupture and the recent conflict with France. Comrades, I declare that these two magnitudes are incomparable, that even if we had on one sector of our international policy greater conquests than those we actually had, and, on the other, we had the breaking-off of relations with Great Britain, the conflict with France, a conflict concerning which there are different opinions even in the majority—the "Bolshevik" pictures it as a n ante-room, as the first step, a real step towards the break—I say that this second sector by far balances the first. I say further that even if we had maintained diplomatic relations with Great Britain, even if we had not had the conflict with France—the defeat of the Chinese revolution created such an unfavourable situation for us, that we may say that it fully counter-balances all gains in our foreign affairs. (Commotion.) Comrade Stalin quite correctly raised the question of the attitude of the working class, the international working class, to the Soviet Union. Yes, the working class is our bulwark, both in our Party, the Comintern, and the Government policy. All of us understand that the utilisation of the contradictions exist-



ing between the capitalist States, between bourgeois and petty bourgeois groups in various capitalist countries, being one of the means of diplomatic manoeuvring, is of relative nature, compared with the basic factor, compared with the working class. But I must say that I do not share the optimistic prognosis and evaluation made by Comrade Stalin. (Voices: "Of Course" Voroshilov: "If you did share it, you would not be in the Opposition.") In this connection, we have heard the following statement: We record a constant growth of working class sympathy for the Soviet Union. In such a general form, it does not give us a correct idea of the changes transpiring abroad. It may mislead us. I say that if the sympathies towards us grow in latitude—(Golostschekin: "Ruth Fischer does not sympathise with us.")—but the activity of these sympathies declines, it is the most alarming feature in our international situation. Let us take Great Britain. We had a conflict with Great Britain in 1923 in connection with the Curzon Note. We had serious dealings with Great Britain in 1924, and we also had a conflict with her in 1927—(Postishev: "And we will have one in 1930.")—Everyone who observes what is happening in Great Britain had to notice the passivity and indifference to our recent conflict with Great Britain, which ended in the breach of diplomatic relations. And this is the most alarming fact manifesting the growth of Social Democratic influence. Side by side with the increasing Communist votes, we must record—(Felix Cohn: "The Vienna rising!")—a most alarming fact, namely, the decrease—(Voroshilov: "What is your conclusion?")—in working-class activity. In face of this alarming fact, I cannot rest content with the statement of a general character concerning the growth of sympathy for us. What is now happening?

On the occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, we see a vicious ideological attack on the proletarian dictatorship by the bourgeois press—(Bukharin: "We see your demonstration on the 7th of November.") One of our would-be friendly newspapers, the "Chemnitz-Zeitung," in its weekly edition for Germans abroad (anyone who so wishes can buy it at the newspaper stand opposite the Kremlin), says (I say in advance that naturally

I do not put my signature to the statement, but it is an alarming fact) that by the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, Soviet Russia is no longer spoken of as an ideological menace, but as any other State. (Commotion.) The Soviet Union has ceased to be an ideological menace—(Bukharin: "And that is why they do not invade us!")—for the capitalist States. (Commotion, siccus. Kahanovitch: "Is the 'Chemnitz-Zeitung' a bourgeois paper? Rakovsky: "It is a bourgeois paper." Golostchekin: "Oh, is that what it is!" Laughter.) It is a bourgeois paper, but I give you warning' concerning this fact. (Commotion. Voices: "We were also given warning in 1917. We can do without these signalmen.") This is a new phenomenon in our international situation. Never has the Soviet Union and the Communist Party been subjected to such an ideological attack as to-day. (Bukharin: "You are attacked!" Commotion, laughter.)

How does the capitalist world regard our Party controversy? I have several interesting documents. (Commotion.) Here is a copy of a publication of the Research Institute of the London Chamber of Commerce. It is devoted to the Soviet Union—(commotion)—it has no author's signature but as can be seen from the document itself, it was undoubtedly written by a British spy who says that he had the opportunity unofficially to observe for two years what is going on in the Soviet Union. I should draw your attention to the fact that this was published in December last year. (Commotion.) What do we find here? It says: "From an investigation of Russia it follows that the destiny of the country is at the present time shaping itself on two diametrically opposed factors. On the one hand, doctrinaire Communism still tries to hold on to the ideals and principles of the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917—(laughter, commotion)—whereas, on the other hand, the stubborn facts of life compel everyone, with the exception of the biggest Communist fanatics, to accept one by one the principles on which Western civilisation is based." (Commotion.)

Comrades, I have no time to deal here with everything the bourgeois papers write. But I shall quote a paper which is frequently quoted by Comrade Bukharin—the

"Arbeiter-Zeitung"—a labour paper published by Otto Bauer. (Voice: "There is a touching affinity between you and Bauer!") It will suffice to read only the beginning. (Commotion, cries of indignation.) In the issues of November 16 and 20 we read:—

"The criticism of the Opposition hitherto undoubtedly hampered Stalin in adopting a consistent course, without having to look backward to the utopian illusions, along a more realistic path in the sphere of economic and foreign policy."

The same thing is said in the issue of the 20th. At the same time there is the American tribute. (Bukharin: "That's weak, it's weak!" Soltz: "In general, you have to look to the bourgeois press to confirm the correctness of your position.") I have before me the "New York Times," which says that to keep the Opposition means to keep the explosive matter which lies beneath the capitalist world. (Laughter, commotion, shouts, protests, and indignation.)

It is an alarming coincidence. Here we are told that we must fight the Opposition, and abroad we also hear that it is necessary to fight the Opposition. (Commotion. Voices: "Your friends, Ruth Fischer and Maslow, say abroad that it is necessary for you to undermine the Party!")

Another point, Comrades, the majority, or, at any rate, many of the reactionary newspapers say that whatever is done against the Opposition is all right but inadequate. (Kossior: "Don't you read anything else but bourgeois newspapers?") I have before me the "Temps" of the 8th November, where, in connection with Comrade Stalin's replies to questions of the international workers' delegation, it is said:—

"Despite the deceptive surface, the Soviet machine cannot seriously develop and Russia cannot expect its rescue by any other means but the final destruction of the proletarian dictatorship." (Commotion.)

I have presented here only an insignificant part of what is written day in and day out. I quoted those which say that "it is all right but inadequate," and those which

say "we need more convincing proof." (Soltz: "You gave us the bourgeois point of view!") What is there alarming about this phenomenon? The newest phenomenon in our international situation, the arrogant attempts of world imperialism to interfere in our inner Party controversy . . . to throw their weight on the side of the majority. The characteristic feature of the present situation is the deterioration of our international position. At the same time, the whole effort of world imperialism, based on the Right leanings in the Party, the whole effort of the world bourgeoisie, consists in the aim of isolating ideologically from the world proletariat—(commotion)—to divorce us ideologically from the world proletariat. Comrades, all of us in the Party remember Lenin's advice—(Voice: "You do not remember, you have forgotten it! Mensheviks! Agents of the world bourgeoisie!")—that it is necessary for us to manœuvre in foreign affairs. We are sometimes reproached by the capitalist States for playing on their rivalries. (Commotion.) However, they themselves play the same game against each other. We must do it to a still greater extent. We are a proletarian State, living under extreme and incomparable difficulties. But in manœuvring, it is necessary to take two main points for our departure. First of all, we must know the limits of the manœuvres. (Voice: "What do you intend to do in the future? Why don't you tell us about that?") Comrade Tomsky complained in Leningrad that the Opposition interfered with the Polit. Bureau in adopting necessary and logical decisions. He said that in order to manœuvre freely we must get rid of the Opposition. (Voices: "Quite right!" Commotion.) I ask you if the Left wing of the Party is to be expelled . . . (Voices: "Get out of the Party and be done with it. Away with the Mensheviks from the platform! This platform is not for Mensheviks. It is not a Left but a Menshevik wing.") The Congress insists on his removal. "Down, down!" Commotion. Chairman rings the bell.)

Chairman: Who is in favour of allowing Comrade Rakovsky to continue his speech?

Nobody.

## COMRADE RUDZUTAK'S SPEECH:

Comrades, Marx said somewhere that one need not be a petty shopkeeper to voice the views of the petty bourgeoisie. (Voice: "That is what Rakovsky did just now!" Applause.) I think that Comrade Rakovsky's speech was a brilliant confirmation of this idea—(Voices: "Hear, hear!")—because his entire speech was the speech of a petty shopkeeper, although I think we can assert that Comrade Rakovsky himself is, as yet, not a shopkeeper (laughter). Let us take his first statement that the external danger is the greatest danger at the present time. It would have been a very good thing, both for Comrade Rakovsky and for the Party, if he had realised this truth at least a month or a month and a half ago. But not so very long ago Comrade Rakovsky, Trotsky, and all other Opposition leaders, were of a different opinion. They thought that the biggest danger in our country is the Central Committee of our Party. (Voices: "Shame!") Only now, at the 15th Congress, where, instead of a majority, which they hoped to have here a year ago, they have not even a single vote, they want to manoeuvre so as to be able to derive some profit from it or at least save something for themselves. But it is not enough to say at the 15th Congress that the external danger is the greatest danger and that "we will support you." It would be a fine thing if you could come out here and say that you will not support the Party and the working class against a bourgeois offensive. (Voice: "In which case you would not even be admitted to the hall!") It is a fine Communist who says from the platform of the Party Congress that he will support the Party and the working class against an attack of the enemies! (Voice: "Shame!" Applause.) In this respect we have heard more congenial speeches from the non-Party workers who greeted here the 15th Party Congress. (Voices: "Hear, hear!" Applause.) It is therefore absolutely absurd and ridiculous for Rakovsky to say that they will support us now. But how have they supported us hitherto in the face of the same world bourgeoisie about which Comrade Rakovsky, spoke so much? I have before me an extract from yesterday's paper to the following effect:—

"Despite the numerous denials by T.A.S.S., the foreign Press, fed by unreliable sources, particularly from Roumania, repeat the communication, in connection with the Opposition struggle in the Party, concerning uprisings and mutinies in the Red Army supposed to have occurred in the Ukraine and allegedly suppressed with great difficulty by the 'loyal' sections of the Red Army and the G.P.U. forces."

This is a result of the "support" of the Opposition—it is a result, by the way, of the fact that Comrade Rakovsky said in Kharkov before foreign delegates that we have Fascists in the Party. (Radetchenko: "This is how Rakovsky educates the workers!" Voice: "Shame!")

It is to a large extent due to this "support" we received from Rakovsky, Trotsky, Zinoviev and others, up to the 15th Congress, that we have the aggressive onslaught of the bourgeoisie. We may thank them for the fact that the danger of intervention has increased; it is precisely due to the "support" of the Opposition, which is backing the bourgeois hope of seeing us weak, to see our internal collapse, to see desolation in our country; it is, in this respect, the best pillar of all bourgeois slander against the U.S.S.R., as the action of the Opposition and its struggle against the C.C. and against the Party, were carried on with the object of weakening both the C.C. and the Party.

Rakovsky's statement that a manifestation of weakness does not make war more distant but closer sounds particularly ridiculous. What is it that you have been talking about all the time? Was it of our strength? Ever since the 14th Congress you have been shouting from the housetops that our economy is breaking down, the position of the working class is becoming worse, the position of the peasantry deteriorates, the kulak danger increases, the worker is depressed, and that bureaucracy and Fascism are thriving within the Party. You have been saying all these things despite the fact that we have been growing and strengthening. It is therefore absolutely ridiculous for Rakovsky to say that we manifest weakness by not declaring war on France, only because France did not want Rakovsky. Rakovsky himself, at one time, advised that we must not start a conflict, but now, you see, if we do

not declare war on France because of Rakovsky it is a sign of our weakness. You have been arguing in the course of the last two years that everything is going to the dogs and that it is easy to come and take us alive. Does this not mean that you are encouraging a new intervention? You, more than anyone else, have created this danger. Abroad you have prepared the ground for the belief that the U.S.S.R. has become weakened, that a military offensive is not dangerous, and that there is a chance of victory over the Soviet Union. Are not the calumnies circulated by the foreign Press a preparation for a military offensive on us, and are they not largely fed by the information and slander concerning our country and the Party coming from the Opposition.

As you see, Comrade Rakovsky could not say anything about the substance of Comrade Stalin's speech because the acoustic conditions were unfavourable and prevented his hearing it. Apparently there is some kind of peculiar Opposition deafness. (Voices: "He is both blind and deaf! He has lost his sense of hearing and smell.") It is not in Comrade Stalin's speech alone that he could hear the Party's opinion on the Opposition and on the necessary measures to cure the Opposition disease. After all, the whole Party has been speaking about it for almost two years. Are Rakovsky's ears really so stopped up that he could not hear the voice of the Party on what it thinks about the Opposition? Is that why he had nothing to bring to the 15th Congress but the yarn of a petty shop-keeper? (Voice: "He is as blind as an owl!")

How does the Opposition propose to overcome this malady? We do not need the chatter delivered here by Comrade Rakovsky about "defence in face of the bourgeoisie," and we must get rid of this kind of defence at all costs. (Applause.) It is not so very long ago that the Opposition accused us of national narrowness on the question of Socialist construction in one country. But to-day, Comrade Rakovsky says: I do not share Comrade Stalin's optimism concerning the growing working-class sympathies abroad for our Union. On the contrary, he says, we see growing indifference to the U.S.S.R. This, Comrade Rakovsky, marks your complete bankruptcy.

If you have lived long enough to think that there is no hope whatever for the sympathy of the West European workers, it means that according to you our revolution, our Party, our working class, has got into a blind alley and there is no outlook for our revolution whatsoever. One cannot accuse us one day of national narrowness because we were convinced of the possibility of the building up of Socialism in our country and declare the next day that we have no sympathy, no support from the West European and American workers. You reveal in this respect a complete disbelief in the solidarity of the working class. I think that, nevertheless, your agitation abroad will not take such deep root as to be able really to frighten away from us the sympathies of the western workers from the Party, from the U. S. S. R. You, Comrade Rakovsky, are absolutely estranged from the life of the working class and workers' organisations, both here and abroad. You do not see the tremendous changes which are taking place both here and there. You do not see the onslaught of a new revolutionary wave on the basis of the economic changes taking place abroad. Is not the new war menace against the Soviet Union one of the signs that the ground is shaking under the stabilisation of the capitalist world? Is it not a sign that new subterranean disturbances are in process which bring to the surface not only the capitalist offensive, but also a new wave of the revolutionary movement? If we had no belief in the solidarity of the working class of Western Europe should we still be in a position to say that we should continue building our Socialist economy and the Socialist State? Should we be in a position to speak of world revolution? Comrade Rakovsky said these things to-day. From him the things he accused us of yesterday are no longer valid to-day. Comrade Rakovsky's conclusion when he deals with the attitude to our Union abroad is: The "Kölnische Zeitung" or some other bourgeois paper says: "By the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, Soviet Russia is no longer spoken of as an ideological menace, but as of any other State." Immediately after this Rakovsky turns the page of his notes and says that Russia was never subjected to such an ideological attack as at the present time. What is the



trouble with you, Comrade Rakovsky? What has happened to you? If you are so upset, would it not be better to bring a laundress instead of a notebook in delivering your next Opposition speech. (Laughter.)

I want to deal briefly with the new document which—(Voice: "When was it concocted?")—the Commission elected by the Congress to investigate the Opposition question, received.

That document is so remarkable that we cannot refrain from mentioning it even before the report of the Commission. I think that this olive branch document which the Opposition presented to the 15th Congress is the most false, most hypocritical thing and the biggest swindle the Opposition ever produced. (Applause.)

First of all it is an absolutely ridiculous threat to say:

"Besides the development of the inner Party struggle definitely endangers the unity of our Party."

You lie! The withdrawal of 4,000 intellectuals from a Party with over one million members does not split the Party. ("Hear, hear!" Applause.) Our Party continuously and incessantly takes in new elements and purges itself by throwing out from its midst the useless elements and absorbing new ones. This renovation has been in progress throughout the year not within the limits of 4,000, but of tens of thousands. Isn't the Party growing and is it not being purged as a result of that? It grows daily, it becomes strengthened both qualitatively and quantitatively, as by means of its practical work and political experience it gradually discharges the refuse which enters through its pores. Such a Party cleansing has now taken place by throwing out 4,000 good-for-nothing and thoroughly rotten intellectuals. Is this a break up of our Party? (Applause.) That is why you, dear Oppositionists, can scare no one by uttering terrible phrases about the danger of a split in the Party. There is no split and there will not be. (Voices: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

Further they say:—

"In the struggle for our views we have adopted path of factionalism."

It is not true that you have chosen the path of fac-

tionalism: you have chosen the path of reaction— (Applause)—because all your work, particularly your recent work before the Congress and before the pre-Congress discussion had nothing in common with ordinary factional struggles. It was a most typical anti-Party struggle and also a struggle against the Soviet Government. (Voice: "Hear, hear!") Your statement, therefore, that you have chosen the path of factionalism is a foxy attempt to cover up the traces. You will not succeed in that. The facts we have our disposal speak too eloquently about your actions. Nothing has ever done so much harm to our Party as your activities. If you really recognise your mistakes, then you must come to the 15th Party Congress, call a spade a spade, and admit your mistakes.

Further they say:—

"But we were forced on to this path by our deep conviction of the correctness and the Leninist character of our views." (Laughter.)

I want to ask those of you who are here: Is it really possible that these people believe in the correctness of their contention that the Central Committee entered into an alliance with the kulak and the Nepmen? Did they really believe in the correctness of their views when they maintained that our economy is becoming definitely ruined, that we are not carrying out our industrialisation, that agriculture falls to pieces, and that we are developing into capitalism? Did you believe that? No, you did not. If you did believe it how could you change your opinion ten times in the course of one year? Did not Trotsky say at the end of 1925, in connection with Dnieprostroï, that "the kulak is a blessing to us if he sells his grain to the Soviet Government for which it can import machinery." Why have Trotsky's views changed so radically in two years? Have the ideas which seemed to you a year and a half or two years ago correct really changed? How can you profoundly "ideological" people change your views and your ideas as you would change your jacket? Do you believe that we are developing into Thermidor, that we have become a Thermidor Party? How so? If you believe that, then your statement that you have no

differences of programme with the Party is absolutely false. One of the two, either you believed in what you were saying, in which case you were viciously slandering the Party, or you lie when you say that you have no differences of programme with our Party. What about your platform and other literary creations during the last few years—what would you call them? Is it not a new programme? Is it not setting up counter-views to those of the Party? I think that Comrade Stalin put the question properly when he said "In what do you agree with our Party?"

Is there any point on which you agree with us? No, there is not. There is not a single point, either theoretical or practical. For instance, the Opposition formerly demanded that 30 per cent. of the poor peasants be freed from the agricultural tax. When the manifesto freed 35 per cent., Zinoviev said, at an illegal meeting in Leningrad: "Now we shall demand that 40 to 50 per cent. of the peasants be freed from the tax." (Laughter.) Such is the value of your statements! No matter what the Party may say, no matter what the C.C. may do, you will always say the exact opposite.

And after that you come out into the open here with a false document, which, from the point of view of the Opposition, is conciliatory, you come out with a false statement that you have no differences of programme with the Party. There is not a single point on which you agree with the Party. That is the truth!

Further they say:—

"We did not and do not intend to make non-Party people the judges of our inter-Party conflicts."

(Voice: "No one believes them!") Is that true? (Voices: "It is not!") Let us take this same document and we will find some false signatures on it. I read from memory: Vuyovitch, a member of the Party since 1912. If my memory does not fail me, he is not a Party member. (Laughter.) You have come together with non-Party people to pass judgment over our Party at the 15th Congress and then you write in this document that you did not and do not intend to appeal to non-Party people to pass judgment on the differences between you and the Party. (Voices:

"How about the November 7th demonstration?") And you have on this document dozens of false signatures of people who claim to be Party members, but are not. (Voice: "They do not recognise our C.C.C., they have their own.") And what about your street demonstration, not before non-Party workers, but before the market crowd, the mob? (Voice: "They seek their supporters on the Okhotnyi Riad Market.") You seek your support there because you have lost it among the working class. You had to get the sweepings of the street to find some support. And after that, you come forward with the false statement that you did not and do not intend to let non-Party people pass judgment on our Party differences. Yes, dear comrades, we do not intend to stand before the bar with you. We are not the accused at the bar! We have not yet been summoned to court, but you stand now accused before the 15th Congress and you must answer for your activity during the last two years.

Further, they say in their statement, the same as Rakovsky said:—

"In face of the international bourgeoisie, speculating on a Party split and ever more insistently preparing war against the U.S.S.R., we consider it our duty to do our utmost in order to strengthen the fighting unity of our Party."

(Voice: "Even to the extent of street demonstrations!") -

This is false and hypocritical. It is not with statements such as these that you ought to bring the olive branch to the 15th Party Congress. All your activities, all your falsehood and slander carried on through traitors and deserters, through Ruth Fischer, Maslow, and similar calumniators—was that, then, strengthening the Soviet front in face of the foreign danger? Did not the falsehood and slander which has been circulated within the country among our peasants, the non-Party workers, the burghers, and the bourgeoisie—did that not weaken our front against the onslaught of the world bourgeoisie? The rumours being circulated abroad concerning our Thermidorism, concerning our becoming Nepmen, concerning our

having entered into an alliance with the kulak—was that perhaps strengthening the united proletarian front against the offensive of the world bourgeoisie, against the united capitalist front? How do you dare to come before the 15th Congress with such an audacious lie and say that in face of the foreign foe, you agree to support the power of the Soviet Union? All that is left for you to do is to speak to the world bourgeoisie because your conscience would not allow you to speak to the working class. (Applause.)

“We consider it our duty to do everything necessary in order to strengthen the fighting unity of our Party.”

We have seen the first step—(Voice: Hypocrisy!)—towards the fighting unity of our Party made by the Opposition through Rakovsky at the 15th Congress. What has he done to strengthen our unity? We heard nothing from him but his panicky and petty bourgeois nonsense. If you, Comrade Rakovsky, had come and said: Well, we dissolve our C.C., represented by such and such people and dissolve our district committees, represented by such and such people; here we liquidate our, as yet undiscovered, printing establishments in such and such places, which we hand over for the use of the corresponding Soviet institutions—(Voice: “The archives!” Laughter)—then I would really understand that you have come with real intentions to establish the fighting unity of the Party. (Applause.) But you have come here with falsehood and deception. On this basis there can be no peace. (Voice: “Hear, hear!” Applause.)

Further, the words in your statement—

“We declare before the Congress that we cease all our factional work, dissolve all factional organisations, and call upon our fellow-thinkers in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern to do likewise”

also sound hypocritical. (Commotion.) This reminds me a little of the parrot which cried, when caught by the cat: “That’s the way to do it!” (Laughter.) It is all right for you to say now that you are dissolving the faction, giving up your struggle when you are smashed. But against whom will you fight and with what? You have no army?

You have no men! You have remained alone; you have only the world bourgeoisie. You have nothing else. Look at the audience we have before us. (He points to the audience.) This is our working class; but you have before you the world bourgeoisie. On which side are you? You are not with us now and where you will be later we do not know.

At any rate, these declarations do not show that you really intend to return to us.

I think that the Congress is not so much faced with the question how to regard the work of our Opposition during the last few years as with the question how to create conditions for peaceful and fruitful work for our Party and our C.C.

I think that there can be only one answer to this question. We must have real repentance and a real dissolution of the faction.' The cards must be exposed. All illegal organisations must be dissolved, all mistakes admitted; it will not do to say that you dissolve your faction, and that you will advocate your views, just as you have done hitherto. I think that we have a right to say that your views are incompatible with membership in our Party. (Voices: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

I think that we can recall here the words of one of the former "dear leaders," Comrade Kamenev, at the 11th Party Conference of the Moscow Gubernia, in speaking about the Trotskyist Opposition.

When some people said that it was necessary to make peace and form an alliance with them, he pictured the Opposition as a multi-coloured bushy tail about which he came to the following conclusion: "If we embrace this tail, I should say the kiss would not be appetising. Would it not, therefore, be better to do as we were always advised, namely, first cut off the bushy tail and then embrace?" I think Kamenev has had plenty of experience during the last two years in kissing, not only the tail! (Applause.) But, nevertheless, it seems to me, we shall not act in this instance quite according to Kamenev's advice. We shall cut off the tail sure enough, but we will omit the kissing. (Prolonged applause.)

### COMRADE KAMENEV'S SPEECH:

Comrades, I appear on this platform only with the object of finding a path to peace between the Opposition and the Party. I have heard Comrade Andreiev's speech, from which one may deduce that the path of peace has already been cut off and that it no longer exists. But I think that in so far as the Congress has been discussing this question for several days, in so far as it has elected a special commission for this question, then Comrade Andreiev, a member of that commission, was rather too hasty in saying that every path had already been cut off, that everything had ended, and that there is nothing left for the Congress to do but to record what has already been decided. (Voice: "It depends on you.")

I want to hope that this is not so. The Opposition constitutes a minority in the Party. Naturally it, on its part, cannot put forward any conditions to the Party. It can only bring before the Congress the conclusion that it has come to for itself from the history of the two years of struggle, and answer the questions which have been put before it.

Two years ago, at the 14th Congress, we differed from the majority on a number of fundamental questions of our revolution—not unimportant questions, serious questions: concerning the direction of our attack, the growth and importance of the anti-proletarian elements in the country, particularly in the villages, the methods of struggle against them, the estimation of the international situation from the point of view of the firmness of stabilisation, and, in this connection, concerning the Comintern policy. The struggle within the Party around these issues during these two years has become so acute that for all of us arises the question of choosing one of two paths. One of these paths is the organisation of a second party. This path is under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship ruinous for the revolution. That is a path of political and class degeneration. This path is prohibited, inadmissible and excluded by the entire nature of our views, by Lenin's teachings on the proletarian dictatorship. We cannot lead our fellow-thinkers along this path.

Hence, only the second path is left. This path, after

a fierce, stubborn, and sharp struggle for our views, is the complete and thorough capitulation to the Party. We choose this path because we are deeply convinced that the correct Leninist policy can be triumphant only in our Party and only through it, but not outside of the Party, and not despite of it. To choose this path means that we must submit to and carry out all decisions of the Congress, no matter how hard they may be for us. (Voice: "Formally!")

In so doing we act like Bolsheviks. But if to this unconditional and complete submission to all Congress decisions the complete cessation, complete liquidation of every form of factional struggle and dissolution of the factional organisations, we should add a renunciation of our views—that, in our opinion, would not be acting like Bolsheviks. This demand of renouncing views has never been put forward in our Party. If we should renounce views which we advocated a week or two ago, it would be hypocrisy on our part, and you would not believe us. If I should come here and say that I renounce everything I published in my theses two weeks ago you would not believe it. It would be hypocrisy, on my part and such hypocrisy is unnecessary. This hypocrisy would bring decay into the very essence of the matter from the very beginning, from the moment the corner-stone of peace is being laid. No one wants that. Of course, I speak of the views which are really our views . . . (Voroshilov: "We want the renunciation of your Menshevik views!")—the views laid down in our document—the platform and theses—signed by us and not of the exaggerations which are often ascribed to us. Many responsible Party leaders have recently spoken openly of serious difficulties which the Party and the country are experiencing at the present moment. We think that these difficulties can be fully overcome, but that a necessary condition for overcoming them is criticism of our own mistakes, readiness to correct and revise our policy, to test it by actual facts and change it if necessary. We think that our criticism, which we pledge ourselves to carry on within strict limits of the Party statutes, will still be of use to the Party, the more so since on several questions our views have been confirmed by life itself, and in



some cases have been adopted by the Party in one form or another.

Tell me what sense is there in insisting that we renounce our views? Can you insist that we renounce our opinions concerning the Anglo-Russian Committee? Can you insist that we renounce our opinions on the Chinese revolution? (Voice: "What do you renounce?") Can you insist that we renounce our opinions on the question of the differentiation of the peasantry? Can you insist that we renounce our views on the question of our industry lagging behind the general trend of development in our country?

Did not the Anglo-Russian Committee die an inglorious death without justifying the hopes that were put in it? Did not the trend of the Chinese revolution prove that it was wrong to rely on the Right and Left Kuomintang? Does not the present economic situation confirm our contention that the kulak elements in the rural districts break up our State plans—the export plan and consequently also the plan of fixed capital investments? Has not the accentuation of the commodity famine again become the central economic problem?

This is a truth about which the Party leaders are telling you. It is not my truth, it is not what I tell you, it is what every economist will tell you. Under these conditions, comrades, the demand that we renounce our views is a thing which cannot be complied with. I will take only one more example which is of absolutely burning importance. The fundamental point of our contention at the 14th Congress was the question of the correlation between our Socialist and peasant economy. You know that it was precisely on this question that we differed at the 14th Congress and after it. It was precisely on this point that you charged us with disbelief, lack of faith, fright in face of the kulak, and disbelief in the construction of Socialism. We, for our part, maintained that the opinions developing in the Party on this question suffer from unfounded optimism, presentation of the New Economic Policy in glowing colours, under-rating the rural capitalist elements, and that this decides the direction of our attack. This, therefore, is one of the central and main points of contention

But several months ago one of our most responsible economic and political leaders said in the Polit. Bureau on this main question, the following:—

“I ought to tell you that we have reached a stage when the peasant element, the peasant grain market, is fully and entirely in our hands. We can, at any time, lower or raise prices on corn, we have all the ropes in our hands . . . because there is no one behind the peasant and no one to interfere with us.” (From Comrade Mikoyan’s report on the reduction of retail prices—verbatim report of the session of the Polit. Bureau of the C.C., C.P.S.U., January 3, 1927.)

Has this not been refuted by reality? Is this not a wrong estimation, a wrong view? Do not the facts of our economic situation prove now that this was a wrong estimation. And from this wrong estimation of the correlation of classes followed a wrong policy. This wrong policy in its turn led not to the overcoming of difficulties, but to their augmentation, to their growth and accentuation. It dimmed the true perspective of the problems which we are facing at the present time, and which must be solved somehow or other. But this is not an individual mistake of an individual comrade.

At the bottom of this error lies the wrong estimation of the correlation of classes in the country. But we Marxians, disciples of Lenin—(Voices: “Ex-disciples”!)—know that from a wrong estimation of the correlation of classes inevitably follows a wrong policy and a wrong tactic. Therefore, so long as such estimations, which are the foundation of a wrong practical policy, are possible in the Party, we cannot renounce our criticism of these views, we cannot abandon the desire to correct them and issue warnings to the Party, even causing alarm concerning such estimations and views. I am convinced that this criticism, if carried on within the limits of the statutes, within the limits dictated by the fact that our Party is a ruling party—I am convinced that such a criticism helps the proletarian dictatorship, that it safeguards the proletarian dictatorship against difficulties and shocks. The demand, under such conditions, that we renounce our views is a thing that

cannot be complied with and is inadmissible. Within the strict limits of our statutes, within the strict limits of the Party decisions we are obliged to carry these views into action and to advocate them.

If you demand anything else you augment artificially the obstacles lying in the path of peace in the Party, which we have sincerely chosen. (Voice: "This is a manoeuvre, and nothing more nor less!") Such demands can be put forward only if you have decided to cut off this path. If you choose that, then of course you can put forward any kind of demands to make sure that they will not be complied with.

I am now coming to the second question. You have set up a condition of disarming the Opposition. You demand from us a guarantee that this disarmament will take place. This is natural. No one is obliged to take anybody's word in politics. If you do not believe us there is only one way, and that is to test our activities. (Voices: "We have been testing them for two years!") Otherwise you can have no guarantees. Wherein lies the guarantee? You will not believe my word of honour, will you? (Laughter. Voices: "Oh, no, we certainly will not!") Consequently, comrades, the Party has one possibility of testing the sincerity and determination of our statements—viz., to give us a chance to prove them in action. There is no other method. (Voice: "Put your illegal organisation on the table!") I do not carry the illegal organisation in my pocket, and I cannot put it on the table. . . . Since we have been saying at this Congress that we decided to capitulate to the Party and to surrender all our factional ammunition we keep no secrets from you.

Our fellow thinkers frankly signed several documents directed to the C.C. of the Party. (Voice: "Without even reading them!") There are about 3,000 signatures attached to the statement of the "83." That statement is in your hands. Our fellow thinkers spoke frankly during the discussion in the nuclei in defence of our platform. You may find their opinions are wrong, you may think they were mistaken, but they behaved like brave revolutionaries. (Voices: "They behaved disgracefully! Counter-revolutionaries act that way.")

**SOLTZ** : The Mensheviks also bravely advocated their views, they went to prison for them.

**KAMENEV** : They advocated their views openly, and considered them higher than their jobs. They were ready to sacrifice their positions for the ideas which you think are wrong, which perhaps you will condemn, but which they considered right, regardless of the consequences.

A situation in which people like Mratchkovsky are in prison—(Voices : " Because they set up a printer's shop ! ")—while we are free is intolerable. We have been fighting together with those comrades. We are responsible for all their actions. Now we come together with them to the Party and ask to be given the opportunity to blot out that period of our Party history. We cannot be separated from them. When you try to separate us from them you no longer respect us. (Voice : " We have had no respect for you ever since October 16th ! ")

Our position in face of this choice—a second Party or back to the Party—is clear. We must go back to the Party, by all means. We ask the Congress, if the Congress wants to go down in history not as an iconoclast Congress but as a Congress of conciliation : Give us a helping hand.

Do not make it more difficult for us by issuing demands which cannot be carried out and which are not worthy of Bolsheviks. The working class wants peace. Despite all differences, despite the sharpness of the struggle, we have a common interest with you, and that is to preserve unity in the Party as the main lever in the proletarian dictatorship. This can be done on the basis of our submission to the decisions of the Congress, which we guarantee to do. (Voice : " We do not believe it ! ") This must be done in the interests of the cause sponsored by Lenin. (Commotion.) I express my firm conviction that the Congress will do it in spite of everything. (Commotion. Voice : " You must first earn our confidence ! ")

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **COMRADE RYKOV'S SPEECH :**

**CHAIRMAN** (Rudzutak) : Comrade Rykov has the floor. (Stormy and prolonged applause, shouts of " Hurrah ! ") The delegates rise to their feet.)

RYKOV : Comrades, Comrade Kamenev concluded his speech with the declaration that he does not dissociate himself from the Opposition in prison. I should begin my speech with the statement that I do not dissociate myself from the revolutionaries who put some of the Opposition followers into prison for their anti-Party and anti-Soviet action. (Tumultuous applause; shouts of "Hurrah!" Voice: "Long live the Leninist C.C. Hurrah!") The delegates rise and applaud). Comrade Kamenev's speech is the only Opposition speech at the 15th Congress which was more or less devoted to the subject every Opposition member is obliged to speak on—the question as to what the Opposition intends to do. It must be firmly and categorically declared that Comrade Kamenev's speech does not satisfy the Congress in the least, and it cannot satisfy the Party.

The fundamental point in Kamenev's speech is his statement that the demand that people should renounce their views has never been put forward in our Party. On this ground he claims we have no right to demand that the Opposition should renounce its views. This is not true. In order to refute this contention I will recall the resolution of the 10th Congress of the Communist Party of Russia on the question of "the syndicalist and anarchist deviation in our Party"—(Radtchenkoff: "They forget that.")—which appeared in the Workers' Opposition. In par. 6 of that resolution, after an enumeration of the mistaken views and an analysis of the ideas of the Workers' Opposition, we read :

"On the basis of all this, the Congress of the C.P.R., whilst emphatically repudiating the ideas enumerated which represent a syndicalist and anarchist tendency, resolves :—

1. To consider a systematic and relentless struggle against these ideas necessary;
2. To recognise the propagation of these ideas incompatible with membership in the C.P.R."

As you see, Comrade Kamenev, the Bolshevik traditions demand the prohibition of the advocacy of ideas recognised as anti-Party and anti-Bolshevik by Party

members. (Voices : "Did you hear it? That's one for you, Comrade Kamenev!")

I repeat, Comrade Kamenev, the 10th Bolshevik Congress repudiated the ideas of the Workers' Opposition and recognised their propagation as inadmissible within the ranks of the Communist Party. That was said concerning the anarcho-syndicalist tendency. This must be repeated now with even greater emphasis, clarity, and firmness concerning the Menshevik tendency. I recall the resolution of the 10th Congress only in order to reassert the Bolshevik traditions and to counter Comrade Kamenev's attempts to distort them in a liberal sense.

The very fact that the Oppositionists do not take cognisance of but try to ignore this resolution, shows beyond dispute how far they have departed ideologically from the Party. (Voice : "Hear, hear.")

With the active participation of the present leaders of the Opposition, the 10th Congress recognised the advocacy of views, then sponsored by the Workers' Opposition, as incompatible with Party membership. At the present Congress, after a prolonged period of Opposition struggle against the party, unparalleled in intensity and form, after many categorical decisions of Party Congresses and Conferences, which declared Trotsky's ideas, now become the ideas of the whole united Opposition, Menshevik ideas, there now arises the question of recognising the propagation and advocacy of these ideas as incompatible with membership of the C.P.S.U. The 15th Congress must settle this question in the same manner as the 10th Congress settled the question of the Workers' Opposition. Only such a formulation of the question will be in keeping with the Bolshevik traditions, in keeping with what Lenin proposed at the 10th Congress. Those who, like Comrade Yevdokimov, see in the Party demand that the Opposition followers renounce the propagation of their Menshevik views, a "superfluous obstacle" to the dissolution of the faction, an obstacle to finding the way back to the party, cease to the Bolsheviks. Such people are not in agreement with the party.

Kamenev is not a young Party member, nevertheless he spoke here on the question of "Freedom of Conscience"

in the C.P.S.U. He forgot one "minor detail," namely, the decision of the 10th Congress adopted with his active collaboration. But this is not simple forgetfulness. It is a part of the Opposition strategy, a new manoeuvre for the attainment of its aims.

The Trotskyists recently came out into the streets: "Down with Ustrialovism! Down with Thermidor!" What does that mean? It means that the Opposition came out into the streets to the working class, accusing the C.C. of pursuing an Ustrialov policy, that Thermidor has set in in the country, that the C.C. of the Communist Party betrays the revolution, betrays the working class. Did Comrade Schliapnikov ever do anything like it? Did he ever carry banners with inscriptions against the Party on the streets of Moscow or Leningrad? Did he openly appeal to the non-Party masses? That was not the case in connection with the Workers' Opposition. But Kamenev, with his associates, came out into the streets to rally the crowd to banners with slogans calling for the overthrow of the C.C. (Voice: "Shame!")

That was a call for the overthrow of the C.C. It was an open challenge to the Soviet Government. (Voice: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

Comrade Kamenev, this was only a month ago. You are telling the Congress that you take responsibility only for the views laid down in the documents signed by Opposition members. But you will not succeed in shirking responsibility, for instance, for the attempt to organise open anti-Party demonstrations. You have partly given voice to your anti-Party ideas in documents submitted to the C.C. (that is why some of your documents were not published by the C.C.). But you pursued a different aim in those documents, namely, the preservation of a legal basis for the struggle against the Party and for the pursuance of your illegal work which was, of course, done "without signatures." We hold you responsible for your deeds in toto. (Laughter. Applause.)

The Opposition has acquired a habit of submitting documents to the C.C., in which they champion what they consider necessary and possible to advocate "within the framework of the Statutes," and Party rules, but parallel

with that they issue proclamations, by illegal means, and unfurl the banner of struggle against the Party and the Government. They have the audacity to come to this Congress and say that they never accused the Party and the C.C. of Thermidorism, of degeneration, and that they never thought that our government has ceased to be a workers' government, and so forth and so on. I have before me a collection of extracts from speeches and statements in which they clearly and categorically advanced these accusations against the Party and the Government. I will not read them because all delegates of the Congress know them only too well. Beginning with the doubt as to the Socialist character of our socialist industry, with the assertion that it is impossible to build up a Socialist system of society in the U.S.S.R. owing to the technical backwardness of our economy—they end with the bourgeois degeneration of our State, the Government and the Party, and that the central Party institutions take the lead in that degeneration. It is exactly these accusations which most clearly reveal the Menshevik background of their ideas. It is precisely these accusations, thanks to their monstrous falsehood, that drew a line of demarcation between the Opposition and the working class, between the Opposition and our Party.

It is from these statements, from these basic conceptions, that the Trotskyist Party proceeded in its work when it sent out its adherents into the streets and squares of Moscow with banners bearing the inscription: "Down with Ustrialovism!" These banners were not carried against some professor in the far East, but against the Party, against its central institutions, against the Soviet Government.

Yesterday, you appealed to the people through your illegal Party with the help of proclamations and banners to undertake a struggle against the Party, against its C.C., against the Soviet Government. To-day you say in your statement to the 15th Congress:—

"We never thought, and do not think, that our Party or its C.C. have become Thermidorian, or that our State has ceased to be a workers' State. . . . We still maintain and will continue to advocate our opinion that our Party is as it has been, the organisation of the



proletarian vanguard and that the Soviet State is the organisation of the proletarian dictatorship." (The Opposition statement submitted to the Presidium of the 15th Congress)

This contradiction alone sufficiently proves the falsehood, the absolute inadequacy of the Opposition statement to the 15th Congress.

How can we understand this double dealing? Only as an attempt on the part of the Opposition to conceal and to facilitate their real anti-Party and anti-Soviet work, their illegal Party. They legalised their illegal Party abroad and in their newspapers there they publish everything that they circulate illegally in the U.S.S.R.

The difference between the Trotskyist Opposition and the actions of Shliapnikov consists in the fact that the former recently tried to start a movement in the country, to get out into the streets and squares for a struggle against the Party, against the Soviet Government, something which the latter did not do. Therein lies the difference. (Voices: "Hear, hear.")

After this they try to appear as naive people crying that it is not Bolshevik tradition for the Party to prohibit the advocacy of views. First and foremost we prohibited the propagation of certain views in the past and will do so in the future. Secondly, it is not here a question of views but of deeds, of open action against the Party. From the anti-Party, Menshevik views of the Opposition evolved anti-party and anti-Soviet action. Therefore, even if we had no experience of struggle against anti-Party opinions under Comrade Lenin's leadership at the 10th Party Congress, the present Congress, since your "opinions" are immeasurably more dangerous than the ideas of the Workers' Opposition, is obliged to adopt a similar resolution. This is all the more imperative because of the fact that the Opposition leaders, after all these activities, have the audacity to say here that they adhere to their opinions, that they will advocate them "within the framework of the statutes," and that they are in agreement with those who are imprisoned, with those who are and will be imprisoned for such deeds.

Comrade Kamenev does not understand a mere trifle.

He does not understand the precipice lying between discussions in the Politbureau and the C.C. and discussions in the streets and at open meetings. The Opposition designates this transition from voting in Party institutions and Party Congress to an open struggle a "path of fractionalism . . . the employment in many cases of means which go against Party discipline." (The Opposition statement to the 15th Congress.) The Opposition question is no longer a current question of Party relations within the C.C., within the Party. We have before us a question of a great political struggle in the country during which the Opposition tried to organise demonstrations and unfurl its own banners against the C.C., etc. This has all been a result, Comrade Kamenev, of your Thermidorian and Clémenceau views. I do not think that after this you could expect that we should become reconciled to your views. The Party cannot allow the legalisation of such opinions in the Bolshevik ranks. A compromise is here out of the question. Either the Party or the advocacy of these views.

Evidently the Opposition does not want to understand this. Comrade Rakovsky came to the Congress and spoke about everything under the sun but the question which interests the Party in its relations to the Opposition. Comrade Yevdokimov glossed over these questions by speaking of mere trifles. I tried to give him a chance to express his opinion despite the indignation of the vast mass of Congress delegates in the hall, only to show, by his example, how shamefully these people have become degraded. (Voice: "Hear, hear.")

The substance of Comrade Kamenev's speech is the outcome of the decision of the illegal Central Committee of the Trotskyist Party. From that speech it is obvious that the Central Committee of the Opposition decided not to capitulate and to try to preserve in future its legality within our Party (preserving thereby the Habeas Corpus for their Menshevik ideology) and to screen its illegal activity. ("Hear, hear.")

This is the only logical explanation of Comrade Kamenev's speech. His statement that he and the other leaders are responsible only for the views which have been laid down in the document signed by them is a sign of

reluctance to renounce and to declare harmful and disastrous their entire Clémenceau, Thermidorian ideology, which is the basis of the activities of their illegal party. The banners with the slogans "Down with Ustrialovism!" and "Down with Thermidor!" are also documents, and by no means less important ones than the statements Comrade Kamenev signed for submission to the C.C. and C.C.C. or the Party Congress. Comrade Kamenev is an ex-member of the Government and he has had some political experience. He should not have complained about the fact that several people of the Opposition who indulged in an open sharp struggle against the Party have been imprisoned. He should have realised that considering the "situation" the Opposition endeavoured to create there are indeed very few under arrest. I think we cannot guarantee that the prison inhabitants will not have to be increased in the near future. (Tumultuous applause. Voices: "Hear, hear.")

In its attitude to the Opposition the Party cannot take as its starting point a document which Kamenev happened to sign or did not sign, or intends to sign.

The Party guides, and is responsible for, the administration of the State and the Socialist development of a vast country. When compared with the problems of the proletarian revolution all these diplomatic statements and signatures put together constitute a mere trifle. The Party and the revolution can pass them over lightly.

They say that when Lenin was with us it was not customary to expel people from the Party for their opinions. This is not true. People were expelled for their opinions. Had there been the slightest attempt made by the Workers' Opposition to organise several hundred of their followers and give them banners with the inscription, "Long live the Workers' Opposition, down with the C.C.," to carry to the Red Square—(Voice: "We would have shot them.")—what do you think, would Lenin have shilly-shalied with them as much as we are shilly-shalied with you? Did we not settle accounts with Miasnikov in two ticks? Is not the danger coming from Kamenev and his fellow thinkers a thousand times greater than we have ever had from any opposition ever since the Party has been in existence? Under Lenin the Party would never have allowed such

outrageous, such absolutely unheard of anti-Soviet action as we have witnessed recently. They tell us they are sincere. Comrade Kamenev, if you sincerely believe that a faction is harmful, and you have not a faction, but an independent party, if you think that the existence of an illegal party is harmful for the proletarian dictatorship, then why don't you get out of it? Who prevents you from doing so? When workers expel followers of the Opposition from their nuclei, the expelled ones are carefully handled by you; they occupy the most strategic positions in your illegal party in the struggle against us. Why should you not withdraw, in the interests of the revolution, from the Trotsky party? In your document you write that factions are harmful. Why do you remain in a faction to this day? If you are sincerely convinced that factions are harmful, every one of you should come here and declare that you have definitely broken with the faction and speak here as an enemy of the Trotsky party, which exists at the present time despite the differences among you, particularly with Trotsky. If the Oppositionists were sincere in their statement that they consider their factional anti-Party struggle harmful to the cause of the proletariat, then their second party and their faction would have ceased to exist long ago. They would then come out at the Congress not as a united opposition bloc, but as individual Party members. However, the united Opposition, despite the disagreements among them, still pursues its three-chamber policy—at first every group meets separately in separate rooms and then they come together—(Voice: "They are making up to one another.")—and then they separate, and then they meet again, and then they come here to the Congress as a unified separate party. This shows that they regard their factional discipline, even now when a breach has already occurred about Party discipline, that they speak to the Congress as if they were a separate party. Comrade Kamenev, that is exactly how matters stand. In dealing with the Party you are still trying to preserve for yourself the chance to try again through your illegal party to carry banners in the street against the C.P.S.U. We think it absolutely necessary

to do away with this possibility and to get this weapon out of your hands.

For this reason the reference of the Opposition to the repressive measures against ideological dissenters is utterly unsuccessful. They have stepped beyond the limit of dissensions admissible in one Party. From Comrade Kamenev's speech it is clear that he understands this perfectly well, and that is why his arguments concerning repressive measures sound so empty and hypocritical.

Things have gone so far that Bakaev, who has not been expelled from the Party, speaks here on behalf of several hundred people. He signs, for instance, on behalf of Serebriakov, who is now in America and with whom he could not even get in touch so soon even by radio. But, as you see, it is not even necessary for him to talk matters over with them. Bakaev is authorised to sign and decide for them. The members of the Opposition speaks not as members of our Party, but as members of the new Party, which is hostile to us. What notary authorised Comrade Kamenev to speak on behalf of two or three thousand members of the C.P.S.U.? Is it possible that these people are so naive as to think that we are obliged to accept this authorisation? By these statements alone it is proved that the Opposition has a definitely organised new Party (with its own views and its own discipline. Comrade Kamenev spoke of sincerity and hypocrisy. Excuse me, but he has two sincerities: one is underground and the other he keeps for us, for legal use. But who the devil can tell about which sincerity he spoke here? As a matter of fact, the "sincerity" of his statements, the substance of every one of his sentences, is determined not by his personal opinion, but by the decision of the C.C. of the Trotskyist illegal Party. We are confronted here with a new manoeuvre, such as the one of October 16th and August 8th. Comrade Kamenev, either one thing or another, either carry on your manoeuvres, then do so outside of our Party, or be sincere not in words but in deeds. Had there been at least a shade of sincerity and conviction on the part of Comrade Kamenev and Yevdokimov in their contention that the interests of the Party, the interests of the working class, stand for them above everything, they could not for a moment continue to

be in the other, the Trotskyist Party. But they speak here as the spokesmen of the Opposition; they have linked up their fate with the new illegal Party, while they tell us that they are against two parties.

Comrade Kamenev spoke before, and he signed a document, on behalf of two or three hundred people. He signed a document on behalf of a collective body—a new, a second party. The Party demands that you should unconditionally and without reservation, clearly and firmly, tear down what you have created, and admit your mistakes on such questions of principle as the question of Thermidor degeneration, the necessity of breaking with the middle peasant, and everything else on which you have uttered such endless nonsense. (Bukharin: "Let him denounce the Clémenceau thesis.") Denounce your Clémenceau thesis, the realisation of which began at the moment you became the centre of gravity of the third force—which began long ago. Admit that the Clémenceau thesis inevitably leads to the idea of a coup d'état. Tell the Party how you intended to drive the "Thermidorians" out of the C.C. and out of the Government.

Just imagine what would have happened if subsequent to the Opposition appeal to the street there had really been several thousand people on their side. They would come here as the masters of the situation. They would say that they have the people, the masses, behind them. You would not hear from them speeches about reconciliation, but about setting up an "anti-Thermidorian-Clémenceau" Government. But when the demonstration clearly proved on which side the working class stood, when Zinoviev almost had a taste of how pleasant it is under the proletarian dictatorship to float against the stream in the sewer—(Laughter)—then only did they come here with pseudo conciliatory speeches. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

From all the Opposition speeches from this platform nothing has been made clear—at least, not to me personally—(Bukharin: "Nor to anyone else.")—and there was nothing sincere. Not a single delegate at the Congress believes that the leaders of the Opposition Party, admitted to the Congress with consultative voice, really say what they

think. The interjections of the delegates that they do not believe Comrade Kamenev are the voice of the whole Party. Both Kamenev and Trotsky have taken active part in political life for over a score of years. Is it possible that they do not understand that their having come out into the streets with a battle-cry against the Party, against the Government, was a preparation for and organisation of a coup d'état in our country? How else can we understand this? (Voices: "Hear, hear.") There was an attempt made to get the masses out in a demonstration, was there not? There was. Zinoviev told the Plenum of the C.C. from this platform about the Leningrad demonstration. Had they really succeeded in getting some ten or a hundred thousand people behind them in a demonstration, would there have been a struggle in the streets of Leningrad and Moscow, or not? There would have been. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") This is what is usually called the organisation of civil war. How is it that after this they come here, like Comrade Rakovsky, to enact with diplomatic cynicism the decisions of their leading illegal centre: "Not to surrender now, but to make the appearance that I am not I, and the horse is not mine." (Laughter.) Hushing up their entire anti-Party activity, refusing to recognise openly the crime they committed against the dictatorship of the working class, not breaking definitely and once and for all with the Clémenceau-Thermidor and similar ideology, the Opposition says to the Party that it does not renounce its objects and tactics. Apparently their plan is as follows: "Let us keep on our offensive, and perhaps later it will be possible to rally more people than hitherto to our illegal banners." (Voices: "Hear, hear.")

If their statements were sincere, then the first thing for Comrades Kamenev and Yevdokimov to do was to say from this platform what they think as Party members, and not what they have been told to say by the ex-Party members, Zinoviev and Trotsky. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") They demand that the Party take them seriously after it has become well known that they are in permanent illegal session with their leaders who have been expelled from the Party, weighing, together with them, every word and every sentence with which they intended to blind the Congress and

the Party. If they think that the Bolshevik Party will stand for that and deal with them on this basis they are greatly mistaken.

It seems to me that it is necessary to make clear to all Party members the falsehood of Comrade Kamenev's and the Opposition's contention that it is non-Bolshevik to demand the renunciation of the right to advocate anti-Party views. Under Lenin the Party established harsh rules against the advocacy of opinions in the Party which did not tally with Party decisions, even if they were less dangerous for the revolution than the present Opposition opinions. Under Lenin's leadership the Party passed a decision concerning the incompatibility of advocating anti-Bolshevik views, whilst being a member of the Party. We are obliged to repeat this decision of the 10th Party Congress in respect to the Menshevik views of Trotskyism. The speeches of Yevdokimov and the other ringleaders of the Opposition at this Congress serve as new proof that such a decision is necessary. (Voices: "Hear, hear. We must kick them out, every one of them." Applause.)

Secondly, it is necessary to explain to all Party members that we are not merely having a comradesly chat here, but that we are adopting certain decisions as political leaders. (Voice: "Hear, hear.") It must be clear to Comrade Kamenev as well as to me and every one of us that in politics a word of honour is not worth a brass farthing. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") In a political struggle not the word of honour of one politician or another is worth consideration, but certain definite and absolute guarantees. It is a question of the responsibility of political leaders in a most important political period in the history of our Party and the revolutionary movement.

The Opposition is held responsible for all Opposition ideas in circulation, whether "signed" in documents or unsigned, for all activities both legal and illegal. The Opposition leaders must not show solidarity with those who have been subjected to repressive measures by the Soviet Government, which, according to their own statement of the 14th Congress, is a Government of proletarian dictatorship, but take responsibility for the violation of the laws of that dictatorship.



Comrade Kamenev will not succeed in throwing even a shadow of responsibility on the Party for the fact that several Oppositionists are in prison. I declare that Comrade Kamenev and the Opposition leaders are responsible for that. They brought them to it. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

In general we must kill the inclination of the Opposition to try to put the blame for what they have done and are doing on the Party. Comrade Kamenev will not succeed in his pose of a naive pupil of an elementary political circle. He is an old politician, and is fully responsible for every one of his steps, also for its subsequent consequences. It may be said about youngsters, about inexperienced Party members, that they have committed one mistake or another owing to their inexperience, or even against their will because someone urged them on to do so. The systematic and planned anti-Party actions of the Opposition leaders constitute a "distant range" tactic, which they endeavour to conceal with talk about matters which have nothing to do with the case. When Trotsky says, "I would not go out in the street with the slogan 'Down with the Thermidorians,' but I do not like the inner Party regime," it is enough to make a cat laugh.

I admit that in one thing we share responsibility with you for the conduct of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev; we are responsible in the sense that it is only now that we are putting a stop to their activity, that we have, you might say, been risking too much, when we gave them the chance to organise their illegal Party and to prepare for an occasion to appeal to the country.

We cannot get out of the present political situation without a radical decision. The interests of the whole Communist Party demand this. The interests of the working class demand this. The interests of the proletarian dictatorship and the defensive capacity of the country demand it; this is necessary in the interests of successful Socialist construction and the development of proletarian revolution.

Comrade Kamenev concluded his speech with the statement that he does not dissociate himself from the Oppositionists who violated the laws of the proletarian State,

and are therefore the victims of repressive measures. My answer to him is: This Congress does not dissociate itself from the working class and from the international revolution, which demand a final and unconditional, organisational and ideological disarmament and liquidation of the second Party, the Party of the Opposition bloc. (Stormy and prolonged applause. Shouts of "Hurrah!" The delegates rise to their feet and sing the "Internationale.")

\* \* \* \* \*

### **COMRADE TOMSKY'S SPEECH:**

(The Congress greets Comrade Tomsky with enthusiasm and prolonged applause, the delegates rise to their feet.)

Comrades, after what has been said about the Opposition prior to the Congress, after what has been said here, after the documentary revelations and disclosures of the activities during the last two years, the question involuntarily arises: Is it still worth while speaking about the Opposition?

Nevertheless, after Comrade Kamenev's speech, after the submission of a manœuvring document, notwithstanding the brilliant speeches of Comrades Rykov, Rudzutak, Andreyev and others, we must still tackle this question and say a few words on it, because we are settling a really vital question on which depends whether we will have peace in the Party in the future or not. First of all, I wish to state, owing to certain attempts on the part of Comrade Kamenev to forecast the outcome of the work of the commission elected by this Congress—his reference to Comrade Andreyev's speech, and his emphasis that Comrade Andreyev spoke as a member of the commission, that the decision of the commission will depend on the future conduct of the Opposition—I make the reservation that I do not speak as a member of the commission, but as a delegate to the Congress.

First of all a few preliminary remarks: I will not deal in detail with Comrade Rakovsky's speech, because I must say that to those who have known Comrade Rakovsky closely and for some time, this speech was depressing. When Comrade Rakovsky, one of the former talented Party speakers, a man with colossal political experience, a wise

politician, delivered yesterday his pitiful disconnected rigmarole, he only demonstrated to what depths a hopeless position may drive some people. But certain points of Rakovsky's speech cannot be left unchallenged. He characterised the present moment as a moment of depression in the Labour movement, as a moment of passivity in the Labour movement, as a moment of indifference, particularly in the British Labour movement, in relation to the Soviet Union. He took as an example the attitude of the British workers to the breaking off of Anglo-Soviet relations. What stamina must a man possess to say that, without at the same time saying that the breaking off of diplomatic relations took place within less than a year after the heavy defeat suffered by the British proletariat, after the heroic struggle of the British proletariat, which was betrayed and which suffered a heavy defeat. To expect that within several months after that, with treacherous leaders, the British proletariat should be able to react in an active manner, means not to understand that it was precisely because of the defeat of the British workers that the Tories were able to break off diplomatic relations with us. To declare after the Vienna uprising, after the campaign against the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti, that, in general, the Labour movement is passive and indifferent, means failing to understand anything at all, means slandering the Labour movement.

Ye/dokimov's and Rakovsky's claim that they constitute the "Left" section of the Party is really ridiculous. The Presidium received a statement yesterday from the so-called group of "15," the Sapronov group, about which nothing has been said from this platform, nor does it deserve mention. It is a statement from people gone mad and who have lost all perspectives. (Voices: "Downright Mensheviks.") They broke with the Party in the very opening of their statement, and we shall make short shrift with them. But they also pretend to be the "Left" section. The methods to which the Trotskyites have to resort in order to prove that they are the "Left section" is original. Zinoviev and others in their effort to prove at the 14th Congress that they are the "Left section," made reference to the "march of history" and to similar portentous

things. At the 15th Congress Rakovsky refers to the statements and articles of a British spy. There is something wrong with your Leftism, comrades, if you have to prove it at the 15th Congress through the medium of extracts from the bourgeois Press and references to Otto Bauer's article and the articles of a British spy, as Rakovsky himself did.

A few words to Comrade Minin. Comrade Minin actually wants to drag us backwards. Comrade Minin is like a clock which stopped two years ago and points to the 14th Congress. We have now the 15th and not the 14th Party Congress. Comrade Minin, you have overslept a good many things: you have overslept two years of your life. Many things have happened during those two years. We have become older. It would seem that we should have become a bit wiser, too, during those two years. Zinoviev, Minin and others, in speaking at the 14th Congress, had behind them a majority of the Leningrad organisation. They spoke as 100 per cent. anti-Trotskyites. But at the 15th Congress Kamenev, Yevdokimov, and the leaders of the Opposition, speak, practically without the backing of a single soul in the Leningrad organisation, and they speak as 100 per cent. Trotskyites. That is the difference. Many changes have taken place during these two years. Stop kidding, Comrade Minin! If you want to abandon the Opposition, get away from it straight, without playing the unhappy and uninteresting role of a buffer. We have seen within these two years how Smilga, beginning as a buffer, eventually deserted the C.C. and went over to the Opposition. We have witnessed Shkovsky's buffer role. It is not worth while, comrades—either you want to leave then, then be quick about it, don't go back to the 14th Congress, but come to the 15th.

A few words about Yevdokimov. We could afford to ignore him but he persistently talks, despite the obvious facts, about working class sympathy shown to the Opposition during the October celebrations. Hundreds of thousands of people saw the contrary. They saw how the Moscow workers "applauded" the Opposition. (Laughter.) But, nevertheless, although hundreds of thousands saw that, there are 140 million inhabitants in the Soviet Union,

and there are those who have not seen it. You can imagine. But what must be the position of people who must hold on to "sympathy" such as they experienced in Moscow and Leningrad? That was real "sympathy," it is some applause. Say, why are you running? We are running because they sympathise with us. But why should you run? Because we are afraid they will shake us up too much. And why do they throw goloshes and pickles at you? Because they have no roses. (Laughter. Applause.) This is classic sympathy. I do not wish you such sympathy, Comrade Yevdokimov. If you ever get sympathy again such as the Leningrad workers gave you, I am afraid you will have to undergo a good cure after it. (Laughter.)

Comrade Kamenev's speech fully and entirely tallies with the document submitted and the document also is worthy of Comrade Kamenev's speech. If we examine both Comrade Kamenev's speech and the document and enquire as to structure and substance of the document, we will find that it consists of two parts: One half stands for peace—"We want peace"—and the other half indicates that—"we want to preserve the possibility of war."

Comrade Kamenev delivered quite a cutting speech, but in a very peaceful and mild tone. That Comrade Kamenev is a master in such matters and that there is division of labour among the Opposition, you all know. Whenever it is necessary to send a live wire, the shield and spear with flying colours. . . . If they want peace they send Kamenev. And if they need tears they send Zinoviev. (Applause.)

What is the substance of the document and of Kamenev's speech? The document and Kamenev's speech are so constructed as to give the impression that the Opposition was right in the struggle, that they think they are still right, and that they will still carry on their fight for their views, and, consequently, all decisions of the Party institutions condemning their views are wrong. The promise to dissolve the factional organisations, etc., etc., does not sound convincing.

Let us see what the Opposition offers us and what it wants in return. When I look through all the manoeuvres

of the Opposition, I recall certain episodes of our past—our war in Turkestan against the Bashmaks. The Bashmaks had their leaders of Bashmak detachments. The battles took the following turn: Throughout the summer we gave them a licking. When the winter set in, the fields became bare and there was no grass, their horsemen were worn out, their horses were starving, their powder was all gone. They came to us and said: "We are coming over to your side, but we retain our ammunition; we recognise the Soviet Government." We did the following: We told them they could come over to us and become our watchmen. They wintered with us and had their fill. But in the spring the grass grew up again and they returned to the fields and renewed the fight.

The Opposition wants to employ the same Bashmak tactics in dealing with the Party, but they will fail. (Laughter and applause.)

Comrade Kamenev, your horsemen are shattered both ideologically and morally. You have no bullets with which to carry on your factional battles. You have no grass fields, no suitable political field for your Opposition cavalry. You want to feed on our bread until you can attack us again. This will not work. Not a bit of it. (Applause.)

Properly speaking, what did Comrade Kamenev say? I do not want to burden the Congress by reading extracts and quotations, but we all remember the past without that. You remember the 13th Party Congress. There was Trotsky before you, who spoke in a very earnest tone about a soldier who always stands at attention before the Party. (Voices: "We remember that all right; how could we forget it? He played the good boy.") You remember the 14th Party Congress and the Opposition saying: "Of course, we will submit to the 14th Congress. We will hold on to our ideas, but we will submit to the 14th Congress."

You remember the declaration of October 16, 1926, in which they said: "We are dissolving our faction, we have realised that matters have taken too sharp a turn. . . . This would subsequently lead us to . . .," etc., and, therefore, "we will fight with different methods," etc. You

remember, finally, how Kamenev repeated almost word for word what the 14th Party Conference said. Some of the expressions were exactly the same. Finally, in August, at the August Plenum, they again repeated the same, and now Comrade Kamenev comes to the 15th Congress and repeats word for word what he had said many times before. But, you know, you really seem to think that we have learned nothing during these two years, that the Party learned nothing, or you positively count on the softness of our Congress without understanding that the situation has changed.

What do they offer the Party and what do they want in return? They want an amnesty from the Party, they want a respite, they want to bring their indecent luggage represented by Ruth Fischer, Maslow, Fischelev, Ossovsky, etc., into the Party. And what do they offer? They offer to dissolve the faction which we can fairly well dissolve without them. We will dissolve the faction without you and without your document. It is clear that if we do not dissolve that faction after the 15th Congress we are no longer Bolsheviks. (Applause.)

Instead of coming to the Party and saying: Two years ago we made a mistake, we got muddled, now we repent—instead of that they do not merely seek forgiveness for all their sins by indulgences, but, indirectly, they want to condemn the lines of our Party and drag in with them Ruth Fischer, Maslow, etc., into the bargain. I understand that under certain conditions the Party may take the position of the biblical good father in relation to his prodigal son, forgive the misdeeds of the Opposition, and perhaps even kill the fatted calf. But there is no legend in which the prodigal son would bring along his rubbish with him to his father. (Applause.)

It is quite clear that this game resembles the Turkestan war. Trotsky was penitent at the 14th Congress, he spoke of a soldier, etc., after Trotskyism had been beaten. Zinoviev and Kamenev spoke of submitting to the Congress after the 14th Congress had given them a good thrashing. In October they repented after they had received a thrashing in the Aviopribor and Krassny Putilovetz. In August they repented when faced with the ques-

tion of expulsion from the C.C. They want also now a small privilege—a respite. Besides, they speak a good deal about the workers, they say that the workers want peace, that they stand for peace, etc. Yes, the workers do want peace, but what kind of peace? The non-Party workers want—I am making no mistake if I put it this way—you to stop making trouble. (Applause.) That is what the non-Party workers want. And that if you will not feel like stopping of your own accord, the Party should stop you. (Applause. Kossior: "That's the rub.")

Don't you believe that the worker is always a pacifist. He stands for peace until the fight begins; as long as the fight goes on at the top, he says it would be better to come to terms. But once the fight breaks out below, once he himself gets drawn into it, he is no longer a pacifist. (Applause.) And every time you brought your fireworks to the non-Party workers, their argument against you was very concise and very energetic.

Kamenev tried to tell us why they cannot accept the conditions of the Congress, why they cannot come and categorically renounce their faction, categorically and squarely recognise their mistakes, condemn and abandon their views. In doing so his chief argument was: Bolsheviks never demanded that people should abandon their views nor their convictions, etc.

There is something wrong about that. Your convictions would be convictions and only convictions if you did not speak about them, if you did not advocate and agitate for them in the Party. In that case there would be no question of combating them. We do not fight against dreams or against unexpressed convictions—(laughter)—but when these convictions are realised, begin to take shape, are being propagated and hawked into our Party, when a struggle is going on championing these convictions, then we have a right to draw our own conclusions about them. And it is no mere accident that Kamenev speaks not merely of convictions, but of a system of views.

You have your system of views. Then remember that we have our system of views. Our system of views has been laid down by the 14th Party Congress and the 15th



Party Conference. What does that system consist of? In essence this system brands your system as a system of social democratic tendencies. Our system of views does not permit that a Social Democratic tendency should thrive within our Leninist Party. This is what you must understand, Comrade Kamenev, and this is what the other Oppositionists must understand.

It follows that we have a collision of two systems. Your system of views is such that you cannot renounce, and our system of views holds that your system of views is a Social Democratic system and that there is no place for it in our Party, just as there was no place in it for Miasnikov's system of views, the system of views of the "Rabotchaya Pravda." How did we then, together with Kamenev and Zinoviev, treat the "Rabotchaya Pravda"? We arrested the so-called "Rabotchaya Pravda" group and allowed no one to make any fuss about it, as their system of views was essentially a Menshevik system, directed against the Party, against the proletarian dictatorship. At the present time it so happens—and Kamenev should have understood that—that we will not abandon our system of views and our system of views holds that there is no place for Social Democratic tendencies within the Leninist Party. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

Kamenev should understand that. And there is another thing that he should understand. He offered on one point a correct theoretical formula, namely, that a wrong estimation of a situation leads to a wrong policy, and that a wrong policy leads to wrong tactics. But this is also true the other way round. If you admit that your tactics were wrong, that they brought you before the dilemma to be with or against the Party, then these tactics were a result of a wrong policy, a wrong system of views.

Your system of views brought you face to face with the question either to remain in the Party fully, entirely and whole-heartedly, working for the Party's system of views and rejecting your system or to hold on to your own system of views, but not in our Party. You can remain in the Party, but only on condition that you discard your entire system of views, all your alien and suspicious luggage, as

represented by Souvarine, Ruth Fischer, and others, leaving them on the other side of the fence.

Either you remain in the Party leaving that baggage behind you, or please stick to your baggage outside the Party.

Why cannot the Congress agree to any other conditions? Because if we were to take the Opposition document seriously, the continuation of the proletarian dictatorship would become impossible. How can a party exist if it is possible to issue within it every few months an oath of peace submitted in documentary form and each time declare war all over again? To allow that would mean to allow the calling out into the streets of one's followers, to try to lead them together with non-Party workers against the general workers' demonstration, against the Soviet Government, and to say later, if that fails, well, it has not been a success, but it does not matter, I will give you a document! Just see how simple that would be. Under such conditions we would have the following state of affairs in our Party: one would say, "Let us fight, if I fail I will give you a document. I will try to bring the masses into the streets, should it not succeed and I get a thrashing, I will give you a document." A farthing for your documents. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Applause.) We must insure our Party against new crimes, against betrayals, and what you did in the November demonstration cannot be qualified in any other way but as a betrayal of the Party. (Voices: "Hear! hear." Applause.) And do you think that you can settle everything through the medium of your cheap documents?

We have come to the Fifteenth Congress. We are considering the question of expulsion. Very well, we are told, we will give you a document saying that we will not fight any more, but we will adhere to our views because they are correct. And, moreover, in the document the right of appealing to non-Party people is stipulated. That sentence consists of two parts. The first part says: "We will not appeal to non-Party people although they are the basis of the Party." It is indisputable that they are the basis of the Party. And the second part says: "The non-Party people can be informed on inner-Party affairs only

by means of an objective interpretation of the existing opinions in the Party. This was the case when Lenin was with us." Allow me to tell you that this was never the case under Lenin. Would Lenin appeal to non-Party people by giving an "objective" interpretation of two points of view involved in our Party controversies? (Uglanov: "This is a pure Trotskyist formula.")

How would a thing like this be put into effect? This is how it would be done. If the Moscow Committee should give me credentials to-morrow to go, let us say, to the Pokhorov works with instructions to lecture on current events and the present situation, I would say that "it is impossible for me not to touch the most important political fact, namely, the inner Party differences. I must tell the non-Party workers that the majority of the Party thinks so and so, and the minority thinks so and so. The majority argues in such and such a manner and the minority in such and such a manner." What for? Evidently with the purpose of giving the non-Party workers an opportunity to decide as to who is right or wrong and give their weighty decision. What would this mean? It would mean nothing else but the right to appeal to the non-Party workers. But as was the case when Lenin was with us, and has been up till now, I am convinced will also be in the future, our Party will go to the non-Party workers as a unit, as the executor of decisions, opinions and resolutions of official Party organs—only so and not otherwise. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Applause.)

Is it not so, From your system of views a different attitude follows, a different conception of inter-relations between the Party and the non-Party workers, and in general an absolutely different conception of the rôle of the Communist Party under the proletarian dictatorship.

I have no doubt that the Opposition which unites under one roof both honest and dishonest people, both Trotskyites and former 100 per cent anti-Trotskyites, both remnants from the Workers' Opposition and relics of Democratic Centralism—all united into one for the struggle against the Party—has within it factions and sub-factions groups and fragments, Right and Lefts, a Right centre and a Left centre. But this is the ideal of the Trotskyite

Party and not of a Leninist Party, not Lenin's Party. That is why we cannot regard the document submitted by the Opposition as satisfactory. That is why it would be a mistake, a first-class funeral of the Party, if we would take this document as a basis, if we would come to terms with the Opposition on the document they have submitted us. That would be the beginning of the downfall of the Party, a victory for the Trotsky policy. That would be legalisation within the Party of the right to have factions, shades and tendencies, to fight against the Party and to take Party quarrels out into the street. The Party will not agree to that. Comrade Kamenev and the others, you must remember that your system of views puts you out of the Party. Those of you who are still in the Party have now an open door before you and the Party tells you: Either throw your system of views out through the open door, and then if you please, remain in the Party, or be so kind as to clear out together with your system. That is what your system of views has brought you to!

And every Bolshevik (if he takes as his starting point the fact that our Party is really a Leninist Party, that it really materialises the proletarian dictatorship, that it really represents the working class and that the government, set up and guided by the Party, is really a workers' government) must understand that if his system of views places him on the other side of the fence, on the other side of the barricade, it means that his system is no good, it means that it must be smashed and thrown overboard. That is how a real Bolshevik would look at the matter. But this is not what you are doing. And as long as you will not do that, as long as you try to use lawyers' tricks in advocating your policy, as long as you come only after you get a good thrashing to the Party in order to recuperate, rest and re-equip for another battle—there is no place for you in the Party.

We have waited two years; for two years we have been patient. Forget the fact that you have high-sounding European names on your list. By the way, Yevdokimov and Kamenev tried to make capital in speaking of their "past" . . . "We have been working for dozens of years" . . . etc. You have rendered services in the past, that is

true. You have worked for the Party. But allow me to recall the words of a hero in Gorki's play "Creatures that were once Men." "You cannot travel far on the cart of your past . . ." It may be added that during the last few years you behaved in a manner that covered up the traces of your past, so that you have nothing left to boast of . . . (Voice: "The heroes of October").

If we put on one side of the scale your services for the Party and the working class, and on the other side what you have done and made a mess of during these two years, the second side of the scale will overbalance the first . . . In settling accounts with you, the services you have rendered to the working class have long been erased from the pages of history. Remember that you will get nowhere "on the cart of your past."

Kamenev and Zinoviev were very eloquent when they were still Bolsheviks in saying that the two elements—Trotskyism and Leninism—cannot be mixed. Either Trotskyism or Leninism. This is absolutely right. This question faces us also to-day. Your present system of views is what we call Trotskyism; our system of views—the system of the Party—is what we call Leninism. Any attempt to mix the two into one, to pulverise and mix the two elements and create a synthesis of them is no good. We are a Leninist Party. Trotskyism and Leninism cannot thrive together, the two things cannot be combined. Therefore, have your choice: either Trotskyism, and then take it and clear out, or Leninism, and then leave your Trotskyist system of views on the other side of the fence. Come to the Party and declare squarely and candidly that you were wrong, that you persisted in your mistakes, you have done all that which Lenin warned against, you were hopelessly confused, you have made a mess of things, you have three times deceived the Party, and that you will not do so again; reject your whole system of views, cast it away together with all your unwholesome camp followers, in the hope that the Party will forgive you.

This is the only possible line open for you, and only under such conditions will the Party be able to say: We shall see, you can remain, don't pretend to the right of

leadership, do some work, only not as you do at the present time.

In your document you say: We shall be of use to the Party and our criticism will do the Party good. Much obliged for your criticism. We want work and not criticism—(applause)—we can criticise ourselves better than you: we can do it in a practical and serious manner. We don't need you in the role of critics. Only if you take this only possible line open to you, will the Party be able to say: Work awhile, we shall see and forgive, because what you have done against the Party requires a long-term test so that the Party may forget your mistakes, your crimes, and the mess you have made of things. (Stormy applause.)

## STALIN'S CONCLUDING SPEECH

STALIN: Comrades, after the speeches of several delegates little is left for me to say. I have nothing to say about the contents of the speeches of Comrades Yevdokimov and Muralov, as they have not given any material for so doing. Only one thing could be said about them: Allah forgive them their sins, for they know not what they say. (Laughter. Applause.) I would like to deal with Comrade Rakovsky's speech, and particularly that of Comrade Kamenev, which was the most pharisaic and false of all Opposition speeches. (Voices: "Hear, hear.")

### 1. On Comrade Rakovsky's Speech.

(a) Foreign policy. I think that Comrade Rakovsky should have left the questions of war and foreign policy alone. Everybody knows that Comrade Rakovsky made a fool of himself at the Moscow Conference on the question of war. He evidently came here to speak with the purpose of making good his stupidity. But the result was still greater stupidity. (Laughter.) I think it would have been wiser for Comrade Rakovsky to keep silent on the question of foreign affairs.

(b) On Lefts and Rights. Comrade Rakovsky maintains that the Opposition is the Left wing of our Party. This would make a cat laugh. Such statements are evidently made to salve the conscience of political bankrupts. It has been proved that the Opposition is a Menshevik wing of our Party, that the Opposition has degenerated into Menshevism, that the Opposition has been objectively converted into an instrument of the bourgeois elements. This has been proved over and over again. How can there be a question here of the Opposition's Leftism? Where have you ever heard that a Menshevik group which has objectively become an instrument of the third force, the bourgeois elements, is more Left

than the Bolsheviks? Is it not clear that the Opposition is the Right Menshevik wing of the C.P.S.U.? Comrade Rakovsky has evidently become absolutely confused and took the Left for the Right. You remember Gogol's Selifan: "Oh, you—you don't know your right from your left!"

(c) Assistance from the Opposition. Comrade Rakovsky says that the Opposition is ready to support the Party if the imperialists attack us. How magnanimous! They, a small group representing hardly one-half per cent. of our Party, are so kind as to promise us help if the imperialists will attack our country. We do not believe in your help and we do not need it, comrades of the Opposition. We only ask one thing, and that is: do not interfere with us, stop interfering with us. All the rest we will do ourselves, you can be sure of that. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

(d) The "signalmen." Comrade Rakovsky says further that the Opposition gives us the signal concerning the dangers, difficulties and the ruin of our country. Here we have the real signalmen who save the Party from ruin when they themselves are being ruined and are really in need of rescue. They can hardly stand on their own feet, but they crawl to save others. Is this not absurd, comrades? (Laughter.) Just imagine a small boat which can hardly float on the surface of the sea and is about to be wrecked at any moment, and imagine a splendid steamer which majestically cuts through the waves and advances with full confidence. What would you say if this small boat should come to save this huge steamer? (Laughter.) Is it not a fact that this would be more than ridiculous? Such is the position which our signalmen of the Opposition are in. They give us signals concerning dangers, concerning difficulties, concerning ruin, and concerning anything you may think of, but they themselves go to the bottom, not noticing that they have already reached the bottom. Referring to themselves as signalmen, the Oppositionists contend for leadership in the Party, over the working class, in the country. The question arises, on what basis? Have they, the Opposition, proved in action that they are at all capable of guiding anything, let alone leading the Party,



the class, the country? Is it not a fact that the Opposition, headed by such people as Trotsky, Kamenev, Zinoviev, have been leading their group already for two years? Is it not a fact that by leading their group the Opposition leaders brought it to its final collapse? Is it not a fact that the Opposition has been leading this group during these two years from defeat to defeat? What does this show, if not that the Opposition leaders have proved themselves to be incapable, that their leadership has been found to be a leadership of defeat and not of victory? But if the Opposition leaders have been proved incapable in small matters, what basis is there to think that they will prove capable in big affairs? Is it not clear that no one will venture to give over the leadership of such big affairs as the Party, the working class, the country to people who have become bankrupt in leading a small group? That is what our signalmen do not wish to understand.

## 2. Comrade Kamenev's Speech.

I will now deal with Comrade Kamenev's speech. That speech was the most hypocritical, most pharisaical, most crafty and roguish of all Opposition speeches delivered here from this tribune. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

(a) A double-faced nature. The first thing that Comrade Kamenev indulged in in his speech was to wipe out traces. The representatives of the Party spoke here of the achievements of our Party, the successes of our construction, the improvement of our work, etc. They further spoke of the Menshevik aim of the Opposition comrades, of their having degenerated into Menshevism, denying the possibility of successful Socialist construction in our country, denying the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., denying the experience of the policy of the alliance of the working class with the middle peasants, circulating slanderous libels concerning Thermidor, etc. Finally, they said here that such views of the Opposition are incompatible with membership in our Party, that the Opposition must renounce these Menshevik views if they want to remain in the Party. Well, what of it? Comrade Kamenev could not find anything better to do than to ignore these

questions, wipe out all traces and pass them by unnoticed. He was asked concerning the most important questions of our programme, our policy, our construction. But he ignored that as if it does not concern him. Can such conduct on the part of Comrade Kamenev be regarded as a serious attitude in the matter? Obviously, it cannot. How can such conduct of the Opposition be explained? It can be explained only in one way, namely, by their desire to deceive the Party, to weaken its vigilance, to fool the Party once again. The Opposition has two faces—a pharisaical kind face and a Menshevik anti-revolutionary face. It shows the Party its pharisaical and kind face when the Party brings pressure to bear, demanding its renunciation of factionalism and disruptive policy. It shows its Menshevik anti-revolutionary face when it takes upon itself to appeal to the non-proletarian forces, when it takes upon itself to appeal to the street against the Party, against the Soviet Government. Now, as you see, it turns its pharisaical kind face to us, desiring to deceive the Party once more. That is why Comrade Kamenev endeavoured to wipe out all traces, ignoring the most important questions of our differences. Can such double-dealing and double-facedness be tolerated still further? Clearly it cannot be tolerated another moment. One of the two: either the Opposition wants to speak to the Party seriously and then it must throw off its mask, or it wants to preserve its two faces also for the future, in which case it will have to remain outside the Party. (Voices: "Hear, hear.")

(b) Bolshevik traditions. Kamenev assures us that in the traditions of our Party, the traditions of Bolshevism, there is no such thing as to warrant a demand that a Party member should renounce certain views which are incompatible with our Party, our Party programme. Is this true? Of course it is not. What is more, it is false, comrades. Is it not a fact that we, together with Kamenev, expelled Miasnikov and his followers from the Party? Why did we expel them? Because their Menshevik views proved to be incompatible with the views of the Party. Is it not a fact that we, together with Kamenev, expelled a section of the "Workers' Opposition" from the Party? Why did we expel them? Because their Menshevik views proved to be

incompatible with the views of our Party. And why did we expel Ossovsky and Dahkovsky from the Party? Why did we expel Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Katz, and others from the Comintern? Because their views proved to be incompatible with the ideology of the Comintern, with the ideology of the C.P.S.U. Our Party would not be a Leninist Party if it permitted the existence of anti-Leninist elements in our organisations. Otherwise, why should we not have the Mensheviks in our Party? What should we do with such people who, being in our Party, have degenerated to Menshevism and are spreading their anti-Leninist views? What can there be in common between a Leninist Party and such people? Comrade Kamenev slanders our Party, he breaks with the traditions of our Party, he breaks with the traditions of Bolshevism, maintaining that people who preach and advocate Menshevik views can be tolerated in our Party. But just because Comrade Kamenev and, with him, the whole Opposition, trample under their feet the revolutionary traditions of our Party, precisely because of this, the Party raises the question concerning a renunciation of anti-Leninist views of the Opposition.

(c) The sham stability of Opposition principles. Comrade Kamenev assures us that it is hard for him and the other Oppositionists to renounce their views because as Bolsheviks they are accustomed to defend their views. He says that it would be lack of principle on the part of the Opposition to renounce their views. It, therefore, follows that the Opposition leaders are high-principled people. Is this really true, comrades? Can it be that they, the Opposition leaders, value their principles, their views, their convictions highly? Not likely, comrades. It is unlikely if we bear in mind the history of the formation of the Opposition bloc. (Laughter.) Just the contrary is the case. History shows, facts relate, that nobody has ever jumped so lightly from one set of principles to another, no one has altered so lightly and so freely their views as the leaders of our Opposition. Why, then, can they not renounce their views now if doing so is in the interests of the Party?

Here are several examples from the history of

Trotskyism. It is known that Lenin called a Bolshevik conference in 1912 in Prague to rally the Party. It is known that that conference was of great importance in the history of our Party, as it drew the line between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks and united the Bolshevik organisations throughout the country into one Bolshevik Party. It is known that in the same year of 1912 there was a Menshevik gathering of the August bloc under Trotsky's leadership. It is further known that that gathering declared war on the Bolshevik conference and called upon the workers' organisations to liquidate Lenin's Party. What accusations did Trotsky's August bloc gathering hurl against the Bolshevik conference in Prague? They were accused of all the mortal sins: of usurpation, of sectarianism, of organising a coup d'état, and the devil knows what else. Here is what the gathering of the August bloc said at that time about the Bolshevik Prague conference in its statement to the 2nd International:—

“ This gathering declares that that conference ” (the Bolshevik Prague conference of 1912) “ is an open attempt of a group of individuals, who deliberately led the Party to a split, to usurp the Party flag, and expresses its profound regret in this connection that several Party organisations and comrades fell victims to this deception and thus helped the disruptive and usurping policy of Lenin's sect. This gathering expresses its conviction that all Party organisations of Russia and abroad will protest against the effected coup d'état and will not recognise the central organs elected by the conference and will do their utmost to help to restore Party unity by calling a real general Party conference.” (From the statement of the August bloc to the 2nd International, published by the “ Vorwärts ” of March 26, 1912.)

You can see that everything is there: Lenin's sect, usurpation, a coup d'état, Thermidor.

Well, what of it? Several years elapsed and Trotsky renounced his views concerning the Bolshevik Party. And not only did he renounce them, but came crawling on his

belly into the Bolshevik Party, entering it as one of its active members. (Laughter.)

What basis have we to suppose, after all this, that Trotsky and the Trotskyists will not be able to renounce once again their views concerning Thermidor tendencies in our Party, concerning usurpation, etc.?

Another example from the same field. It is well known that at the end of 1924, Trotsky published a pamphlet entitled "The Lessons of October." It is well known that in that pamphlet, Trotsky qualified Kamenev and Zinoviev as the Right semi-Menshevik wing of our Party. It is well known that Trotsky's pamphlet caused a big discussion in our Party. Well, what about it? Only about a year later, Trotsky renounced his views, proclaiming that Zinoviev and Kamenev represent not the Right wing of our Party, but its Left revolutionary wing.

Another example, this time from the domain of the history of Zinoviev's group. It is well known that Zinoviev and Kamenev wrote a whole pile of pamphlets against Trotskyism, it is well known that even in 1925, Zinoviev and Kamenev declared together with the whole Party that Trotskyism is incompatible with Leninism. It is well known that Zinoviev and Kamenev, together with the whole Party, passed resolutions both at our Party congresses and at the 5th Congress of the Comintern on the petty bourgeois deviations of Trotskyism. Well, what about that? Hardly a year passed and they renounced their views, abandoned them and proclaimed that Trotsky's group is a truly Leninist and revolutionary group of our Party. (Voices: "A mutual amnesty!")

Such, comrades, are the facts which could be multiplied if necessary.

Is it not clear from this, that the superior stability of the Opposition principles, of which Comrade Kamenev has been telling us, is a fairy tale having nothing in common with reality? Is it not clear that no one has as yet succeeded in our Party in renouncing so easily and freely their principles as Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev? (Laughter.) The question' arises, what reason is there to suppose that the Opposition leaders who renounced their principles, their views, several times, would not be capable

of doing so once again? Is it not clear that our demands that the Opposition renounce its Menshevik views are not so hard for the Opposition leaders as Comrade Kamenev is trying to make believe? (Laughter.) It is not the first time they have had to renounce their views. Why can they not do it, just once more? (Laughter.)

(d) Either the Party or the Opposition. Kamenev argues that we have no right to demand that the Opposition renounce some of their views which have become incompatible with the ideology and the programme of the Party. I already told you how trifling Kamenev's arguments are if we keep in mind the past and the present of the Opposition bloc. But supposing for a moment that Comrade Kamenev is right. What would be the result? Can the Party, our Party, renounce its views, convictions, principles? It is possible to demand that our Party renounce its views, its principles? The Party is definitely convinced that the Opposition must renounce its anti-Leninist views otherwise it will be compelled to clear out of the Party. If we cannot demand that the Opposition renounce its convictions, why it is possible to demand that that the Party should renounce its views and convictions concerning the Opposition? According to Kamenev, it follows that the Opposition cannot renounce its anti-Leninist views, but that the Party must renounce its views concerning the impossibility of permitting the Opposition in our Party without a renunciation of anti-Leninist views on the part of the Opposition. Where is the logic? (Laughter. Applause.) Comrade Kamenev assures us that the Oppositionists are courageous people defending their views to the end. I do not believe much in the courage and principled integrity of the Opposition leaders. Particularly, I do not believe much in the courageousness for instance of Zinoviev and Kamenev (Laughter) who but yesterday didn't leave a shred on Trotsky and to day they are embracing him. (Voices: "They are used to playing leapfrog.") But supposing for a moment that the leaders of our Opposition still have some manhood and firmness of principles left. What basis have we then to suppose that the Party possesses less manhood and integrity of principles, than let us say Zinoviev, Kamenev or Trotsky?

What basis is there to suppose that it is easier for the Party to renounce its conviction concerning the Opposition, concerning the incompatibility of their Menshevik views with the ideas and the programme of the Party, than for the leaders of the Opposition who change their views, so to speak, as one changes gloves? (Laughter). Is it not clear from this, that Kamenev demands that the Party renounce its views concerning the Opposition and its Menshevik errors? Does not Comrade Kamenev go a bit too far? Will he not agree and admit that it is rather dangerous to go that far? The question stands thus: either the Party or the Opposition. Either the Opposition renounces its anti-Leninist views or it does not do so, in which case, not a trace of it remain in the Party? (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

(e) The Opposition broke with the Bolshevik traditions. Kamenev maintains that it is no part of the Bolshevik traditions to demand from Party members the renunciation of their views. Comrade Rykov definitely proved the contrary. Facts show that what Kamenev says is absolutely untrue. But the question arises, is there anything in Bolshevik traditions to justify what the Opposition takes the liberty to do and still continues to do? The Opposition organised a faction and transformed it into a Party within our Bolshevik Party. But has it ever been known that Bolshevik traditions allow anyone to commit such outrages? How can one speak of Bolshevik traditions, permitting at the same time a split in the Party and the formation of a new anti-Bolshevik Party within it? Furthermore, the Opposition organised an illegal establishment, entered into alliance with bourgeois intellectuals who, in their turn, were found to be in alliance with avowed White Guards. The question arises, how can one speak of Bolshevik traditions permitting such outrages bordering on direct betrayal of the Party and the Soviet Government? Finally, the Opposition organised an anti-Party, anti-Soviet demonstration appealing to the street, appealing to non-proletarian elements. But how can one speak of Bolshevik traditions appealing at the same time against his Party, against his Soviet Government? Has it ever been heard of that Bolshevik traditions

allow such outrages, bordering on direct counter-revolution? Is it not clear that Comrade Kamenev speaks of Bolshevik traditions in order to conceal his break with these traditions in the interests of his anti-Bolshevik group? The Opposition gained nothing by its appeals to the street, as it proved to be an insignificant group. This however, is not its fault, but its misfortune. What of the Opposition had found to have greater forces? Is it not clear that the appeal to the street would have been transformed into a direct Putsch against the Soviet Government? Is it so hard to understand that that attempt of the Opposition was essentially in no way different from the famous attempt of the Left S.R.'s in 1918? Voices: "Hear! hear!") According to the rule, we should have arrested on November 7th the entire Opposition for those attempts. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Prolonged Applause.) We did not do it, because we took pity on the Opposition; we displayed magnanimity and wanted to give them a chance to think matters over. But they regarded our magnanimity as our weakness. Is it not clear, comrades, that Kamenev's talk about Bolshevik traditions is false and empty chatter, intended to conceal the break of the Opposition with Bolshevik traditions?

(f) Sham Unity and Real Unity. Comrade Kamenev warbled here about unity. He surpassed himself in asking the Party to come to their assistance and establish unity "at all costs." They, you see, are against the policy of having two parties, they, you see, are for the unity of their Party at all costs. But we know for sure that while Kamenev sang here concerning Party unity, his followers adopted resolutions at their illegal meetings to the effect that the declaration of the Opposition concerning unity is a manoeuvre with the object of preserving their forces and continuing their disruptive policy. On the one hand, they sing about unity at the Congress of Lenin's Party, and on the other they work underground, in splitting the Party, in organising a second party, in undermining the unity of the Party. This they call unity "at all costs." Is it not high time to throw this criminal game overboard?

Kamenev spoke of unity. Unity with whom? Unity with the Party or with Sherbakov? Is it not high time



to realise that it is impossible to include in one unit both the Party and Sherbakov? Kamenev spoke of unity. Unity with whom? With Maslow and Souvarine or with the Comintern and the C.P.S.U.? Is it not time to understand that one cannot speak of unity of the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern while maintaining unity with Maslow and Souvarine? Is it not about time to understand that it is impossible to merge Lenin's ideas with the Menshevik ideas of the Opposition? Lenin with Abramovitch? No, comrades! It is time to stop playing.

That is why I think that Kamenev's talk about unity "at all costs" is a Pharisaical game intended to deceive the Party.

We need real unity and not playing at unity. Have we real Leninist unity in our Party? Yes, we have. If 99 per cent. of our Party members vote for the Party and against the Opposition, this constitutes real, genuine proletarian unity, such as has never existed in our Party. Here is the Party Congress with not a single Opposition delegate in its midst. (Applause.) What is that if not unity in our Leninist Party. This is what we call the Leninist unity of the Bolshevik Party.

(g) The Lid on the Opposition! The Party did everything possible in order to put the Opposition on the Leninist path. The Party displayed a maximum of leniency and magnanimity in order to give the Opposition a chance to think matters over and correct their mistakes. The Party proposed that the Opposition renounce openly and honestly before the whole Party their anti-Leninist views. The Party proposed to the Opposition to recognise their mistakes and denounce them, so as to be rid of them once and for all. The Party proposed to the Opposition to disarm completely both ideologically and organisationally.

What does the Party want to attain by that? It strives to put an end to the Opposition and proceed with its positive work. It strives to liquidate the Opposition at last and get a chance to get to with our great constructive work. Lenin said at the 10th Congress. "We want no opposition now, this is the end of the Opposition; we have put the lid on it; we have had enough of the Opposition!" The Party wants this slogan of Lenin to be realised at

last within the ranks of our Party. (Prolonged Applause.) If the Opposition will disarm, well and good. If it will not we will disarm it ourselves. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" —Applause.)

### 3. Conclusion.

From Kamenev's speech it is clear that the Opposition does not intend to disarm completely. The Opposition declaration of December 3rd, indicates the same thing. Evidently the Opposition prefers to remain outside of the Party. Well, let them stay outside of it. The fact that they prefer to be out of the Party, that they cut themselves adrift from the Party, is not something terrible, it is nothing extraordinary, nothing surprising. If we look back at the history of our Party it will become clear to us that always at certain serious turns within the Party, a certain section of old leaders dropped out of the cart of the Bolshevik Party, leaving room for new people. A turn is a serious business, comrades. A turn is dangerous for those who do not sit firmly on the Party cart. Not everyone can keep his equilibrium when a turn is made. The cart is turned and then you see that somebody has fallen out. (Applause.)

Let us take 1903, the time of the second Congress of our Party. That was a period when the Party turned from compromise with the liberals to a life and death struggle against the liberal bourgeoisie, from preparing a struggle against tsarism to an open struggle against it, for the complete destruction of tsarism and feudalism. The Party was then headed by a sextette: Plekhanov, Zaslitch, Martov, Lenin, Axelrod, Potressov. The turn proved catastrophic for five out of the sextette. They fell out of the cart. Only Lenin remained. (Applause.) It happened so that the old Party leaders, the founders of the Party (Plekhanov, Zaslitch, Axelrod) and two young ones (Martov, Potressov) proved to be up against one, Comrade Lenin, young leader. If you knew how much vociferation then occurred to the effect that the Party is doomed, that the Party will not hold out, that without the old leaders nothing can be done. However, the invective and the complaints fell flat, but the facts remained. The facts were

that precisely because of the withdrawal of the five, the Party was able to get on the right road. It is now clear to every Bolshevnik that without Lenin's determined fight against the five, without eliminating the five, our Party would have been unable to consolidate as a Bolshevnik Party, capable of leading the proletariat to revolution against the bourgeoisie. (Voices: "True!")

Let us take the next period, the period of 1907-8. That was a period when our Party turned from an open revolutionary struggle against tsarism to round-about ways of struggle, to the utilisation of all and every possible legal opportunity—from insurance societies to the Duma platform. That was a period of retreat after we had been beaten in the 1905 revolution. That turn demanded from us that we adapt ourselves to new methods of struggle in order, after gathering our forces, to start once more an open revolutionary struggle against tsarism. But that turn proved fatal for a good many old Bolshevniks. Alexinsky dropped out of the cart. He was at one time by no means a bad Bolshevnik. Bogdanov dropped out. He was one of the most earnest leaders of our Party. Rozhkov, a former member of the C.C. of our Party, dropped out. And so on. There were vociferations and cries about the rule of the Party at that time perhaps no less than in 1903. However, the vociferations fell flat, but the facts remained. The facts prove that our Party would have been unable to get on the road under the new conditions of struggle without purging itself from the vacillating people who only hampered the cause of the revolution. What did Lenin aim at at that time? Only one thing—to clear the Party as quickly as possible of the vacillating and whining elements and keep them from getting under our feet. (Applause.)

That is, comrades, how our Party grew.

Our Party is a live organ. As in every organism, there is a digestive process going on within it: the old, the dying—drops out (Applause), the new, the growing—lives and develops. (Applause.) Some deflect at the top and at the bottom. New ones grow at the top and at the bottom, leading the cause onwards. That is how our Party grew. That is how it will grow in the future.

The same may be said about the present period of our revolution. We are now experiencing a turn from the period of restoration of industry and agriculture to the new construction of our economy, its reconstruction on a new technical basis, when the building of Socialism is not merely in perspective, but a live, practical matter, demanding the overcoming of most serious difficulties of an internal and external order. You know that this turn proved fatal for the leaders of our Opposition who got scared of the new difficulties and made up their mind to lead the Party to capitulation. If some leaders who do not wish to be firmly settled in the cart now drop out, there is nothing surprising in that. That will only deliver the Party from people who get under our feet and interfere with its progress. Evidently they seriously want to free themselves from our Party cart. Well, what about it? If some of the old leaders who are getting ready for the rubbish heap want to drop out of the cart, well, let them, and God speed! (Stormy, prolonged applause. The Congress rises to its feet and gives Stalin an ovation.)

## RESOLUTION ON THE REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE

The 15th Congress of the Communist (Bolshevik) Party of the Soviet Union fully approves the political and organisational line of the Central Committee.

The Congress records that the correct policy of the C.C. secured, under most difficult conditions during the period under report, the consolidation of the international strength of the U.S.S.R., the rise of our country as a factor of international peace, and the growing authority of the U.S.S.R. as a stronghold of the world revolutionary movement.

Thanks to the policy of the C.C., important successes have been attained in the country in the sphere of Socialist construction: the productive forces both in town and country have continuously risen accompanied by a greater development of Socialist elements throughout the entire economy, the material and cultural level of the masses of workers and peasants has risen, the Soviet Republic has been consolidated on the basis of a correct fulfilment of the Leninist national policy, the alliance between the working class and the peasantry has been consolidated, the leading influence of the proletariat and its party has increased, and, on the whole, the position of the proletarian dictatorship has been systematically strengthened.

The proletarian State, the working class, and the Party now begin their work in the international and home situation in many respects under changed conditions.

In the international sphere the period under review disclosed a series of new outlines and characteristic features both in the imperialist camp and in the inter-relations between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. The partial stabilisation of capitalism which was pointed out at the 14th Congress has by now revealed with sufficient

clarity its character and let loose the smoldering antagonisms within it. Despite certain progress of the capitalist States, despite the growth of world production beyond pre-war limits, despite the restoration of world exchange and the stabilisation of currency, despite a certain "normalcy" of international relations, despite the partial technical progress and capitalist rationalisation—despite all this, and to a certain extent on the basis of that, irreconcilable contradictions inherent in the world capitalist system have become acute. The unequal development of capitalist countries has been accentuated and on that basis the struggle for spheres of economic and political influence and for a re-division of the world has become more intense. The international struggle for markets of exchange, sources of raw material and spheres for capital investments, has sharpened owing to the discrepancies between the productive possibility of imperialist economy and the buying capacity of the masses of the population, impoverished by capitalism, owing to a chronic under-working of the capitalist productive apparatus and owing to the loss by the capitalist economic world of such a vast market as the U.S.S.R.

The contradictions between the European and American countries—the Metropolis—on the one hand, and the oppressed colonial countries on the other, have sharpened whilst the struggle of the oppressed countries against imperialist oppression has begun to assume the form of armed insurrection, national wars, and colonial revolutions (China, Indonesia).

The class struggle in the imperialist countries has become more intense where, in reply to the capitalist offensive against the working class and its standard of living, in reply to the liquidation of the eight-hour day, and rationalisation which intensifies exploitation, in reply to the reactionary militarist policy of the ruling bourgeois groups, the working class begins to take up a counter-offensive.

The antagonism between the bourgeois countries and the U.S.S.R., which undermines the foundations of world capitalist domination by its successful development, has been sharpened. The growing Socialist elements of the

U.S.S.R., the collapse of the bourgeois expectations that the proletarian dictatorship will degenerate, side by side with the growing international revolutionary influence of the U.S.S.R., are the main factors in this intensification.

Thus, capitalist development as a whole has revealed a tendency to shorten the historical phase of peaceful "respite," to bring nearer a new phase of great imperialist wars and to hasten the revolutionary outbreak of world conflicts. For the U.S.S.R. this means first of all a growing intensity of relations within the bourgeois States, whose policy, despite many inner contradictions among them and the various groups of the bourgeoisie which have so far hampered the formation of a united capitalist front, becomes ever more hostile to the U.S.S.R. and creates a direct menace of an imperialist offensive from without.

The phase of international development during the past two years proved once more very clearly that the efforts of the bourgeois and the pacifist politicians to "unite" and "reconcile" the powers on a capitalist basis are futile. The endless unity conferences and commissions of the League of Nations, the co-called "Bankers International Manifesto" (a declaration against the post-Ver-sailles customs tariff Bacchanalia), the international economic conference, the pacifist "pan-Europe draft," the Three Powers Geneva "disarmament" conference, proved another deception of the working class. The "unity" attempts merely concealed the frantic imperialist rivalries behind the scenes, the struggle for a division of the colonial spoils, the perpetual armament chase, the forming of secret and open military blocs, directly preparing for new imperialist wars. Actually, Fascist, Chauvinist, and militarist tendencies have been growing. Under the leadership of the Conservative British Cabinet the reactionary elements of the international bourgeoisie began to prepare the ground for an armed offensive on the U.S.S.R. entangling it in a whole network of provocations (raiding of Soviet Missions and murdering of Soviet diplomatic representatives abroad).

The 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U. records that simultaneously with the growing and sharpening fascist and aggressive militarist tendencies in the policy of the

capitalist States, conditions are emerging for a revolutionary solution of the present-day international and internal contradictions. The British general strike and miners' lock-out in 1926, the Indonesian rising, the great Chinese Revolution, the revolutionary upheaval of the workers in "stabilised" Austria (July, 1927), side by side with the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R.,—sharply reveal the antagonisms and decay existing in the world capitalist regime. The ebb of the revolutionary wave in Europe (since the defeat of the German revolution in 1923), is again being substituted by a flow,—growing militant activity of the proletariat, the differentiation and radicalisation of the labour movement, the consolidation of the ranks of the Comintern and its Sections, the growth of a mass revolutionary movement (demonstrations in connections with the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, the election successes of several Communist Parties, the October delegations of foreign workers to the U.S.S.R., etc.).

Taking into consideration the enumerated circumstances characterising the present international situation, the 15th Congress authorises the C.C. to carry on its work in the future:

(a) On the basis of further unbending continuation of the policy of peace which is nothing else but a policy of struggle against the danger of imperialist wars, at the same time being the main condition for the further growth of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.

(b) On the basis of every possible strengthening of fraternal connections between the workers of the U.S.S.R. and the workers of the Western countries and the toiling masses of the subjugated countries.

(c) On the basis of further systematic development of economic connections with the capitalist countries, safeguarding the growth of economic independence of the Soviet Union.

(d) On the basis of continuously strengthening the defensive capacity of the country, the strength and fighting capacity of the workers' and peasants' Red Army, air-fleet and navy.

(e) On the basis of accumulating necessary economic



reserves (grain, manufactured goods, currency, special defence reserves).

The 15th Congress considers the line and work of the Central Committee in the sphere of Home Policy and Economic Construction absolutely correct.

On the basis of Leninist policy the C.C. insured the development of State industry beyond the pre-war level with corresponding increase in the number of workers, productivity of labour and wages. The development of large-scale State industry was accompanied by an uninterrupted growth in the proportion of the means of production produced. The fundamental achievements of the Party and the working class on the path of industrialisation of our country, proclaimed by the 15th Party Congress include: Surpassing the pre-war level in industry, renovation of fixed capital of Socialist industry, beginning of a cardinal technical and productive transformation, considerable successes in electrification, creation and development of entirely new branches of industry (machinery, automobiles, turbines, aviation, chemistry), building of new factories; large buildings and machinery, and a cardinal re-equipment of old plants.

Simultaneously with the State Socialist Industry the importance of the other key positions of the proletarian State: transport, the State budget, financial institutions, the commercial apparatus, has also grown. State and Co-operative trade has assumed a decisive position on the market, systematically crowding out private capital. Our foreign trade has also expanded on the basis of the foreign trade monopoly, despite the semi-boycotting manoeuvres of our capitalist neighbours, and at the same time a favourable trade balance has been attained.

The economic policy of the Party during the recent period enabled us, on the basis of gradually strengthening the leading rôle of the Socialist town, to further the development of agriculture, enlarge the cultivated areas, increase commercial farming, supply higher technical elements: crop rotation, commercial crops, mechanisation of agricultural production. The economic alliance between town and country has considerably strengthened. Together with the growth of agriculture, the supply of manufactured

goods to the rural districts has increased, and so too has the importance of agricultural co-operation.

The 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U., however, considers it necessary to point out that the achievements referred to above are inadequate, and that the agricultural level is still extremely low. In view of that, the Congress authorises the C.C. to take practical measures for the intensification of agriculture, one of these measures being a speedy completion of the rational re-distribution of land. It is necessary to make it a task of foremost importance, on the basis of further co-operation of the peasantry, gradual transformation of the disjointed peasant enterprises along the lines of large-scale production (collective cultivation of land on the basis of intensification and agricultural machinery), fully sustaining and encouraging the beginnings of communal agricultural labour. Such intensification of agriculture is necessary also in the interests of raising the welfare of the basic masses of the peasantry, in the interests of expanding the market (of exchange and raw material) for large-scale industry, and in the interests of technical transformation and Socialist co-operation of the rural districts, and so overcoming the rural capitalist elements.

The past phase of economic development is undoubtedly a step forward towards Socialism. This general success does not mean, however, that the difficulties, dangers and antagonisms have been overcome which are connected with the peculiarities of our growth, the technical economic backwardness of the country, and the pressure of the social class forces hostile to the proletariat. Only by a systematic struggle against these will it be possible to overcome such difficulties and attain further progress towards Socialism. Among the most outstanding difficulties are the following: the export and import problem, which has become extremely complicated owing to the acuteness of the international situation; the problem of fixed capital; the problem of the cost of production and the reduction of prices of manufactured goods; the problems of unemployment and the agrarian surplus population; the problem of the commodity famine on the one hand and the better supply of the towns with farm products on the other; and,

finally, the problem of accumulating reserves (commodities and currency). The Congress calls the attention of the whole Party to the fact that a successful solution of these problems requires special efforts on the part of all Party forces, unity of will, and correct observance of Party decisions.

The 15th Congress considers that in respect of private capitalist economic elements, whose absolute growth is much slower than the growth of Socialist elements, a policy of ever more determined elimination can and should be pursued. Pre-requisites for a further economic offensive on the capitalist elements have been created by successful economic development on the basis of growing commodity exchange and the liquidation of survivals of Military Communism (the Decision of the 14th Party Conference) which concentrated in the hands of the proletarian State the necessary material economic resources, both for a successful elimination of capitalist elements in the villages (the offensive together with the middle peasants on the kulaks, extensive help to the poor peasants, strengthening of the co-operatives of the poor and middle peasants, production co-operatives), as well as for further crowding out of private capital in the towns.

The 15th Congress authorises the C.C. not to slow down the pace of Socialist Industrialisation which has already brought the first positive results. By strengthening in every way the industrial power of the U.S.S.R., the Party must continue to develop (using for this purpose the existing financial and economic resources) the production of means of production, particularly metallurgy and machinery, develop the production of raw material (cotton, wool, hides, etc.) in the country, continue the policy of reducing the cost of production, and undeviatingly carry out the price-reduction policy on manufactured goods.

The general orientation towards the industrialisation of our country must be accompanied by a determination to rationalise production and management. Rationalisation of production, with a simultaneous improvement and simplification of the Government and State apparatus, is an outstanding task in the coming period. In the interests of raising the material and cultural level of the proletariat,

and also in the interests of rationalisation of the process of production, the Party proclaimed a gradual transition to the seven-hour day, accompanied by a further rise in the standard of living of the working class which constitutes a fundamental difference between our methods of rationalisation and the capitalist methods, where rationalisation is accompanied by a lowering of the standard of living of the masses and lengthening of the working day. Calling upon all Party, economic, trade union and Soviet organisations to devote their utmost energy to the solution of this most important task—the Socialist rationalisation of industry—the 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U. holds that only on this basis is it possible to industrialise the country (including also the industrialisation of agriculture), abolish unemployment, overcome bureaucratic distortions in the proletarian state, meet the growing requirements of the masses of workers and peasants, enhance their further cultural development, and overcome the main difficulties in the way of Socialist construction.

Despite the leading and ever-growing rôle of Socialist economic elements, the increase of the productive forces of the U.S.S.R. economy is inevitably accompanied by a partial development of class contradictions. The private capitalist sections of town and country, linked up with some bureaucratic elements of the Soviet and economic apparatus, endeavour to strengthen their counter-action to the working class offensive—they endeavour to bring their influence, which is hostile to the proletarian dictatorship, to bear on certain sections of employees and intellectuals, on backward artisans and craftsmen, workers and peasants. This influence asserts itself also in the sphere of culture politics, and ideology (the Smienoviekh ideas, the slogan of the kulak "peasant union," chauvinism, anti-Semitism, the advocacy of bourgeois-democratic "liberties," and the petty bourgeois oppositional two-party slogan connected with it, etc.). This hostile influence and growing activity of the capitalist elements has been reacted to by the working class, headed by the C.P.S.U., by strengthening the régime of the proletarian dictatorship, by still greater activity, initiative and cultural development of the prole-

tarian masses (the livening up of the Soviets, expansion of trade unions democracy and co-operation, greater ideological proletarian activity in the villages, cultural and educational work among the masses, etc.), and also the strengthening of the ideological influence of the proletariat on the broad sections of the Soviet intelligentsia. Recording a series of undoubted successes on this battle front, the Congress considers it necessary to mobilise, as far as possible, the proletarian masses in the future and to intensify the struggle on the ideological and cultural front.

Recording a quantitative and qualitative growth of our Party since the 14th Congress, fully approving the policy of the C.C. in regulating the social composition of the Party, and taking cognizance of the success of the "October Drive" for working-class members for the Party in connection with the tenth anniversary of the Soviet Government, the 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U. declares that the guiding rôle of the C.P.S.U. as the main lever of the dictatorship can be preserved, insured and strengthened only on the basis of Leninist consolidation and proletarian discipline among the Party ranks, accompanied by an uninterrupted growth of the ideological, theoretical, and cultural level of its members, a consistent policy of inner Party democracy, and systematic improvement of the social composition of the Party through continuously recruiting working men and women employed in industry for the Party.

The Congress considers it necessary, particularly owing to the complexity of the tasks now confronting the Party and the object of raising the activity of the masses of Party membership, to develop inner Party democracy, practical criticism of shortcomings both in the Soviet apparatus and in the Party itself, to intensify the struggle against careerism, and so forth and so on. Simultaneously, the Congress calls the attention of the Party to the necessity of intensifying our activities in the Young Communist League, among the young workers in general, and among women.

The 15th Congress places on record that, despite the warning of the 13th Party Congress, which noted the "petty bourgeois deviation" of the Trotsky group, and despite the warning of the 15th All-Union Party Conference

concerning the "Social Democratic deviation" of the united Opposition under Trotsky's leadership, the latter continued to intensify its revisionist errors from month to month, fighting against the C.P.S.U., and Lenin's teachings, building up its own party, taking up the struggle outside the C.P.S.U., appealing to non-proletarian elements in the country against the régime of the proletarian dictatorship. The ideology of the Opposition, which openly made an alliance with the renegades of international Communism (Maslow, Souvarine, and Co.) has at the present time developed into and taken the shape of Menshevism in its peculiar Trotskyist form. The denial of the Socialist character of the Soviet State enterprises, the denial of the possibility of victorious Socialist construction in our country, the denial of the policy of an alliance of the working class with the basic masses of the peasantry, the denial of the organisational principles of Bolshevism (the policy of splitting the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern), logically led the Trotskyist Menshevik Opposition to slander the U.S.S.R. as having a degenerating, Thermidorian Government, the denial of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R., and the counter-revolutionary struggle against it.

In general the Opposition broke ideologically from Leninism, degenerated into a Menshevik group, adopted the path of capitulation to the forces of the international and home bourgeoisie, and became objectively transformed into an instrument of the third force against the régime of the proletarian dictatorship. That was precisely why the Opposition suffered such a crashing rebuff on the part of the entire mass of Party members as well as the working class as a whole.

All decisions of the C.C. and C.C.C. directed against the disruptive activities of the Trotskyites, the 15th Congress considers absolutely correct and as a necessary minimum; it authorises the C.C. to guarantee Leninist unity in the Party also in the future, at any cost.

Taking into consideration the fact that the disagreements between the Party and the Opposition changed from tactical into programmatic differences, that the Trotskyist

Opposition objectively became a factor of anti-Soviet struggle, the 15th Congress declares membership of the Trotskyist Opposition and the propagation of its views incompatible with membership of the Bolshevik Party.

On behalf of the C.P.S.U., on behalf of the working class of the Soviet Union, the 15th Congress expresses the firm proletarian belief in the triumph of Socialism in our country, regardless of all difficulties. The world historical experience of the ten years of proletarian dictatorship is a splendid confirmation of the correctness of the Leninist path which the C.P.S.U. follows. The 15th Congress proposes to the C.C. to move forward undeviatingly along this path in the future, consolidating under the watchword of Socialist construction ever larger masses of toilers of our country, strengthening the fraternal ties of solidarity with the proletariat of all countries, making the U.S.S.R. year in and year out an ever more powerful advance post of the World Socialist Revolution.

(The resolution was adopted unanimously.)

# REPORT OF CENTRAL CONTROL COMMISSION

## and Workers' and Peasants' Inspection

### By Comrade Ordjonikidze

#### 1. The Work of the C.C.C.

Comrades, there is no need to dwell much on the Opposition, since only a short time ago a resolution was unanimously adopted on the report of the C.C. giving an exhaustive appraisal of the ideological content of the Opposition. The Congress clinched the question by approving the point of the incompatibility of membership of the Trotskyist Opposition and the propagation of its views with membership of our Party. It now depends entirely on the Opposition as to whether they are to be in our Party or not, as to whether they want to capitulate fully in accordance with the decision of the Congress and remain in the Party, or whether they want to adhere to their mistaken views and remain outside of the Party.

By its unanimous vote the Congress decided that if the Opposition does not capitulate fully and completely, both ideologically and organisationally, they will place themselves outside the Party.

If hitherto we had to argue with and prove to the Opposition that they carry on factional work, that they have a faction, that they organise a second Party, now there is no need to prove and argue about it, as Comrade Kamenev, who spoke here, did not dare to deny that they have a faction and that the statements of several former Oppositionists show with absolute certainty that it was not a mere faction, but a Party with its own platform and its own programme. It is clear that two parties cannot exist within one.

What is our position at the present time? The imperialist states are preparing an offensive, and we shall



be faced with a good many difficulties within the country which can only be overcome if we have one Party, a Party governed by the iron discipline which has always made us strong. Does the Opposition strengthen this discipline by its action? Does it strengthen the unity of the Party, or vice versa? People who have their own printing establishment, people who try to organise demonstrations against the Party and the Soviet Government—such people do not strengthen our Party discipline.

Who raises his head while the Opposition pursues its destructive struggle? What do the White Guard newspapers contain? What do the Menshevik Dan and his friends write? They have only one thing to say, and that is: "It is unimportant to us as to what the Opposition programme is; their Left phrases are of no importance to us; what is important is that by their agitation and their struggle they shatter discipline and the proletarian dictatorship." The Opposition voluntarily placed themselves outside of the Party ranks by their actions during the two years since the 14th Congress.

Since the 14th Congress the Opposition continuously carried on their factional struggle. They carried on their struggle in Leningrad while the 14th Congress was in session, and immediately after the Congress they wanted the Leningrad organisation not to submit to the Party Congress. What could the C.C.C. do, except demand from the Opposition leaders that they cease violating the decisions of the Congress? If they continued an open struggle in Leningrad after the 14th Congress, and within a few months began to organise "forest meetings," what was there left for the C.C.C. to do? Should it have praised them, and told Lashevitch that he was doing a good thing? Of course not. It had to warn Comrade Lashevitch, which it did, that such things are impermissible in the Bolshevik Party. It warned him, and then proposed to the joint Plenum of the C.C. and C.C.C. that he be expelled and cease to be a candidate for membership of the C.C.

A few months elapsed, and in October, 1926, the Opposition tried to force a discussion on the Party. A discussion fever set in. The Opposition leaders ran from factory to factory, they travelled from Moscow to Leningrad and

from Leningrad to Moscow. Being smashed and beaten by the rank-and-file members of the Party, they issued a declaration on October 16th, in which they renounced their factional struggle and gave a pledge that they would not do it any more.

If some comrades were expelled from the Party on the eve of the 17th of October for violation of Party discipline, the C.C.C. literally did its utmost after the statement of October 16th to reinstate them in the Party, imposing upon them the one condition of not indulging in any more factional battles. We had to dilly-dally with some comrades for three days in succession, urging them to remain in the Party. Perhaps the Congress will say: "Who authorised you to dilly-dally so much with people who do not want to be in the Party." But I am merely reporting to you what actually happened. Comrade Soltz and myself were bargaining with Vladimir Smirnov for a whole week—(Voice: "You honoured him too much!")—urging him to renounce the impermissible statement he made at a session of the C.C.C., which he did, and thus enabled us to annul the decision of the Moscow Control Commission and to leave him in the Party. In this manner we reinstated' about 90 per cent. of all the expelled, for which we were rebuked by the local control commission, saying: "We combat the Oppositionists, expel them from the Party, and the C.C.C. reinstates them all." That was the case with some districts, as, for instance, Transcaucasia, where quite a number of people were expelled—and they undoubtedly deserved expulsion—while we reinstated almost every one of them. (Voice: "You should not have done it!") I know that we shall not be patted on the back for it, but I am telling you these things not in order to be praised or rebuked. I am merely reporting what has actually happened, to show you that we did all that we could to enable the comrades to fulfil their pledge of October 16th.

They regarded all this with contempt, and interpreted our attitude as a sign of weakness. They began to compose all kinds of legends about disagreements within the C.C.C., about three and four groups, etc

At the August Plenum we dilly-dallied with the Opposition for almost three days, making maximum concessions

in order to retain them in the C.C. and prove once more that it is we who want unity in the Party. No matter how wrong the Opposition's actions had been, no matter how impermissible their action had been, we nevertheless tried to keep them in the C.C. Those who attended that Plenum remember only too well the resentment in this hall when I reported and made my proposals on behalf of the Commission, while the whole plenum insisted on expulsion. We had to make an enormous effort to induce the Plenum to accept the proposal of the Commission.

How did the Opposition appreciate that step? On the very next day the rumour was circulated that the C.C. and C.C.C. are weak, their hands are too short, they will not dare to touch us. I spoke with Kamenev the next day after the August Plenum, and told him: "Look here, Comrade Kamenev, do not offer any such explanation, because it will prove fatal." Kamenev answered: "Yes, we must now live up to our pledge given to the C.C. and C.C.C." "October 16th" could happen a second time, but not a third time. That is how it actually turned out. A third time it could not happen.

Further, the October Plenum. Another warning. They treated it again with contempt. Instead of fulfilling the pledges given to the C.C. and C.C.C., they organised an illegal printing establishment. All kinds of scoundrels and White Guard scum flocked to this printing establishment. When they were told about it they got wild, saying: "How so? You accuse us of plotting!" We do not accuse you of plotting, but of becoming a plaything in the hands of the third force. That is what we contend. When we asked Sharov and Preobrazhensky to explain themselves, they said: "We declare that we are politically responsible for this business, and we, the undersigned, are the organisers of it, and not the non-party people who are incidentally connected with it." And, further: "We demand the immediate liberation of all those arrested in connection with the case, as we bear the responsibility." (E. Preobrazhensky, L. Serebriakov, J. Sharov.)

Comrade Kamenev spoke here of Mratchkovsky's arrest, and was indignant about it. Do you think it was so pleasant for us to arrest Mratchkovsky? Do you think that

we do not know that Mratchkovsky fought against Kolchak? Of course we know. But when Mratchkovsky, who fought against Kolchak, now begins to fight against our C.C., against our Soviet Government, what is there left for us to do? There is no other way out but to arrest him, no matter how much we dislike it. (Applause.) Revolution is not a trifle. If we begin to shatter the Party which leads the revolution, then, according to Lenin, any revolution can be lost. We have no right to allow anyone to shatter our Party and our revolution. And that is exactly to what the Opposieion activities lead.

Before expelling Zinoviev and Trotsky from the Party, the Presidium of the C.C.C. demanded that they cease their illegal meetings. There was only one demand—that is, to give up the illegal meetings. We did not demand the dissolution of the faction, we did not demand the renunciation of their views which are incompatible with membership in the Party. You can go to the nuclei, to meetings, develop your platform, do anything you like, only give up your illegal assemblies. What do you think? Was that demand unacceptable? Was that quartering people? Staying together in one Party, we said: You can develop your views, you can speak openly at meetings; only give up your illegal assemblies.

What was their answer? "You are putting a revolver at our heads," they said. "Give us a chance to think it over and consider it," etc. To answer such a demand as to give up illegal meetings it turns out that it is necessary to come together, convene the illegal Central Committee, consider and think matters over, and only then reply. With such an attitude to the Party it is impossible to be together with us in the Party. (Voices: "Hear, hear!")

They claim that we did not allow them to publish their platform. But the C.C. and C.C.C. decided that the discussion should begin one month before the 15th Congress, in accordance with the Party statutes. There was nothing in that decision in violation of the statutes, nothing that was unacceptable to the Party. But what did they do? They submitted their platform, which constitutes a regular programme of a new party, abusing throughout the 72 pages both the Party and the C.C., and demanded its

immediate publication. Two weeks prior to submitting it to the Polit-Bureau they sent their platform to Turkestan, naturally, not for editing, but for circulation. When the C.C.C. replied that the discussion begins on the 1st of November, that they will be able to submit their counter theses at that time, and that such is the decision of the Party, they treated that reply with contempt, opened their illegal printing establishment, and began to print their platform illegally.

## II. WORK OF THE WORKERS' AND PEASANTS' INSPECTION.

Before dealing with the work of the W.P.I., allow me to make a few preliminary remarks. When we speak of our apparatus and say that it is good for nothing, there is, of course, a good deal of truth in it. But when people want to blame the C.C. or the Party for it, that is wrong. This is not because we want to protect ourselves. I have already been at that work for a year, and have raised Cain against our apparatus, which I think must be done also in the future to set its work right. This is inevitable. It is indispensable.

But to understand why our apparatus is as it is we must turn back and recall what was before, what stuff it was made of, what it was then, and what it is now. We cannot compare our State apparatus, for instance, with the German, French, or any other State apparatus. Here is what Lenin wrote on the eve of October:

“Not a parliamentary republic—a return to that from the Soviet of Workers' Deputies would be a step backward—but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Agricultural Labourers', and Peasant Deputies throughout the country from top to bottom.

“The abolition of the police, the army, the officers (*i.e.*, substitution of the standing army by a universal armament of the people).

“Salaries of officials, who are to be elected and subject to recall, should never exceed the wages of skilled workers.” (Vol. XIV., Par. I., p. 18-19, Russian Edition.)

In developing this idea further, he wrote in his pamphlet, “Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?”:—

"The Soviets are the new State machinery. In the first place, they give expression to the armed force of the workers and peasants, in such a way, however, that this force is not divorced from the people, as was the force of the old standing army; but is bound up with them as closely as possible. In a military sense this force is incomparably greater than the former; in relation to the revolution it is second to none. Secondly, the connection of this machinery with the masses, with the majority of the people, is so intimate, so indissoluble, so readily verified and renewable, that nothing like it is even approached in the former State. Thirdly, this machinery, because it is elective and its constitution is revocable in accordance with the will of the people without any bureaucratic formalities, is far more democratic than that of the old Governments. Fourthly, it provides a firm connection with the most various industries and professions, thus facilitating all sorts of most radical reforms without any bureaucracy. Fifthly, it gives form to the organisation of the vanguard, that is to the most conscious, most energetic, most progressive section of the oppressed classes of the worker and peasants, and is thus an apparatus whereby the vanguard of the oppressed classes can uplift, educate, and lead in its train the whole gigantic mass of these classes which until now have stood quite outside all political life, outside history. Sixthly, it makes it possible to unite the advantages of parliamentarism with the advantages of immediate and direct democracy—that is, to unite in the persons of elected representatives of the people both legislative and executive functions. In comparison with bourgeois parliamentarism it is a step forward in the development of democracy which has a historical world significance." ("Will the Bolsheviks Maintain Power?" pp. 41-43.)

We should compare our present Soviet apparatus with that. It stands to reason that we could not create a machine to realise Lenin's idea in ten years.

What was our situation on the morrow after our victory? We had no cultural and technical forces of our own. Which of us was then able to manage a factory? Which of us was then able to administer the country? Ninety-nine per cent. of our comrades did not learn to

manage the State. We were therefore compelled, the day after the revolution, to employ the technical and cultural forces of our opposing classes—the forces of the old officialdom, the old bureaucracy. They, those bureaucrats, in coming to us brought with them also their manners. They were opposed to the Soviet Government and openly sabotaged. This old officialdom tried to build the Soviet apparatus after the image of the old tsarist apparatus.

The Opposition make a fierce attack against our Red Army. In the statement of Zinoviev and Trotsky, and particularly in the statement of the "15"—the Sapronov-Smirnov group—our Red Army is described as a Pretorian army constituting a basis for any Bonaparte. Is that true? It is absolutely false.

The number of workers on the staff of the Red Army constitutes 18.1 per cent., the peasants constitute 71.3 per cent., and the others 10.6 per cent. In 1925 the Communists and Young Communists constituted 22.8 per cent., and in 1926 29.9 per cent. The number of Party members on the staff increases from year to year. Thus in 1920 they constituted 10.5 per cent., in 1921 20 per cent., in 1922 22.5 per cent., in 1923 29.6 per cent., in 1924 31.8 per cent., in 1925 43.3 per cent., in 1926 47 per cent., and in 1927 54 per cent.

Is that our Army or not? Perhaps you will say that it is not linked up with the working class. Maybe our Red Army men meet the workers only when they are out on strike and the Army disperses them, as is the case in capitalist countries. There is not a single human being in our country who would be able to assert that our Red Army ever came to quench labour unrest in a factory. Our Red Army comes to the factories and the workers come to the barracks in order to demonstrate their unity, their fraternal bonds.

If you take our other State institutions you will find everywhere that, despite all shortcomings, the State apparatus is ours, it is in our hands. Such facts as the "Control Figures" of the State Planning Commission, on the basis of which national economy is planned from year to year, show that we are at the helm, that the question "Who, whom?" raised by Lenin, is settled in our favour.

We have 3,722,000 people working in our State apparatus, including educational workers. There are about 2,000,000 people working in our administrative and managing section of the apparatus. The upkeep of this apparatus costs the country about 2,000,000,000 roubles.

We should not leave unnoticed our new construction. We began to build gigantic plants, and upon their rapid completion and expedient construction depends the question of the industrialisation in our country.

Building goes on without ratified plans, drafts and estimates; work is not completed to time; the dates fixed for the completion of work in the different departments and forms of construction do not tally; we have high costs and low quality of building; there is chaos and disorder in the supply of building material and the importation of implements (things coming too late, etc.); the general administrative expenditure is too high (20 per cent. of the cost of building, equalling in some cases 100 per cent. of the wages).

We considered administrative expenditure too great, and that the experience and forces from abroad are not sufficiently used in this direction, and therefore raised this question quite categorically. The acuteness of the situation is now over. When I recently spoke with comrades from the Supreme Economic Council they all thought that the really necessary work had been accomplished which has resulted in eliminating many defects.

In this connection the foremost question is the continuation of our work in simplifying and cheapening the State, industrial, co-operative and trading apparatus. The commission of the Council of Labour and Defence, headed by Comrade Tzurupa, accomplished an enormous amount of work in rationalising the distributing apparatus. But the practical materialisation of the measure mapped out requires to be tested continuously.

It is the task of the W.P.I. to see that the decisions of the Government and the Party are always carried out. Lenin pointed out many a time that we have no shortage of good laws. We have plenty of them, but they are not always carried out properly and in due time.

The Party has now raised the question of the



rationalisation of national economy. It should be stated that this work is being carried on in the country apparently on a large scale. We have no résumé as yet, but I recently looked through the manuscript of quite an interesting book written by Yermansky. He has a mass of material on the results attained in the sphere of the rationalisation of our production. There is reason for boasting, but there is also cause for weeping. He cites an example, for instance, of how the Mospoligraph built a pencil factory, ordered the best machines from Germany, but was absolutely unable to instal them properly. The result is that, despite the excellent machines, the effect is not what might have been expected, merely because the machines are not properly installed.

At the same time, many examples are cited showing great progress. Simple, elementary, sensible organisation of labour gives big results. The same book contains such an example. Under similar conditions in a factory abroad a worker produced 50 per cent. more than the other workers. It transpired that this was the result of the following: Every time the workman came to work, before starting the job, he placed all his instruments in a position most suitable to their manipulation during the work.

This simple trick gave 50 per cent. greater results. The book also contains such an example: In our mines a skilled miner has to run about looking for wood which could well be supplied by an unskilled worker.

Despite our technical backwardness, we have vast opportunities for rationalising our enterprises. It is necessary to draw our workers into this work, our technical and scientific forces and foreign experts, and assimilate the experience of other countries. It is impossible to attain results of consequence in the sphere of rationalisation without making extensive use of the scientific and technical forces. Considering that rationalisation must be carried out by the forces of the enterprises themselves, the W.P.I. makes it its task to test the achievements in this sphere and the expedient utilisation of the workers and scientific and technical forces as well as the instruments.

The central point in all our work must be a relentless,

systematic struggle against bureaucratic distortions in all branches of our Soviet apparatus. It is not only a question here of eliminating shortcomings of which I have to speak, but also of stopping intolerable treatment of people in State institutions, factories, workshops, co-operatives, the Militia, the Court, etc. It is intolerable that people should be served well or badly in our co-operatives according to the kind of clothes they wear. If we are to pay attention to clothes, then first service must be given to those who wear poorer clothes. In every one of our institutions people must be able to get proper information and a decent answer. It often happens that one cannot find the person he is looking for, or get a sensible answer to one's questions.

The broad masses of workers and peasants must participate in the struggle against bureaucracy. Lenin taught us that the struggle against bureaucracy can be successful only with the participation of the masses. Speaking of participation of the masses in combating bureaucracy, Lenin never tired of repeating that it is necessary to draw into this struggle the non-Party working men and women, peasants and peasant women.

Lenin attached tremendous importance to the Press in the struggle against bureaucracy.

We have such powerful organisations for the struggle against bureaucracy as our Soviets. Real enactment of Soviet democracy is a death blow to bureaucracy. We have about 1½ million people in our Soviets, about 20 million shareholders in the co-operatives, 9 million trade union members, the Young Communist League, the Party, production conferences, economic commissions, control commissions, and the entire working class—such is our army, with the help of which we must carry on a systematic struggle against bureaucracy.

In instituting the W.P.I. and taxing it with the task of fighting bureaucracy and the shortcomings of our apparatus, Vladimir Ilyitch realised only too well that the W.P.I. will be able to cope with its task only if the Party assigns the best people to the work. He definitely declared that we must give the best we have for the W.P.I., otherwise it does not pay to organise it. This idea of Lenin must be realised. (Stormy and prolonged applause.)

## DISCUSSION ON COMRADE ORDJONIKIDZE'S REPORT

There were twenty-five speakers. We give here in abbreviated form the most typical speech, i.e. the speech of Comrade Yaroslavsky, member of the Presidium of the C.C.C.

Comrades, I have to say a few words on the work of the Party collegium.

If we take all local control commissions during the two years under report (not quite two years) we will find that 93,000 members and candidates of the Party were called to account. Of these 83,000 were reprimanded, 28,563 being expelled. The absolute figure is very big, but if you will divide it by two, you will find that in one year, 1925, altogether 1.8 per cent. of the Party members and candidates were called to account for various acts, and in 1927 1.6 per cent. The percentage in the second case is somewhat smaller, but it should be taken into consideration that we started last year to include also those called to account by the district control commissions which hitherto was not the case, so that the number increased. The number of people expelled is about 14,000-15,000 annually. This number also seems big, but again it is not a number that we did not see before. We were also, in former years, compelled to select our Party members, for, being a ruling Party, it at times attracts people who have ulterior motives.

The number of expulsions declines comparatively from year to year. We always pursued a class attitude also in the Party. We judge the crimes of Party members very strictly, but at the same time we take into consideration the political development, living conditions, etc.

We have considerably less slander. Every Party organisation will tell you that there is less slander in our Party now, while formerly it corroded the organisation.

This does not mean that we have no slander at all; we have that also now when a struggle is taken up by some group which is based on no principles. In such cases slander is given the form of high differences of principle: one group accuses the other, as was, for instance, the case in Koma (Zyriansk district). One group accused the other of being in the Opposition. It unearthed all kinds of ideological foundations to prove that the group must be removed, etc. This we still have, but to a much smaller degree than in former years. There are fewer conflicts on national grounds. There is a good deal less intemperance, fewer violations of Party discipline, less squandering of funds and less debts. I cannot claim that everything is perfect in this respect. If we have any improvement in this connection it is due to the Party organisations, as well as our control commissions, which put up a violent fight against all waste, people who never think of public interests but only of their personal welfare, how to make themselves comfortable, how to make use of the funds which happen to be in their hands.

I am the first one to unfurl an Opposition banner at this Congress. (He unfurls a banner which causes commotion in the hall.) This is the banner of the Spassk Co-operative "Bondar." At the head of that co-operative was the former owner of the enterprise; his daughter was the secretary. That was in the Far East, in the town of Spassk. They decided to display the following banner on the occasion of the anniversary of the Revolution: "Long live the Unity of the Bolshevik Ranks, and their vanguard—the Leninist Opposition!" (Laughter.)

We are responsible for a good many steps being taken in regard to the Opposition. Not only do we intend not to shirk this responsibility, but, on the contrary, we are proud of it. We voted for the expulsion of Zinoviev and Trotsky from the Party before the Party Congress. We supported such measures as the removal of Bieloborodov from his position as Peoples' Commissar for Home Affairs, and Smirnov from his position as People's Commissar for Postal Services, before the Congress. It must be remembered that we really overtaxed our patience. We knew, for instance, that these people pursued an anti-Party line.

However, we took no measures after the Fourteenth Congress to remove them from highly important political posts. At one time they even boasted: "Look, we hold some of the most important positions; we have our comrades abroad, Rakovsky is in Paris, and such and such a one is in such and such a place," etc. But when events developed, how far did they go? They went so far that at their illegal meetings everything they said was pure calumny of the Party, in the true sense of the word. We have information in our commission—anyone can see the material if he likes—of dozens of illegal meetings organised under the leadership of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Rakovsky, Radek, and others. There they reigned supreme.

Trotsky was asked at an underground meeting in Malaya Ordinka what he thought of the Manifesto, and he said: "This document is an adventure, the still-born babe of a bureaucracy which feels the ground shaking under its feet."

At another meeting he was asked: "Why have you established connections with Stcherbakov, who is non-Party?" He replied: "Stcherbakov is non-Party only because he was not accepted, otherwise he is a splendid Communist." This splendid Communist, a manufacturer's son who is connected with elements absolutely foreign to us, is closely related to some of the Oppositionists, in the literal sense of the term. Stcherbakov's relationship is close to the chief leaders of the Opposition.

He is a real Communist; the only trouble with him is that he has no Party card in his pocket. When Trotsky was asked what about the Fifteenth Congress he answered: "What is the Fifteenth Congress? The pending Fifteenth Congress is nothing but an All-Union Conference of Stalin's fraction." (Shouts of indignation.) "It stands to reason," continued Trotsky, "that the Opposition will develop its activities after the Congress." But if they say such things at some underground meetings, at another meeting in Miuskaya Street Trotsky said: "We can be separated from the working class and the Party only with our flesh and blood. We are convinced that the real discussion will begin only when the Congress is over."

How can we, after this, believe the statements they

have made here? Zinoviev will not protest if Urbahns still calls him chairman of the Comintern while he has already become the chairman of some other unknown international. What that international will be, whether a Three-and-a-half International, or the same Second International with which some of the Opposition, such as Rosenberg, collaborate, we will see in the near future, if they do not find their way back to the Party. They themselves did not in the least live up to the same elementary loyalty to the Party which they demanded from the Workers' Opposition.

Allow me to deal with the activities of Bieloborodov and Mratchkovsky. Bieloborodov was People's Commissar for Home Affairs. He took part in the working out of the same instructions on the elections of which they later accused us. He participated in the elaboration of all subsequent instructions. The question arises: Can anyone mention at least one document of recent date concerning which that People's Commissar for Home Affairs would declare that he disagrees with the Government? He always remained a member of the Government. Any honest man in his place would have said: "Comrades, I cannot be a People's Commissar, because I disagree with the Party line." But he stayed in the Government, used the apparatus as much as he could, and recently sent out people everywhere to act in his name. He himself went personally to the Urals together with Mratchkovsky. He spoke there before non-Party workers, something to the following effect: "The Stalin faction existing in the C.C. made an alliance with the Right S.R.'s and enacts a policy in the interests of the bourgeoisie. They will rob the working class and skin the peasantry." What would you call this in the language of any class? That is what is called treason.

When he was escorted out of the Session Hall he excitedly turned to the sentry, saying: "You are in the service of a foreign class." To the question of a Red Army man: "What do you mean by a foreign class, what class is it?" Bieloborodov answered: "You are serving Ustrialov." I do not know whether every Red Army man knows who Ustrialov is, but he does know that he serves the cause of the Workers' and Peasants' Government, that he

serves the cause of the proletarian revolution. (Applause.) And when a People's Commissar tells him that he serves in the interest of another class, that is—(Voice: "Counter-revolution!")—quite so; it is nothing but counter-revolution. No Menshevik would dare do that, and here is a Trotskyite who is trusted by the Party, daring to do so!

After that we were forced to tell the whole country that Bieloborodov not only does not voice the opinions of the Soviet Government, but that he cannot even be a member of the Soviet Governments—(applause)—that he cannot be a member of the Party for another moment. (Applause.)

I called him out and had a comradely talk with him. Naturally, he maintained that this was not so. He admitted that certain things were said but not in exactly the same way. On the whole, however, he did not deny his actions. On this account I see no cause whatever for annulling the decision of the Ural Control Commission concerning Bieloborodov.

The same is true of Mratchkovsky. Mratchkovsky told us when we considered the case of the underground printing establishment that he organised it, and will do so in the future, using similar methods in the struggle against us. After that he went to the Urals, started to work underground, and declared that he would not leave until he had brought the Ural Party organisation to its knees. (Laughter, voices: "He wanted a bit too much. We will bring him to his knees!") Once the question took the form of "Who—whom?" it stands to reason that the Ural Party organisation did everything before Mratchkovsky developed his activities. He conducted the most demagogic policy possible. What were his instructions? Here is an outline written by Mratchkovsky, given over, it seems to me, by Kuzovnikov. In this outline there are the following practical "tasks": "Do not worry over the Party card; but if you are expelled do not give it up; collect signatures to the platform even under separate points, i.e., show separate points and get as many signatures as you can to them." And after that they stated that he played a big rôle in the civil war, and therefore he must by no means be thrown out of the Party.

On the basis of the Opposition work downright White Guardists are now thriving. It begins with a circular written by Radek, Lashevitch, Bakaev, Naumov, Zalutsky, Fiedorov, Zinoviev, and Yevdokimov. It is explained that they write articles for the "Leningrad Pravda," but knowing that we cannot circulate such abominable stuff, they begin to circulate it by hand. How do they describe the Party in it? "Hissers, scandal-mongers, who attack the Bolshevik-Lenists like low-down burglars and political bankrupts."

I will take the Vologodsk Gubernia, a purely agrarian province. An unimportant Trotskyist group was organised there, trying to work in the villages and send out circulars. Here is what they say: "To all groups of the Ustianov district, the Velsk Opposition group," etc. The slogans are very interesting: "On with the work, down with the dictators of the Commune, Long live the only right Party!" What kind of an only right Party is that? It turns out that we need the only properly constructed Party, the Party of the Left Trotskyites. The same Trotskyist, apparently, writes to the Velsk Opposition concerning the Industrialisation Loan. You know from to-day's papers that the Industrialisation Loan has fully materialised and was even over subscribed by twenty-million. (Applause.) We know that the working class rendered support to Soviet Socialist construction which we could only expect from the working class. We know that peasants also participated in this Loan. I think that this is not the last industrialisation loan and that we shall show the capitalists of the world that the Leninist Party of our country has the necessary support of the working class and the peasantry. But these people seem to be afraid that the peasants will participate in the industrialisation loan just as we were afraid in 1917 that the peasants would subscribe for the "Liberty Loan." This Trotskyist writes to his leaders: "The Industrialisation Loan does not interest the peasantry at all, the peasants do not take it up. Only the employees buy bonds. Your fears are unfounded." Do you see now what they are afraid of? They are afraid that the peasants will support the Industrialisation Loan. Only an enemy who has defi-



nately gone over to the camp of the counter-revolution can think that way. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Applause.)

The same Oppositionist asks his leaders: "What should I do if a non-Party peasant joins our group for a joint struggle against the Party's rural policy?" That is how far it went. He did not know what to do. He was so entangled that he could not understand as to whether he should rebuff those who "join" in for the struggle against the Party, or whether he should caress them and adopt them as his allies. But this is exactly what they are appealing to—it is the third force. That is where the third force is. That is where real counter-revolution comes from.

During the life of Lenin we often said, and Lenin maintained, that people who stand up against the Party, against the proletarian Bolshevik Party, become the pivot, the rallying point of all counter-revolutionary elements. We often warned the Opposition that they were coming to this. And they have done so. If they are not strong enough to-day to make a sharp turn from this path upon which they have entered, you can understand that the Party cannot regard such a group in any other way but as counter-revolutionary. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Applause.)

There is a document about Bukharin at the Conference of the Moscow Gubernia, with which I cannot deal in detail. It is a draft "Programme of the Communist Party of the Working Class of the U.S.S.R." Of course, neither Trotsky nor Zinoviev, nor any of those who were leaders of our Party wrote this programme, but that they inspired others to do it there can be no doubt. It contains everything you can think of against the C.P.S.U. But this does not prevent the programme from advancing a theses which is absolutely an anti-semitic programme. It is very remarkable, considering that the Opposition tries to accuse the majority of the Party of permitting anti-semitism. In reality the Opposition gives rise to all kinds of counter-revolutionary elements, including anti-semitism. Here is what they say in that programme:

"Instead of abolishing classes and national differences, they continue the same old Tsarist policy of:

'Divide and rule,' setting the workers against the intellectuals of their own nationality, abusing them and hurling wholesale charges of counter-revolution, and other deadly (literally so) sins against them, only because they can see a good deal. This gang of parasites removed the shackles from the most crafty and artful Jewish bourgeoisie and intellectuals, their worst representatives, who with loud shouts and fulminations about revolution, Socialism, and working-class welfare, enter the first rank of parasites exploiting and growing fat on the sweat of the workers, not only of the other nationalities, but also on the sweat of the Jewish workers, and are able, in robbing and deceiving the whole working class, to surpass the adventurers and scoundrels of the bourgeoisie of other nationalities by their abominable work, provoking thereby general national hatred to all Jews, regardless of the class to which they belong."

Then comes a division of the Opposition platform into points:

The Trotskyists are indignant over the repressive measures which we have taken against them. I must tell you, from the Fourteenth Congress, that up to November 15 we called to account for factional activity altogether 2,031 people. That constitutes 0.17 per cent., or one-sixth of one per cent. of our Party membership. We expelled after the Congress 970 people. That includes all Party organisations. Altogether 4,000 votes were given for the Opposition, while we called to account only about one-half of that number. It means that we still thought that an Oppositionist can be in our Party if he does not carry on any factional work. If you take the social composition of those called to account, you will find that 35 per cent. of them are office workers, and 10-14 per cent. students. More than half are not workers. Whereas, the workers constitute 62 per cent. of the Party, the workers in the Opposition constitute only a little over 40 per cent., although the Opposition recently issued a slogan to attract workers by all means possible.

The C.C.C. was even more lenient. For instance, we

called to account 75 people and expelled only 19. One hundred and forty-six people from the provinces appealed against their expulsions; we approved only 47 expulsions.

If you take all the activities I describe and add the fact that there is a second Party, the statutes of which were published in the "Pravda," the picture will be clear. Let them organise their Party with the Liberals and the Stcherbakovs, but let them not lay their hands on the working class, because the working class—I am convinced—once it finds out about all their counter-revolutionary activities, will strike even harder still than hitherto. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Applause.)

## THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE TASKS OF THE C.I.

(Report of the Delegation of the C.P.S.U.  
to the E.C.C.I. at the 15th Congress of  
the Party)

### COMRADE N. I. BUKHARIN'S REPORT.

Comrade N. I. Bukharin's appearance on the platform was greeted with stormy applause. The delegates rose and cheered him. Comrade Bukharin said:

#### *(Introduction.)*

Comrades, two years have passed since the last Party Congress. These two years were rich in events both in a general sense and from the international point of view. Important changes have taken place during these two years, such as transition to the reconstruction period in the U.S.S.R.; development of partial capitalist stabilisation and of differences within this stabilisation: economic reorganisation in the biggest capitalist States (increased trustification, etc.); growing acuteness of international conflicts; growing war danger, particularly the danger of war against the U.S.S.R.; growing acuteness of the colonial problem for capitalist States in general; the great Chinese revolution, the revolution in Indonesia, the undoubted revival of the national-revolutionary movement in India, etc.

On the European continent alone there have been developments of internal stabilisation differences, growing acuteness of the class struggle which has been evident in a whole series of important historical events: strikes in Great Britain, rising of the working class in Vienna, and strike conflicts in a considerable number of European countries. Suffice it to mention the great struggle which is

confronting workers employed in the metal industry of Germany. A struggle for the masses is going on between us and the Social Democrats. The bourgeoisie, with the support of the Social Democrats, is employing new methods to bribe the working class (I mean by this efforts in the direction of the so-called "Americanisation" of the labour movement). The struggle between Communism and social-opportunism is becoming more acute, and synchronises with the collapse of the Social Democratic centre (first of all Austro-Marxism, then "the Independent Labour Party" in Great Britain, etc.). We must certainly expect that the struggle between Marxism and social-opportunism of all shades, forms and categories will become very acute in the next few years. In my report I want to lay particular stress on the growing acuteness of the struggle between the Communist and Socialist Parties, and on all contemporary questions both trifling and of importance.

This constitutes a brief enumeration of the most important and characteristic events during the last two years.

#### **I. QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS AND CRISIS IN THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM.**

I will deal first of all with questions concerning international economics and the crisis in the capitalist system as a whole. There are many problems with which I shall not deal here, because Comrade Stalin has already dealt with them very fully in his report. We all know—and, in fact, it is an axiom for us all—that we are living in the epoch of wars and revolutions, which is at the same time the epoch of capitalist decline, in spite of the occasional booms in the capitalist development of some countries or groups of countries. An inkling of this, "a foreboding" of this truth, has penetrated the minds of the most prominent representatives of the bourgeois science of economics—a science which sees in the revolutionary movement of the proletariat "savage huns," dangerous destroyers of "culture and civilisation."

I will give you first of all a small quotation from the works of a very prominent German economist who at the same time is generally speaking one of the most prominent

bourgeois economists, Professor Werner Sombart. In the preface to his book "Economic Life in the Period of Highest Capitalist Development," Sombart gives his own version of the present phase of development. He says:

"Together with it (*i.e.*, with the war) the period of high capitalist development came to a sudden end. But already during the years just preceding 1914 there were unmistakable signs of its decline. These were symptoms of old age, the first lost tooth, the first grey hair. . . . Those who have carefully followed the post-war development are of course aware that capitalism has entered upon a period of calm—not by any means upon a period of old age, but upon a period when 'man is in his prime.' The time of strong manhood is passed, the last years of the 40's have begun."

Another prominent economist and a student of world economy, Professor Bernhard Harms, recently published a book entitled "The Economic War and the World Economic Conference," in which he argues with Sombart and accuses him of "pessimism." He says that the affairs of the capitalist world are not at all so precarious. Let us see what he has to say in answer to Sombart and how he says it. He writes:

"It is true that in old Europe there are many countries where limits have been set to the efforts made by the capitalist spirit to protect itself from degeneration, or where this spirit has begun to decline. But in other parts of the world this spirit is alive, as its deeds show. . . . The heart of world capitalism beats now, not in Europe, but in the United States, which is destined to be the leader in the coming period of 'high capitalist development,' and from which the revitalised capitalist spirit will start on its victorious progress with the help of new countries. Compared with them Europe reminds one of declining Rome, which, when face to face with growing social difficulties, saw a way out in the distribution of bread to the masses." (From Bernard Harms' above-mentioned work, pp.

250-251.)

These two quotations are very characteristic, coming as they do from the most prominent ideologists of the bourgeoisie and not from ordinary bourgeois scribblers.

Let us examine the sugar coating put on the bitter pill which the capitalist world has to swallow by Werner Sombart, the prominent economist, who has imbibed a certain amount of Marxist "poison," the savant who watches the trend of events with the mien of an aristocratic aesthete, of a disinterested observer. He says: "It is true that capitalism has not yet perished, but it is approaching the period of decay and decline. . . ." Sombart watches this aging capitalism with the dim eyes of a rather decrepit disinterested observer. All his sympathies are with this world, but, alas!—nothing is left to him but the joys of "pure knowledge," knowledge of phenomena which in themselves are far from joyful. In fact, how could anyone delight in "the pure knowledge" that one's hair and teeth are falling out one after the other?

Let us now see how another more optimistic representative of bourgeois science answers him. He says: "No, the capitalist world has not perished and is not perishing. Nevertheless Europe already reminds one of Rome on the eve of its fall. This Europe will be dragged out by new countries, wonderful overseas countries headed by the dollar republic, the country where a continuous stream of gold is flowing. But what about Europe! . . . Europe is getting into a state of senile decay, just as hoary-headed Rome, and exhales an odour of putrefaction and degeneration. . . ."

As a matter of fact, both worthy savants are wrong, because they only see half the truth. If we take, for instance, the U.S.S.R. alone—to call it one "tooth" fallen out of the jaw of the capitalist order—is, you will admit, an under-estimate. Even on the strength of arithmetical proportion, one-sixth is certainly a little more than one tooth out of the greedy capitalist jaw.

B. Harms is also quite wrong, because in present-day world economy all component elements are so linked up with one another that the decline of an enormous section of the old civilisation (Harms agrees with this) cannot but be reflected in the growth of differences throughout the world, which will inevitably render internal and external conflicts more acute, as a result of which the capitalist régime will break down. B. Harms compares Europe with

Rome "in the period of decline," but these comparisons do not bear criticism, for the contemporary working class is not the "lumpen proletariat" of declining Rome; the contemporary proletariat will not rest content with sops in the form of "distribution of bread," it will march on, and in its onward march new historical problems will arise. Contemporary workers are a class trained and educated by machinery, by capitalist technique, and not the down-trodden paupers who thronged the public squares of Rome.

Our estimate of the position of capitalism does not mean that we deny the existence of a partial stabilisation of capitalisation. Neither can we deny the possibility of a number of booms within the framework of this partial stabilisation. We certainly witness a growth of production. Technical reconstruction is making big strides, particularly in Germany, where just now "gasofication"—extraction of liquid fuel from coal—is contemplated, where electrification is also making rapid progress. We witness also partial and temporary political stabilisation in the main centres of the capitalist régime, achieved partly with the help of White Terror, Fascism, abolition and eradication of the remnants of democratic "liberties," and partly with the help of the Social-Democratic parties—the main prop of the present-day régime. But this partial stabilisation cannot conceal even from the Sombarts and Harmses the fact that it is taking place in the epoch of capitalist decline and disintegration. Partial stabilisation has assumed certain forms which preclude a more or less smooth progress of the capitalist social order. On the contrary, these forms themselves are the product of the post-war crisis and they are so contradictory and have such enormous internal defects that they are themselves calling forth additional conflicts, crises, and, generally speaking, phenomena of a "crisis" type. I will deal here with just a few of these structural changes within world economy.

There is, firstly, the transfer of the centre of economic life from Europe to America. I draw attention to the well-known series of figures concerning the United States: 60 per cent. of the world production of steel, 72 per cent. of the oil production, 53 per cent. of the copper production,



43 per cent. of the coal production, nearly 20 million motor cars (out of the total world production of 24 million), more than half of the entire gold reserve. This transfer of the centre of gravity to America is creating an enormous number of additional difficulties for the capitalist régime, and is fraught with the danger of gigantic conflicts within the world economy.

Secondly, the decline of Great Britain. Great Britain has become a rentier country, a big parasite. I will give you a few illustrations of this: In 1925 Great Britain made £100 million profit by its trade, and it made another £420 million by export of capital and other banking operations. In 1926, the year of the big strike, which undermined the entire economic system of Great Britain, according to the calculations of the English periodical, the "Economist," the dividends of 1,500 joint stock companies in the mother country were 11.8 per cent., whereas in 1925, when there were no strikes and when British industry was not shaken to its foundations by this enormous convulsion, this tremendous strike spasm, they constituted 10.5 per cent., *i.e.*, dividends were higher in the strike year! What is the explanation of the phenomenon when revenue is not determined by the state of industry? The explanation is that British capitalists do not derive their chief profits from British industry, but from colonial raw material and produce, rubber, tea, oil, etc. Stamp, one of the most prominent British bankers, in conversation with the learned German economist Hirsch, about the unprofitableness of the British industry, declared that the British make more profit out of two or three raw material monopolies than out of the whole British industry. Thus we witness the transformation of Great Britain into a parasite of the rentier-banking type, into a rentier State, where industrial enterprises, including coal mines, are becoming more and more unprofitable, where a specific crisis exists in the export industry, where the policy of big investments in industry has become impossible, where consequently a basis for the technical reorganisation of industry is lacking. This decline of Great Britain and its industry, the transformation of Great Britain from "the workshop of the whole

world" into a rentier State is accompanied by chronic unemployment, and this destroys all hope that British industry can be reorganised by capitalist methods. No wonder some circles of the British bourgeoisie are fussing like children over a toy with the idea of mass emigration to Australia and that the doctrine of the clergyman Malthus is rising in estimation.

Finally, we must turn our attention to several antagonisms in Central Europe, from which the well known term "Balkanisation of Europe" takes its origin. In this connection I will limit myself to quoting the declaration of the editor of the above-mentioned British periodical, the "Economist," V. T. Layton. He writes about the situation in Europe to the effect that there are in Europe 10-12 million people whose bread-winners are without work, there are also 11,000 kilometres of new customs boundaries, and 2½ billion dollars are spent every year on armaments.

A remarkable characterisation.

The main centre of European differences and complications is Germany. It offers the best illustration of these differences. On the one hand we witness in Germany, more than any other country, stabilisation achievements in regard to technique and also in regard to the organisation of capital. We have there, for instance, a considerable reduction in the cost of production, with the result that Germany's capacity to compete on the world market is increasing. On the other hand, Germany is the best illustration of the perils arising out of a situation created by the Versailles Treaty on the European Continent.

At present, the reparation problem looms big. The "Rheinische Westfälische Zeitung," of October 14, 1927, contained the following statement:—

"No one in Germany has a notion how, after September 1, 1928, we can carve out of the new Budget 1,250 million for reparation payments."

There is also the question of payment of interest on debts, and apart from reparations the German debt mounts to about 10 billion marks, according to the estimate of Schacht, the director of the Reichsbank. The

problem of the payment of interest and of reparations hangs over Germany's head like the sword of Damocles. These payments demand increased exports. In the meantime Germany has a more passive trade balance than before the war, and we must not forget that the world has to do with a very much curtailed Germany, ravaged considerably by the Versailles Treaty. This small example is a graphic illustration of the differences between the productive possibilities of Germany and its power as a State. Finally, another factor to be reckoned with is the fact that the growing acuteness of the class struggle is called forth to a great extent by the progressive development of the stabilisation process, the internal differences of which are making themselves felt more and more.

Here you have a classic example: Maximum stabilisation achievements and, at the same time, maximum difficulties, which are undermining this stabilisation. This is an illustration of my argument. Stabilisation itself proceeds in forms based on the post-war and war crisis; that is why—not to mention a number of other factors—the capitalist world presents such a complicated picture with such an enormous number of internal frictions and conflicts, which will inevitably drive it to more serious conflicts and convulsions. To all this must be added such "trifling" facts as the existence and development of the U.S.S.R., the growth of the colonial movement in China, India, Indonesia, etc. I will deal with this later on.

It should be pointed out that, lately, differences between the capitalist powers have also increased, particularly differences between European States and America, and, in a very pronounced manner, between the capitalist world (Great Britain especially) and the U.S.S.R. All this, in its turn, calls forth within capitalist States a growing tendency to co-ordinate economic life, to give an impetus to the process of the concentration and centralisation of capital. I should like to formulate this as follows: On the one hand, we witness between capitalist State organs a growth of conflicts in spite of all efforts at co-ordination and attempts to slur over differences, etc. On the other hand, these growing conflicts compel the bourgeoisie to tighten the screw of concentration and cen-

tralisation of capital as rapidly as possible within the country. To formulate it differently: We witness at present a growing tendency to develop towards State capitalism under bourgeois dictatorship. Although I do not interpret this tendency in the sense that we are now witnessing a growth of the State functions of the bourgeoisie in the economic sphere, a certain growth must be admitted. I mean that during the post-war years, and particularly during the last few years, the tendency to form powerful trusts (not syndicates and cartels, but trusts, *i.e.*, industrial amalgamations of various types, combined and non-combined), is developing with the utmost rapidity. Economic concentration and centralisation are making gigantic strides. If one may say so, we witness the process of the "trustification" of the State Power itself, when the State Power of the bourgeoisie is becoming more and more directly dependent on the biggest and most powerful capitalist concerns or combines. In other words, we witness the process when private enterprises are merged in the State apparatus, although in the majority of cases statification of these "economic organs" does not take place. Therefore, there is as yet no State capitalism, merely preparation for it, a tendency in this direction. Of course, all this does not mean anything especially new. But I want you to understand that never before in the history of capitalism have these processes shown such a development, and it seems to me that this must be taken into consideration.

Look, for instance, at Germany. The total capital of the German joint stock companies amounts to 18 billion mark, and out of this total 2½ billion belong to the chemical and steel trusts. The steel trust, which has two-thirds of the entire steel production, rules over practically everything and determines to a great extent the political life of the country. Walter Greiling, the author of the book "The German Mining Industry" and editor of the economic periodical "Wirtschaftsdienst," makes the following statement:

"The importance of the iron industry consists in the fact that it determines the whole trend of German economy. The sources of the main forms of raw material are at its

disposal. It is a big power in home and foreign politics. The German manufacturing industry is under its control. The working class is powerless against it. The Reichstag dare not go against it."

Such is the evidence of a bourgeois economist.

The chemical trust has concentrated in its hands 80 per cent. of all chemical production.

Electrical stations. Four-fifths of the production of electric power are in the hands of the State, according to the estimate of a social democratic economist (Fritz Baade). It may be said that at present industry in Germany is literally tied into one knot, which in its turn is tied to the entire home and foreign policy of the German republic. This is one type of the development of the concentration and centralisation of capital, one type of tendencies towards the preparation of State capitalism.

I will deal now with a country at the other end of world economy—Japan, a country about which we speak comparatively little, but which nevertheless is achieving enormous conquests, which during the recent years has converted Mongolia and Manchuria into Japanese colonies, which means that it has practically absorbed them. In Japan there has been no such upheaval in industrial life as in European countries. But it is very characteristic that at present about 30 per cent. of industrial and bank capital exclusive of railways, belongs directly to the State. This state of affairs grew up partly on the basis of the old forms of Japanese economy. But at present these forms have been converted into a form of "finance-capital" regime, directly connected with the Japanese State which, on its part, has become first and foremost the representative of Japanese finance capital. Irreconcilable antagonisms exist between Japanese imperialism and the imperialism of the United States and Great Britain. Therefore, being attacked from outside, it gave every possible encouragement to the development of State capitalism at home. The example of Japan offers a classic confirmation of the fact that political reasons drive capitalism in a number of countries in the direction of consolidation and organisation. Japan is the second type of the same tendencies.

The third type is Italy. Here capitalism is certainly

moving towards a peculiar form of State capitalism and a peculiar type of State Power. What does that which Mussolini calls the "corporative State" in the so-called "labour charter" really represent? The "Corporative State" is in substance nothing but the so-called "functional democracy" of Otto Bauer. According to this theory democracy depends on the representative bodies of various professions, classes, groups, etc., on their "functions" in social life. The employer controls the enterprise and rules, the worker works and obeys the employer, the consumer buys, the producer sells. If one takes these various "functions" (to use Otto Bauer's delicate expression) and their representatives, one gets—says Otto Bauer—a peculiar state of non-Parliamentary type. Otto Bauer's utter triviality consists in his failure to decide the question of power, to declare whom this mechanism is serving and who is governing it, and yet this is the main thing. Mussolini has annulled parliament, he is building his Fascist "corporative State" and by peculiar methods wants to draw even the workers into this constructive work. He is destroying genuine trade unions and is organising Fascist "trade unions," he is appointing leaders for them and on the basis of "representative" chambers of commerce, big industrialists, bankers, and these Fascist "trade unions" he builds the Fascist "corporate State." From the point of view of economic tendencies, all this represents a peculiar form of State capitalism when the State power controls and develops capitalism. On the basis of relentless exploitation of the working class, the policy of the industrialisation of Italy is carried out. Wages are reduced, the working day is lengthened, "discipline" is introduced through the Fascist trade unions, and, on the other hand, prices of manufactured goods are regulated, etc. For the last two years Italian workers' wages have been steadily decreasing and have dropped now to 70-75 per cent. of the pre-war level (but I will deal with this later on). Such is the basis of the industrialisation of Italy. This is the third type of State capitalist tendencies.

Finally, I must mention the rather original forms which exist in Austria, forms—if one may say so—"of municipal capitalism." I mean communal enterprise in

which the social democratic party exercises considerable influence. Such are the main types of the internal economic reorganisation which is taking place in the capitalist organs of the most important countries.

Thus, we have on the one hand, an increase of differences between the various capitalist States. On the other hand, we have continuous organisation of capitalist forces within countries which finds its expression in tendencies towards State capitalism. To deduce from this—like Hilferding, who by the by, is grossly exaggerating the process of the so-called “organisation” of capitalism within the country and does not say anything about the main thing, the class character of this process—that the above-mentioned tendencies mean transition to a state of capitalism when there will be no more wars, etc.—is utterly absurd. The contrary is the case. Although external complications and conflicts encourage these tendencies—welding together of capitalist forces within the country, this very welding together makes still more acute the conflicts between the capitalist States, because this process is accompanied by more acute competition, growth of differences, erection of tariff walls, etc. Such an “organisational” tendency brings with it not peace, but the sword.

This is the expression not of a pacified “ultra-imperialist” sheltering under the peace cloak of the League of Nations, but the expression of more acute struggles and conflicts which inevitably lead to catastrophe, the name of which is “another cycle of wars.” The problem of markets and of the struggle against the U.S.S.R., has become more acute, pressure on the workers has grown, the war danger is more real than ever before. State capitalist tendencies do not remove this problem, they are only making it more acute. Conferences, such as the disarmament conference, are a pacifist deception on the part of imperialists and social democrats. It is not necessary to speak on this subject at our Party Congress. The danger of another cycle of wars is looming big, this is the new or partly new phase which the last two years have brought us in regard to the mutual relations of capitalist countries and their relations with the U.S.S.R.

## II. THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASS.

I will now deal with the question of how the process of development effects, or is expressed in, the condition of the working class. First of all, just a few words about such elementary matters as wages, unemployment, etc. I must say that many of us thought on the basis of official statistics, that in Western Europe wages had attained the pre-war level. On the basis of more exact research, including the reports of the Labour Research Department in England and of Varga's bureau and such other exact data, for example, "The Imperial Credit Society," in Germany, we get a somewhat different picture. If we take the level of wages in the different branches of production and then calculate the average, the result attained differs from the official statistics. The general result is, that with the exception of the United States and other overseas countries, wages have not reached the pre-war level. The position is, generally speaking, as follows: In Germany, in July, 1927, real wages for qualified workers were about 93 per cent. of pre-war wages, for unqualified workers 100 per cent. According to the data given by "the Imperial Credit Society," Germany, in April, 1927, nominal wages for qualified workers were 135.8 per cent., and the index of the cost of living 146.4 per cent. Thus we see that there is a deficit from the point of view of real wages. In Great Britain, the average wage is not more than 90 per cent. of pre-war real wages. There is an especially sharp drop in wages in such basic branches of industry as textile, mining, and iron, and at the same time a further drop in wages is contemplated. In France, in Paris, towards the end of 1926, only printers' wages were over the pre-war level, in all other branches they were only 65-87 per cent. of the pre-war level. In Italy, since the last reduction of wages, workers receive 70-75 per cent. of pre-war wages. During the past two years wages have been systematically falling. In the United States of America there is an average increase in wages of 30 per cent. (I repeat only in overseas countries, and hardly in all of them, has there been any increase in wages). Included in this average increase there exist enormous differences between various branches of industry



and district. For example, in the Southern States, where there are many negroes, and where the textile industry is most developed, it is possible to find insufferable working conditions, low wages, and long working days, whereas at the other end of the United States, amongst American-born workers and in branches of industry where mainly qualified workers are engaged, you will find a considerably higher level of wages. The "average" figure of 30 per cent. increase covers the sharp differentiation within the working class and between the various districts.

For European capitalism where pre-war wages do not exist, this condition is considered absolutely inadequate from the point of view of capital: the opinion prevails that the level of wages should be further reduced. There are quite a number of "learned" economists, who actually demand that further pressure be brought to bear on the working class. I should give you an example of one great bourgeois professor, by name, Cassel, who is well known as a theoretician in financial matters. He submitted a memorandum to the International Economic Conference, and also published a book under the title of "Recent Monopolist Tendencies in Industry and Trade. Research into the Nature and Cause of the Poverty of Peoples" (this is written on the same parallel as Adam Smith's "Research into the Causes of the Wealth of Nations"). In this work Cassel develops a theory extremely interesting because of its audacity. He says that our time is a time of monopoly. Monopoly is a very injurious thing, because only the free movement of people, of capital, of goods, secures a maximum growth of productivity. But now? We have monopolies. What kind of monopolies? Cassel says we have the monopoly of enterprises, which is very bad. We have also workers' monopoly (workers' trade unions), and that is still worse. Now trade unions (*i.e.* "monopoly" of the working class) are stronger than the monopoly of enterprise, syndicates, trusts, etc. Therefore, this learned gentleman says there exists "pressure" of the working class, therefore wages are now so "high," and this is the cause of all the misfortune. The chief cause of unemployment, of crisis, etc., according to Cassel, is to be found in the too high level of wages. Hence unemployment. If

wages were less, then it would be possible to give employment to more workers. Hence he proposes destruction "of the too great monopoly" of the working class and of the "too high" wages. This means pressure and threats to those unions which exist, cuts in wages and increase in working hours, despite the attainments which the capitalist world has already had in this respect.

Hence, we may come to the conclusion that the partial stabilisation of capital proceeds on the basis of increased exploitation of the workers; trust-capital is the hero of this process, and its premise is the destruction of labour organisations. It is interesting to note under these conditions that trustification and the formation of cartels usually goes hand in hand with the creation of anti-strike funds.

Take as an example the steel trust. I will here give a quotation from Uferman's "Steel Trust."

"The annual turnover of the European Steel Trust is about 176 million marks. . . . The fact is worthy of note that according to paragraph 7 of the Statutes of the Cartel, for every shortage in tonnage, in accordance with the quota, a compensation of four dollars must be paid. Although in the agreement nothing is said that shortage in the quota due to strikes need be compensated, still the cartel must compensate for this shortage."

Thus, in accordance with the Statutes, you have the organisation of an anti-strike fund. The latest information definitely speaks of the organisation of this anti-strike fund.

I have in my possession a wonderful description of the results of stabilisation and capitalist rationalisation on the backs of the working class. Again the source of this evidence is not working class circles, but a bourgeois journalist, the correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt," who, in order to ascertain the present conditions of the workers, went himself to one of the biggest factories and then described the results of his observations. The factory in question is the great chemical enterprise "Lena," where about 40,000 workers are employed. This is what he writes about the living conditions:—

"I looked for a room in the settlement near the factory, but in vain. I looked in the neighbouring village; everywhere overcrowded. In these low huts

overcrowding is excessive. Many sleep on the floor. Everywhere the same picture. In Merseburg, in Halle, in Corbet, Laustadt, the conditions are no better. In Weisenfels I found a corner for myself with difficulty."

#### **Conditions of Work and Transport.**

"Two hours' journey by train, 8-9 hours hard labour, a wash, then take a train back, altogether 14-15 hours daily on one's feet, in the train, and at the machine. This undermines the health of the workers and causes premature age. In the railway carriages it is dark and cold, there is no room to sit. Many go to sleep on their feet from sheer weariness."

#### **He Writes as Follows about Supervision:**

"Such a state of affairs does not exist anywhere outside the big factories in Germany, except for black workers in South Africa."

#### **Fines:**

"The Lena works imposes fines for conversation, for spending too much time in the lavatory, for washing one's hands, and for standing idle. The fines are considerable, varying from 2-3 marks; a deduction of 2-3 hours' work. The work in the enterprise necessitates the frequent washing of hands."

The correspondent further describes the condition of children, etc.

This is a picture of one of the biggest and most advanced enterprises in Germany. The chemical industry is one of the most advanced branches of industry. All these disclosures are made by a bourgeois Liberal observer. Therefore, our conclusion that capitalist stabilisation and rationalisation actually is carried on at the expense of the workers through merciless exploitation is absolutely undisputed.

We must admit, however, that German capital has been able to reduce unemployment to a considerable extent. This fact must be acknowledged. Unemployment in Germany was enormous. Not so very long ago, the number was to be counted in millions, and recently 700,000, and at

present this figure has still further been reduced. The development of German industry brought about a sudden decrease in unemployment. In this fact we find an enormous difference between Germany and Great Britain, where unemployment has become stabilised, and is still to be counted in millions (it should not be forgotten that here we refer only to industrial workers and not to agricultural).

We thus find that there exists a big difference between the development of industry in Central Europe (primarily in Germany) and the undisputed decline of development in Great Britain.

### III. STRUCTURE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND TYPES OF WORKERS' MOVEMENTS.

This comrades, is the position of the working class. On the basis of the differences in the conditions of capitalism in various countries we have different types of workers' movements and different methods are employed by the bourgeoisie to gain control over these workers' movements. On this account I want to say a few words about the attempts of the so-called "American" workers' movement. If we analyse the workers' movement in the United States, we shall understand why at present there is such an outcry in Europe about America, and why the Social Democratic opportunist leaders of the trade union movement look with enthusiasm towards this "American ideal." If I dwell somewhat long on this type of American movement I do not do so because I consider the American labour movement a classical type of present-day workers' movement, but simply for the reason which I have already put forward.

At present the United States dominates and monopolises world economy, even to a greater degree than Great Britain ever did. Therefore the working class in America is more bound up with its bourgeoisie than perhaps was the case in Great Britain. We can use the same words about the American proletariat as Engels did in his time when he referred to the British proletariat, we may refer to the "bourgeois proletariat" in America. Let us take a rather small table of wages which will immediately make the situation clear to you. Take for example, the average real wage in 1925 in London as 100, you will then get the follow-

ing figures for other centres: Philadelphia (America) 221, Paris 71, Rome 48, Warsaw 47, Prague 58, Brussels 57, Vienna 47 (Voitinsky "The World in Figures"). The European average 40-50 and suddenly 220. There you have the relation between aristocracy of the international working class and the masses of the European working class. And if you were to take in addition the wages of the Chinese coolies or of the African workers, or other colonial groups of workers, then you may imagine what a tremendous difference you will find between the coolie and the American. But even in America itself, as I have already remarked, there are great differences among the proletariat, even official sources prove this tremendous difference. For example, Davis, Minister of Labour of the United States, openly declared a short time ago, in an article published in one of the Labour papers, that it is no exaggeration to say that there are several million American workers who do heavy work at low wages. Furthermore, he pointed out that there are not less than ten to fifteen million people who are deprived of the ordinary necessities of life which the rest of the people enjoy.

In the Southern States, especially in the textile industry, the working day is from 10-11 hours, the work is extremely intensive and the monthly wage inclusive, varies from 18-32 dollars.

Hence, on the one hand, within the ranks of the American workers we have a labour aristocracy and, on the other hand, a low grade of workers which works under slave conditions. This is the class of workers which, according to Davis, works hard and gets little. This is an absolute fact. The truth of the matter is that these low grade workers are composed of negroes and newcomers, who were formerly in still worse conditions in other countries. As regards negroes, they are considered amongst the working class as second-grade citizens. Every workers' organisation is built up so as to maintain the oppression of this grade of workers, who sometimes express their revolt in the most desperate and fierce kinds of struggle; for example, the last strike in Colorado, where there were more encounters, and dead and wounded, and where they almost had to resort to using poison gas against

the workers. The mechanism is of such a nature that capital holds the workers in its hands with the help of a certain class among the working class itself.

The organised forces of the working class are of such a nature that they are directed against any kind of revolution. The total number of workers (not including employees) is about 25 million, and of these only 3-4 million are organised. 75 per cent. of those organised belong to the aristocratic American Federation of Labour. Hence, every trade union organisation of the working class bears the stamp of superiority. In the American Federation of Labour you find the aristocratic sections. The leadership within this American Federation of Labour is in the hands of bureaucrats, the like of whom our working class cannot even imagine. I shall not dwell on the methods of robbery, corruption, bribery, appropriation of trade union money, etc. But what salaries do these bureaucrats receive? Stone, the President of the Machinists' Union, gets 25,000 dollars, plus 25,000 for presiding, a total of 50,000 dollars—(commotion in the hall)—*i.e.*, an average of 10,000 roubles or 8,300 gold roubles monthly. (Commotion in the hall). There you have "the leaders of trade unions!" Such is the situation in the American Federation of Labour.

But in addition to this organisation there is still another form of organisation there, still more specific than the "American Federation of Labour." This is the "Company Union," *i.e.* joint unions of employers and workers of the same enterprise. Their aims are, for example, industrial peace and avoidance of the class struggle, and they perform extremely intensive work in bringing a certain section of the working class under the pressure of the capitalist. I shall give you a well-known example of this: on the railroad, Baltimore-Ohio, there is a kind of a company union. The main slogan is "increase of production and no strikes of any kind." To a certain extent they copy on capitalist lines our methods: they hold consultations about production, and during the past year in forty-five enterprises of this company 18,000 different proposals were made for the improvement of the enterprise. Of these 18,000 proposals 15,000 were accepted and put into practice.

As a result of the pressure brought to bear on the workers, the dividends of the company doubled during the period 1924-25.

What are the principles of the organisation of these company unions? The organisation is only within the enterprise. The owner supports the organisation through which he is able to double his dividends. In these enterprises all kinds of trade unions and class struggle organisations are forbidden.

Another type is the Labour Bank. T. H. Carver, a very important American economist, writes in the "Locomotive Journal" :—

"The Labour Banks constitute the only revolutionary movement in the world. Their colossal possibilities become clear if we recall that the sum paid in wages in the country is about half of those 50 dollars deposited in our 31,000 banks, and that the annual harvest of the farmers amounts to two-thirds of the other half. If the majority of American workers and farmers succeed in concentrating their savings in their own banks in one generation they will gain control over the richest nation in the world."

Of course, all this "philosophy" is mere nonsense, because no control exists over these "workers' banks," but, on the contrary, the workers' savings, which represent a very considerable sum, will, as hitherto, be at the disposal of the magnates of bank capital; the finance capital oligarchy knows very well how to use small deposits. The workers bring their savings to the "workers' banks," the banks place this capital in shares in various enterprises, companies, and trusts. Thus we see that the workers bring their savings to the banks, and these savings at the disposal of the bourgeoisie bring in a considerable surplus turnover. At the present moment there are about thirty-seven workers' banks and all these banks are run on the general mechanism of capitalist society.

Based on this enterprise there exists a quite extensive theorisation. This same economist, Carver, whom I just quoted, has published a book entitled, "The Present Economist Revolution in the United States" (Boston, 1925).

In this, various revolutions, etc., are dealt with, but these are mere trifles. There was a political revolution in Germany, Austria, etc., but the real revolution is the economic revolution, and this is being carried out at the present time only in one country; that country is the United States. Carver maintains that in the U.S. at the present moment the only economic revolution is taking place. This revolution is abolishing the difference between workers and capitalists, making workers their own capitalists and making the majority of capitalists workers of some kind or another because they are unable to live on their own capital. This is something absolutely new in the history of the world.

Carver is further of the opinion that the methods of this revolution consists in, first of all the quick growth of deposits; secondly, savings on the part of the workers by buying shares in trusts; and thirdly, growth of workers' banks.

In reality this ideology of Carver is the very same ideology on which the entire International Social Democratic philosophy is based. There is no difference in principle between social democracy and Carver.

What do we find in America? The lower grade of the working class is composed of foreigners and negroes. Their methods of struggle are very revolutionary, and this struggle is suppressed with the most fierce methods. On the other hand, a large section of the American working class, the aristocracy of the aristocracy. Their organisation is the aristocratic American Federation of Labour. Then there are the company unions, the workers' banks, etc. The company unions are supported by the organisation of capitalist powerful enterprises, banks, concerns, trusts. All these hold the entire working class in their hands by various means.

And this is the "ideal" of present-day international social democracy and the leaders of the reformist trade unions. These are the methods of the American bourgeoisie which they wish to transfer to Europe, forgetting that in America these methods have a certain basis in the monopoly system prevailing in the country, and that in Europe they neither have, nor can have, this basis. In



some countries they are even actually absurd. Take for example, Great Britain. Its position as a monopoly country has disappeared, although the Government of Great Britain manœuvres in colonial matters, makes concessions, secures a certain breathing space, and puts off the fatal hour. But still the basic tendency is downward, and this is apparent primarily in the stabilised condition of unemployment. The further attacks of capital called forth such actions as the march of the miners on London. The Chinese revolution, and the revolution of other colonial countries undermines the entire British Empire. Revolt is rampant amongst the lower strata, strikes, etc., are the order of the day. Therefore American methods cannot have any basis here. Still, capital endeavours with the help of the leaders of the Labour Party and trade unions to introduce here the proverbial "industrial peace" and organise "company unions," etc. For example, Spencer organised such a company union amongst the miners, and founded the "League of Industrial Peace." The "Economist" in one of its recent issues (October 22nd), in an article "On Industrial Peace," tells with delight of the unity between such leaders of capital as Mond and the charlatans in the Labour Party.

This great capitalist whale, Mond (chemical industry), wants to use American methods in the struggle with Socialism. But the Labour politicians welcome this attempt as a step towards Socialism.

In Germany also it is scarcely possible to find a basis for American methods. However, the German bourgeoisie is trying to use the same little tricks in this respect. For example, at the present moment, we have a certain disproportion in some branches of industry between employees and workers. The ratio of the employees as compared with workers in 1907 was 11.1 per cent., in 1925-26 36.5 per cent. In certain branches of industry, such as the mining industry, the number is 7.6 per cent., in the textile industry 13.8 per cent., in the engineering industry 23 per cent., in the chemical industry 32.8 per cent.

A regrouping takes place within industry, and on this basis endeavours are made to substitute a section of the workers by employees, to take a certain section of the

workers in tow, and through these hold down the other sections.

The "philosophy" of Carver is supported completely by the social democrats and the trade union leaders. Although they act as if they were fighting against the organisation of company unions, they themselves ideologically, and actually from the political point of view, carry out the same policy as Carver. A social democrat (Erdman) actually formulated the position thus: "Trade unions are part of the capitalist system." Their whole policy consists in avoiding as far as possible any kind of strike, although occasionally under the pressure of the masses they are forced to take the lead in strikes. The idea of industrial peace is supreme in their minds.

There are certain attempts to organise company unions, but so far these are few. There is a special organisation called the "Dinta" (an institute for the technical training of workers). This institute issues 200 factory newspapers, and through these penetrates into the ranks of the workers. Recently the policy of arbitration with State intervention in conflicts (that is to say, a system almost approaching industrial peace under the dictatorship of the bourgeois State) has become noticeable.

American methods are popular both with trade union and social democratic leaders, and they are trying to arrange that stabilisation and its further development in Central Europe shall continue without any great social conflicts; but this is a bourgeois reformist utopia, as far as Europe is concerned, and primarily for such countries, as for example, Great Britain. For, in order to introduce American methods a certain preparatory introduction of American economy is necessary in Europe. In short, the position is what one might term extremely difficult.

In the colonial countries of the capitalist world we observe the development of the working class as an independent force. It is true that in the colonies they are already endeavouring to introduce all kinds of perversions: Yellow union under Chiang Shek, the machine-minders' unions in Canton, etc., and the attempts by the British reformists to handicap the Indian trade union movements. But generally we can say, in speaking of the movement in

colonial countries, that we now have an epoch in which the working class is becoming conscious as an independent force in the movement, and is becoming a leading force in the revolutionary movement. This has never been the case before. It is perfectly clear that the endeavour to corrupt the working class is becoming more difficult for the bourgeoisie, because the basis is lacking. The necessary basis consists in a tremendous gap between skilled workers and the masses of the workers.

Attempts such as these can have a certain success in the United States, but they are destined to failure in Europe and in the colonies, where the working class is organising for battle in a heroic struggle against the system of world imperialist oppression.

#### **IV. INTENSIFICATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN EUROPE.**

I shall now proceed to analyse the situation, and to show how, on the basis of stabilisation and the development of internal contradictions, the intensification of the class struggle is progressing in Europe.

If we consider events of recent date from the point of view of the class struggle we see that, on the one hand, there is a continuation of the attack on the working class (Fascism in Italy and Poland, and incipient Fascism in Great Britain). There exists an unusually fierce policy of White Terror now, developing into a system which keeps the working class in subjection by smashing up the workers' organisations. (In the Balkans there is an exceptionally cruel regime of White Terror; in Italy recently, in order to catch two or three Communists, round-ups were organised and thousands of workers arrested; in Poland similar methods are used.) Then there is the policy of breaking up even tame trade unions. You all know the story of the British Anti-Trade Union Act. Along the whole front there is the continuation of the capitalist attack on wages and the working day. Hence in Europe there exists a combination of Fascism and the attempt to introduce American methods.

At the same time on the basis of this same stabilisation, and this is the basic note in present-day European condi-

tions, there exists the fact that the working class of Central Europe is gaining its feet after repeated defeats. The working class movement is beginning to revive, the class struggle on the part of the proletariat is becoming more acute, there is a certain change taking place in the relationships of class forces, there exists a swing to the left, and a revolutionisation of the proletariat in the main centres of European countries.

This process is being expressed, is proceeding and developing in various channels. First of all I shall deal with elections in a number of countries in Central Europe. Germany. There is a simultaneous growth both of social democrats and Communists. The elections in Hamburg: in 1924, 203,000 votes were gained by social democrats, in 1927, 249,000. In 1924, Communists secured 90,000 votes, and in 1927, 111,000 votes. Poland: at the general elections in Lodz, in 1922, the P.P.S. secured 20,000 votes, in 1927, 56,000. The Communists secured in 1922, 14,000, and in 1927, in spite of the exceptionally fierce terror, over 50,000. Czecho-Slovakia: in the election in Prague, the social democrats in 1925 secured 41,800 votes, in 1927, 47,600. The Communists secured in 1925, 66,700, and in 1927, 70,700.

An analysis of the elections shows that the ranks of the social democrats are mainly being strengthened by elements from the petty bourgeoisie, employees, etc., whilst the ranks of the Communists are being increased by an influx from the ranks of the working class. There is an increase in the Communist vote in the most important countries of the European continent. This growth of the influence of the Communist Party is expressed in fundamental processes which we term, generally, a swing to the Left.

The second symptom is the influence of Communists in the trade unions. Without doubt there is an increase in the influence of Communists in the trade unions and the revolutionary opposition generally in a number of countries, for example, in Germany (especially in Berlin, Hamburg, Halle, and other big towns). In Italy, in spite of the upheaval, in spite of the fierce White Terror, the Party is fighting with great success for the re-establishment of the

trade union organisations. In Czecho-Slovakia there exists also an increase in the influence of Communists in trade unions, although we must admit it is not very great.

The third symptom which we noted is the open activity of the workers. Under this symptom we include the great British strike, and the revolt of the workers in Vienna, which had great importance in the appraisal of conditions in Europe. Furthermore, we must recall the effect created in Europe amongst the working class by the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti. Undoubtedly such movements show that the working class is beginning to express itself psychologically in a different manner from that displayed a short time ago.

Finally, we have an undoubted increase in strike movements in a number of countries. After various conflicts which have resulted in failure and discouragement there exists a certain rise in the strike wave. In Germany, there is the miners' strike and the lock-out of the engineers, which affects several thousand workers and is an answer to the workers' demands for an increase in wages. There was a certain strike wave also in France, a building workers' strike in Czecho-Slovakia, a strike wave in Italy, etc.

There are also many other symptoms which cannot be classified as open activity on the part of the workers. The Toulon mutiny of the sailors in France, the discontent among the reservists, the anti-Fascist street demonstrations in France and Germany, a number of street demonstrations in connection with the attack on the Soviet Union in various countries, in France, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Poland (here we should recall the mass demonstration in Poland in connection with the murder of Comrade Voikov), the Red Front Fighters Day in Germany, and the oath of the Red Front Fighters to protect the Soviet Republic, all these are an expression of the growth of revolutionary tendencies. And finally, if we take quite different countries, we should consider the two big strikes in the United States of America. I refer here to the Passaic strike and the miners' strike, where matters went to the length of open military encounters between the workers and the employers.

Thus we see that the attempts on the part of the European capitalists to drag the working class into co-

operation with the bourgeoisie, the attempt to attain industrial peace for which there is no basis in Europe, are met by a widespread development of a wave of class struggle.

The characteristics of these events should be absolutely clear to us. These are not remnants of defensive strikes against the capitalist attack. These are not the, so to speak, last dying cries of those struggles which the working class carried on formerly.

No. These mark the beginning of a new period, in which the working class is turning to the Left after previous overthrows; it is beginning again to reconstruct its own ranks and to develop an acute class struggle on the basis of the growing contradictions within stabilisation.

A new cycle of development is beginning—a renewal of the class struggle, which also is participated in by such groups as the sailors and soldiers in Poincaré's France.

This signifies the intensification of the class struggle in Europe, this is the growth of the capacity of the working class to mobilise its forces following the development of those contradictions which are to be found in the very womb of stabilisation.

I do not wish to say that we are now on the eve of an immediate revolutionary situation in Europe; matters have not yet developed that far.

But already, after a certain interval and period of depression in the workers' movement, we have a changed situation, tending towards the mobilisation of the forces of the proletariat for active struggle.

The worst period is over; the working class is rehabilitating itself, it is beginning to mobilise its forces, it is again proceeding to the struggle; the intensification of the class struggle on the basis of the development of the internal contradictions within stabilisation is a fact which cannot be disputed.

## **V. AMERICANISM, SOCIAL DEMOCRACY, AMSTERDAM.**

Comrades, if we consider the internal life of European countries, we realise that that fact is a determining factor in the appraisal of the coming phase.

Communists, as the vanguard of the working class, must support this process in every possible way, must take the lead, evolve correct tactics under the new conditions created by the growing acuteness of the class struggle which is fundamental in the present period. In the struggle for the working masses, for leadership over them, in our endeavour to give class actions a more acute form, we collide first and foremost with the social democrats and with Amsterdam.

Just a few words about their position at the present juncture. The danger of international conflicts, a proper appreciation of the struggle between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R., the swing to the left of the working class in Europe and the colonial revolutions on the one hand, and, on the other hand, mobilisation of the forces of capitalism are accompanied by the unmistakable turning to the right of the upper strata of the Second International and the Amsterdam Federation of Trade Unions. I think that since the foundation of the social democratic parties there has never been exhibited such complete capitulation before bourgeois ideology, both in theory and practice, as at the present time. Formerly, we had the struggle of what were called "orthodox elements" and revisionists, we had a European, so-called "Marxist" social democracy, and alongside of them we also had Christian preachers such as MacDonald and Co. But now all these ideological tributaries have converged into one stream and constitute an indivisible whole in all decisive questions of theory and practice. What, then, is the fundamental organisation of social democracy of the trade union upper stratum, etc.? It is essentially bourgeois "Carverism," as I already pointed out. The pith of their arguments runs thus: "We must convert modern factories into constitutional factories, we must democratise factory institutions in a peaceful way." One of the most prominent social democratic ideologists, Karl Renner, calls tariff agreements concluded between employers and workers "wage socialisation." "Socialism" is already being born, hence the process of "wage socialisation." It is necessary to insist on the democratisation of factories through the peaceful work of factory and works com-

mittees; it is necessary to insist on the democratisation of trusts. In one of his articles Hilferding says that the magnates of capitalism are quite unwittingly doing essentially marxist work—they are turning towards organised economy, paving thereby the way to Socialism. In short, Social Democratic theory brings forward as a fundamental slogan the slogan of "Economic Democracy."

This means that, through factory and works committees and trade unions, it is possible in a peaceful way to remodel factories, seizing them, without any revolution, by democratic measures, and this also applies to trusts and any concern or group of banks. This is called "economic democracy." It is said, moreover, evicently as a consolation for the working class, that this process will go on for hundreds of years.

Karl Zweig, one of the ideologists of the movement, says in his book, "Sociology of the Trade Union Movement":

"Just as in politics, in respect of which November, 1917, crowned the development towards political equality fought for during centuries—the establishment of equality of rights in the economic sphere demands the same prolonged historical development. We are only at the beginning of this development."

The aim is the democratisation of capitalist factories, trusts and banks, and after that peaceful democratisation of the State.

Hilferding not so long ago brought forward the thesis that one cannot say that bourgeois democracy exists in Germany, Austria, etc. According to him, it is absurd to speak of bourgeois democracy. There is democracy "generally speaking," and through it the working class "democratises" the whole State. This theory disgusted even Hilferding's colleague Max Adler. But Social Democracy as a whole greeted it with stormy applause. This theoretical and practical organisation is now going on even further, if it be possible, to democratise factories, banking concerns, and individual States in a peaceful manner. It is not only possible, but imperative, to democratise the League of Nations if it is to be taken seriously! Thus the slogan "Democratisation of the League



of Nations" is made the main slogan in foreign policy, and the American idea of class collaboration wins the day.

In this respect M. Albert Thomas's speech is typical from every point of view. He works in the Labour Office of the League of Nations, is a member of the French Socialist Party and of the Second International, has connections in Amsterdam trade union circles. Well, this individual attended the meeting of an employers' organisation in Berlin and made the following speech, which was published in the periodical "Arbeitgeber" (a Berlin publication) on October 15th, 1927. With your permission, I will read you an extract from his speech :

"In view of the consequences of the war—to follow the trend of thought of your Minister for Foreign Affairs—it was precisely in Germany that the idea originated that agreement, mutual understanding, and mutual rapprochement are essential. I venture to say that the idea of co-operation, which was so often brought forward and always suffered shipwreck, is once more appearing on the scene. We aspire to this working co-operation. This idea is given expression in Mr. Bórzig's article already mentioned. It occurs in Mr. Silverberg's speech, and is also expressed elsewhere. What one of my collaborators had to say on his return from America is very characteristic. The same desire for agreement also exists there. Likewise, in Great Britain, the main thought and care in economic circles during the last few weeks is towards establishing economic peace, which will put an end to the instability of social conditions. In Italy (!) the Government and interested circles are also endeavouring to find ways to attain such an understanding, and we in France are also animated by the same desire."

A nice state of affairs! Formerly the cry was: Mussolini is a bandit, a Fascist, etc. Now it is said: In Italy "the Government and interested circles" (namely, down-right capitalist rogues) "are endeavouring to bring about an understanding between labour and capital!" Here we have a complete system, a positive attitude to trusts, to the construction of capitalism, to banks, the State, and the

League of Nations, accompanied by timid and at the same time charlatan propagation of the democratisation of this machine by evolutionary means, a machine which is in the hands of the sworn enemies of the working class—such is the “programme” of Social Democracy at the present time.

I just want to mention that lately nearly all the big Social Democratic Parties have been paying special attention to the Agrarian programme, utilising, in a way quite their own, the “Russian experience.” A number of parties have drawn up new agrarian programmes, all of which aim at drawing the peasantry, through its most important sections, into the same vortex of capitalist relations, into the general process of capitalist construction, on the basis of glorification of the capitalist régime as a whole. Vladimir Ilyitch once said that opportunism can bring forward its theoretical and political conceptions in various terms, including Marxist terms. Up to quite recently the state of affairs was such that social democratic opportunism was doing its utmost to preach its opportunism in Marxist terms, using Marx’s phraseology; but now there is capitulation to bourgeois ideologists and a capitalist practical and theoretical conception on the part of Social Democracy. Never before has there been such glaring general disagreement between us, Communists and Social Democrats. Never before has such a gulf divided us.

It goes without saying that a positive attitude to capitalist rationalisation, to any capitalist enterprise and any capitalist State, as well as to the League of Nations, determines the attitude not only to small questions of the general class struggle, but also to big political questions, and first and foremost to the War Question.

## **VI. THE WAR QUESTION AND GROUPINGS WITHIN THE LABOUR MOVEMENT, SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND AMSTERDAM.**

The war question is at present the most revolutionising question, and at the same time the central question in the sphere of “high politics.” Just now the influence of the U.S.S.R. is different from what it was before, and therefore the war question assumes a different aspect to the

broad masses of the West European proletariat. At the beginning of our Revolution, in 1917, some sections of the working class were in favour of the working class attempting to seize power without having a definite notion of the prospects of what was going to happen later on. During the civil war they helped us at a time when the question of a real European war against the Soviet Union had not yet arisen, when it was not yet definitely known what the trend of development in our country would be. During the famine period Soviet influence dwindled, and although some sections of the working class defended us, they did not do so on as big and broad a scale as before, and did it without the necessary understanding for the perspectives of our development. What is more, there existed a certain doubt as to the success of the (to use a bourgeois and Social Democratic term) "experiment which was being made on the live body of the Russian people by the Bolshevik Soviet Government." Furthermore, even during the period of our economic reconstruction, the European working class was not so sure at whose expense and by what means our economy was being reconstructed, for the entire Social Democratic press asserted that reconstruction was going on entirely on a capitalist basis—*i.e.*, that there was nothing but retrogression: a concession had been made to the bourgeoisie (N.E.P.). "New shoots and crops of the capitalist régime are springing up. They are fertilising this savage and barbaric country, which had even reached the stage of cannibalism. One cannot tell what will become of the whole thing." Such were the thoughts that were in the minds of a considerable number of workers.

But the influence which the U.S.S.R. has now is an influence which impels increasing sections of the West European working class to follow us, in spite of all the idle talk of the Opposition (which in this respect does us great harm). They follow us to an ever-growing extent, just because the path of our development is clear to them, and because big achievements have already been made on this path of Socialist development. They are defending now actual Socialist construction, not only embryos of genuine Socialist construction, but its real achievements. In principle this constitutes an enormous difference.

Western European workers, and particularly German workers, combine their revolutionary aspirations, or the embryo of their revolutionary aspirations, with a practical matter-of-fact attitude; they demand proofs and genuine successes and achievements. We are able to say now that sympathy for the U.S.S.R. is growing, and this is mainly due to the great constructive work of our working class.

That is why the U.S.S.R. problem has now assumed a different aspect in the eyes of the working class of West Europe. That is why the question of war has also assumed a different aspect. That is why the gulf between us and the Social Democrats is widening. The problems of the U.S.S.R. and imperialist war form the pivot of "high politics" in West Europe. There will soon be elections in France, Great Britain, Germany, and other countries. In such countries as Great Britain, France, and even Germany, relations with the U.S.S.R. will be one of the main questions in the election campaigns. Although there are people who want to steer clear of this question, the election campaigns in a number of countries will revolve around it. Since the class struggle is becoming more acute, the working class is veering to the Left, and sympathy for the U.S.S.R. is growing. And since colonial problems are also becoming more acute, a big fight will ensue. Because the pressure of the labour rank-and-file on the upper strata of Social Democracy is very strong, the latter is being compelled to "manœuvre." We witness recently, on the one hand, a very definite veering to the right in Amsterdam circles and those of the 2nd International, and at the same time a certain amount of apparently "Left" manœuvring directed by the Social Democrats against us. A Social Democratic slogan which is now given prominence in respect of this question is: "Not against the U.S.S.R., but against Communism." It is very interesting and significant that "Vorwärts" published lately an article from which I am going to quote:

"We would willingly give our support to the same businesslike work in Russia. It is carried on in the name of Socialism, and that is why we are interested in it. It is childish to imagine that we German Social Democrats are badly disposed towards Russia. We

condemn the despotic methods with the help of which politics are still carried on there. But should the Russians achieve big and brilliant successes by their economic policy who will be more pleased about this than we?" (Laughter.) "In such a case Russia will become the country of a great experiment, and in the coming elections and polling in Germany a big majority will endeavour to achieve by democratic means that which has been achieved in Russia by dictatorship." (Laughter.) "Freedom and democracy are certainly not a phenomenon of declining capitalism and a devilish invention of the bourgeoisie. Let us defend them,"

The "Vorwärts" goes on to say, in connection with another argument:

"Who knows but that one fine day Trotsky, Zinoviev, Smilga, and whatever the others are called may be found on its [democracy's] side." (Laughter.)

I shall not dwell on this subject, because just now it is of no interest to me, and shall deal with the meaning of this manœuvre. What does it mean? It means, in fact, nothing but a Social Democratic "reproduction" of the policy carried on just now by Chamberlain. Chamberlain says to us: "We are, if you please, not at all averse to carrying on trade with you, but we would like you to close down the Comintern." Social Democrats say: "Good gracious, we were always in favour of your great experiment in Socialist construction, but please do not transfer Communist and despotic methods, which are so contagious, to our country."

What does this mean? Either: "Send instructions to 'your' Communist Parties to cease work"; or, "Close the Comintern immediately!" This is the crux of the matter. It is difficult just now to attack the U.S.S.R. openly; the mood of the masses does not encourage this. Therefore advances are made to the U.S.S.R. At the same time, on the other hand, an attack is being made on Communists. Thus the meaning of this manœuvre become very transparent.

There is another interesting point. Lately Social Democrats tried to throw out their bait also in the direction

of the Comintern. We have received from the Independent Labour Party in Great Britain a letter inquiring whether it would not be possible to amalgamate the 2nd and 3rd Internationals (these people pretend not to understand that Communists can never amalgamate with traitors). The President of the German Reichstag, the Social Democrat Löbe, has made a declaration in which he says approximately the same as the "Vorwärts." In Austria Otto Bauer has made a speech of an analogous type, etc.

Needless to say, the answer of the Communist Party to this manœuvre must be a more energetic counter-attack on the Social Democrats, because, I reiterate, the chief meaning of this manœuvre is a reproduction of the capitalist manœuvre. This is all the more necessary because they are at the same time circulating impudent lies about the U.S.S.R. Their "sympathy" for the U.S.S.R. is hypocrisy from beginning to end. Why? I will quote from the report read by Rudolph Hilferding, who is connected with German financial circles, at the last Congress of the German Social Democratic Party in Kiel. The burden of this report is State capitalism, which must receive all possible support. Logically, this "Leitmotiv" is linked up with a remark concerning August, 1914, from which it follows that the Social Democrats are eager to repeat the policy of the imperialist war. Supposing Germany were to be on the side of our enemies (which is more than probable), what will the Social Democrats do, since their whole policy implies that they must defend Hindenburg "democracy" against the "despotic methods of Bolshevism? The answer is clear.

From this point of view all the talk about sympathy for the U.S.S.R. is deliberate deception of the masses. It is more likely, in regard to the question of war, that the upper strata of Social Democracy, while carrying on an anti-Soviet Union policy, will disguise it by highly democratic "theories." They will say: There exists a world organisation, the League of Nations, which, in spite of its defects—it is not very democratic; but "we" can democratise it—embodies the desire of nations for genuine peace, etc., etc. And yet this despotic, Asiatic, Bolshevik oligarchy, which, according to Trotsky, Smilga, and

Zinoviev, is rotten to the core, has degenerated, etc., refuses to submit to it. Which deserves support? This desire of the nations for peace embodied by the League of Nations, or the rotten oligarchy of the Soviet Union? And so they will go against us "with a clear" conscience.

There is no doubt whatever that they will meet with opposition on the part of their "own" workers, but their entire State capitalist attitude is a counter-revolutionary weapon in the struggle against Socialism within the country and in the sphere of international politics. This attitude is coming more and more into collision with the new attitude of the working class itself, because, I reiterate, never before was sympathy for the Soviet Union so great as now, never before has the idea of defending the Soviet Union been so popular. Workers' delegations, the movement for the U.S.S.R., the oath of the ex-soldiers in Germany, the demonstrations held in our more trying days—all this is a small step towards the revolutionisation of the working class.

A few words about the Congress of Friends of the Soviet Union. This means something new. In the first workers' delegation the Communist element predominated, in the second there were fewer Communists, and in the last there were more Social Democrats than Communists. Moreover, these Social Democrats were more favourably disposed towards us than before, because they assimilated better than before our solution of questions of Socialist construction. Why? Well, because the position of the Soviet Union is not what it was before. That is why—also in regard to the main question, that of war—there will be, there are bound to be, fierce struggles with the Social Democrats for the soul of the working class, for mass influence over the working class. At its last Plenum the Communist International dealt very thoroughly with the war problem and elaborated important theses on the war question. We have chosen as the central slogan of the day not the slogan of peace, but the slogan of defence of the U.S.S.R., defence of the Russian and Chinese revolutions—not the pacifist abstract slogan of peace, but the concrete slogan of militant action. For the soldiers of imperialist armies we have adopted not only the defeatist

slogan in regard to their respective countries, we have brought forward the slogan of transference of allegiance to the Red Army, in as far as it is a question of struggle between imperialist States and the Soviet Union, the country of working class dictatorship. We have elaborated detailed instructions for Communist Parties in regard to work in this direction, and we are convinced that this time the Communist Parties will succeed in carrying with them enormous working-class masses if the bourgeoisie venture to attack the Soviet Union. Just in regard to this question of preparation for action—it has already begun, it is proceeding systematically, it must continue—we have had, and will have in future, even more acute struggles with the Social Democrats, who by their whole attitude, their theory and their practice, are defending the capitalist régime and constitute one of the chief barricades which we will have to take by storm.

## VII. THE STRUGGLE FOR THE MASSES AND UNITED FRONT TACTICS.

I have already mentioned that a re-grouping has been taking place lately within the European working class. We are growing, and so are the Social Democrats.

What is at the root of Social Democratic influence? Stabilisation of capitalism increases their influence among employees and in the ranks of the labour aristocracy (particularly in trustified branches of industry). At the root of their influence are: intermittent hope that "their" capitalist industry will boom; pacifist deception on the part of Social Democrats; and, finally, the Social Democratic pretence of opposition (at present Social Democrats who for some time occupied back seats in the various Governments are playing at "opposition," are making noises like opposition, obviating thereby the pressure of the lower strata of the working class).

At the root of Communist influence are instability of stabilisation, danger of future war in general and war against the U.S.S.R. in particular, and finally, the turning to the Right of the Social Democratic upper strata.

This process brings us face to face with the problem: Must we continue united front tactics—without changing



them in the least—under present conditions just as we did two years ago, or must we introduce into united front tactics some new notes, certain new accentuations? Must we make certain deductions from changes which have taken place in the objective situation, from some of the regroupings within the working class itself? We think that it is essential to introduce some new accentuations. (“Hear, hear!”) These new accentuations will take the form of more acute struggle against Social Democratic leaders and the Amsterdam International. Therefore, the distinguishing feature of united front tactics at the present juncture is the determined application of united front tactics from below. This is the centre of gravity. There is a basis for this in the labour movement; the base for upper stratum combinations is at present much narrower than before, because the upper strata are veering to the Right in spite of some of their “Left” tricks. But our general attitude in regard to united front tactics at the present juncture must be: Still more attention to the lower strata, turning our tactical moves in their direction.

United front tactics are developing and must develop in various directions. In regard to the struggle against the war danger, they take the form of a more energetic struggle against the Social Democrats, and particularly a struggle against pacifism, which is a real menace, and is, unfortunately, still very strong among the working class; of a more energetic campaign for the defence of the U.S.S.R.; of work of all kinds by mass non-Party organisations, of utilisation of the success of the recent Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union; of work in such organisations as, for instance, the anti-Imperialist League; of organising congresses on a national scale, wherever this is possible, in support and defence of the Soviet Union; of the utilisation of the recent diplomatic action of the U.S.S.R. in Geneva. On all these occasions we must strike at pacifism. This is our bounden duty. The organisation of non-Party conferences on a broad basis, of Congresses and committees of actions whenever necessary—*i.e.*, when the situation becomes more acute—must be part of the main programme of our united front tactics. Comrades, we must also face the most decisive problem with which we

have ever had to deal—namely, the problem of the trade unions and the united front. The trade unions form one of the most acute, most worrying, and most difficult problems of our whole movement. First of all we must, under the new circumstances which have arisen, determine on what lines our work in the trade unions must be carried on. You know that the greatest defect in a number of Communist Parties is not only that our trade union work is still inadequate, but that in many cases there is a total failure to understand of what Communist work in trade unions must consist, failure to understand what kind of work should be given more prominence, and what should be the pivot of this work in reactionary trade unions.

Comrades, it seems to me that what I have said shows clearly that the Communist attitude must be opposition to any idea of class collaboration and to the entire counter-revolutionary Social Democratic idyll. The Social Democratic attitude is: "Constitutional factory," "democratisation of trusts," collaboration with capitalists, arbitration commissions, decision of all questions "by arbitration," etc.—in short, "industrial peace." Our attitude is: Maximum acuteness of the class struggle against trust capital, against any collaboration with capitalists, against any factory and works 'committees' policy which draws these committees, and through them the working class, into collaboration with capitalism, against compulsory arbitration, and against anything which ties the hands of the working class; for strikes as a means of struggle, for the extension of the class struggle, for making the wage and unemployment question a burning question, for giving more prominence to the question of the working day and to the struggle against industrial peace tendencies, and against all slogans which might imply or hint that we are at present making common cause with Social Democracy. Here I should like to say in parenthesis that it was wrong for comrades—and there were a good many of them—to bring forward at the present juncture the slogan "control of production" as a slogan embracing our entire trade union work. This is an erroneous attitude. The slogan of "Workers' control of production" is correct under revolutionary conditions, when it can develop into the

slogan "Seizure of enterprises," etc. Outside such revolutionary conditions this slogan is bound to sound like a slogan borrowed from an opera on the subject "Economic democracy, evolutionary capture of factories." It is utterly wrong. Neither nationalism for capitalist countries, nor communalisation, nor transference of factories from private capitalists into the hands of the State, nor the slogan of workers' control, nor this whole mixture of State capitalism slogans are acceptable from the point of view of the Comintern. It is in this spirit that the same question was raised at the 3rd Congress of the Comintern, held under the direct leadership of Comrade Lenin. We must not be led astray on any account organisationally; our attitude must be a demand—particularly in view of the growth of very powerful employers' organisations—for the organisation of trade unions according to branches of production, for their federation into corresponding trade union groups, etc., etc.

In this connection we must do our utmost to improve our trade union work, as trade unions are the main stronghold of the Social Democrats and the connecting link between them and the workers. We must do our utmost to strengthen the Red Trade Unions, our own organisations, wherever they exist. We must turn our attention to recruiting the unorganised, to activity among unorganised workers. Their number is very great, even in such countries as France. They are still a virgin reservoir of labour. Their number is very considerable in Czecho-Slovakia, as well as in such a country as Germany. We must give an impetus to this branch of our work. At the same time we must put more energy into our struggle for international unity in the trade union movement; we must certainly develop the work of the R.I.L.U., and must put relations between the A.R.T.U.C. and the R.I.L.U. on a more satisfactory basis. Comrades, we must realise that we have some experience in regard to this, and can arrive at a number of satisfactory results.

The Anglo-Russian Committee was broken up by British opportunists. In regard to this, Comrade Kamenev said here: ". . . The Anglo-Russian Committee died an inglorious death, and you are to blame for it." Well and

good; but if we had broken it up during the British strike it would have probably meant a glorious death? I fail to understand this. It would also have been an inglorious death (for British opportunists). To argue like Kamenev means taking as our point of departure the Zinoviev illusion that with the help of the Anglo-Russian Committee we could have "overcome reformism in Europe." I will not dwell on this point, for we have heard more than enough about it. I merely want to say briefly in passing that because disruption came over the most acute question of the international movement—the question of war—and because the odium for the disruption happened to rest with the British, this very fact can serve us for many months, if not years, as a weapon of exposure, for these opportunities have broken up the Anglo-Russian Committee over the chief question which is bound to affect the working class of all countries. But, comrades, I ask you if we are to put aside the question of a united trade union front just because the Anglo-Russian Committee has ceased to exist?

Certainly not. We must set other forces going, use other levers. We must strengthen the R.I.L.U. in every possible way, we must make the Soviet trade unions as efficient as possible, to enable them to work inside and outside the R.I.L.U. and to do everything on their part to strengthen the R.I.L.U.

We must conclude political alliances with other trade unions, bearing at the same time in mind that the centre of gravity is here, in the everyday work for the welding together of the masses. We have in a number of countries "unity groups," but these groups are not co-ordinated, there is no centralised control over them, they are at a loose end. This should not be, and we must put a stop to this. We have recently established connections with several trade unions in Eastern countries. Comrade Lozovsky will probably report on the Pacific Conference. To be able to deal exhaustively with the colossal number of problems confronting us, to give an impetus to the work in all these spheres, we must have organisational help. The ever-changing world situation dictates more energetic international struggle in connection with the trade union movement, and the Party Congress must certainly take note of

this. Finally, comrades, we must also make certain deductions for the forthcoming election struggle.

As I already mentioned, there will be election campaigns in Great Britain, France, Germany and Poland. This raises the question of the struggle for the united front. Is it necessary, in view of the international situation and existing special conditions, to make any changes in our struggle, in our attitude to Left bourgeois Parties, Socialist Parties, etc. The idea might easily arise that, in view of the complicated international position of the U.S.S.R., we should be more lenient with the Social Democratic Parties. However, my previous analysis shows that our election campaign should certainly be an effort on our part to prove to the workers that the Communist Party is the only revolutionary Party of the working class.

Let us take Great Britain. The Conservatives there are carrying on a fierce struggle. A bloc between the Liberals and the opportunist Labour Party is not out of the question. On a number of most important questions the Labour Party has capitulated before its bourgeois partners. On the question of Moscow, the Chinese revolution, and the struggle against the anti-Trade Union Bill the Labour Party has done, during the period with which we are dealing, more mischief than during its whole previous existence.

Some British comrades referred to Lenin's statement in "Left Wing Communism, an Infantile Sickness" that it is essential to push the Labour Party into power. (It would be certainly a great mistake to assume that Lenin's idea was that we must vote indiscriminately for the Labour Party. Nothing of the kind. He proposed a compromise, a division of mandates, etc.) It is impossible to use these arguments of Lenin at the present juncture, because we have now an utterly different situation. One can hardly say now that we must "push" the Labour Party into power, for it has already been in power. When Vladimir Ilyitch was writing this his idea was that we must do so in order to expose it all the more effectively. At present, however, we cannot strike out what has already been. On the contrary, we must do our utmost to expose the leaders of the Labour Party for their treacherous conduct on questions

such as the coal strike, the Chinese revolution, the attitude of the U.S.S.R. to the Trade Unions and Trade Disputes Bill, etc.

To take slogans and tactical orientation connected with circumstances of long ago and to apply them to utterly different circumstances, is not exactly carrying out the injunctions of Vladimir Ilyitch. It means total failure to understand Leninist tactics. At present our tactics must be to bring forward in a large number of places our own candidates against the candidates of the Labour Party, to act as an independent party with a character of its own which does its utmost to expose the leaders of the Labour Party.

To put it differently, we must strike a more decisive note than before.

In France we are faced with a "to be or not to be" of the Poincaré Cabinet. Here, too, the question might arise: Is it necessary to support the general "Left bloc" because the Conservative Government constitutes a danger to the U.S.S.R.? Such an orientation would be erroneous.

We must prepare our French Party for real battles. It has not yet been under fire. It will be under fire. Big battles are in store for it, particularly in the event of a serious conflict, and the forthcoming election campaign in France must be conducted by the French Communist Party in such a manner as to show to the entire working class that on the one side of the barricade are the bourgeoisie and its Socialist followers, whereas on the other side of the barricade is the Communist Party—the only revolutionary Party of the working class. This, of course, does not mean that we must reject all united front proposals and refuse to vote in some cases for Socialist candidates, for instance, when reactionary candidates have a chance to succeed. However, voting for the Left bourgeoisie would certainly be a mistake. It is inadmissible at the present juncture. In Germany it will be necessary to expose the Social Democrats who are preparing for a "broad coalition." In Poland no united front proposals to the upper stratum of the P.P.S. (Polish Socialist Party). I think that in Poland there is no ground whatever to approach these despicable Pilsudskyites, who have not an atom of proletarianism

about them. (Applause.) We must approach the P.P.S. rank-and-file.

Thus, in our application of united front tactics we must transfer the centre of gravity to the rank-and-file, we must fight more energetically against the Social Democrats, and particularly against so-called "Left" Social Democratic leaders; our entire agitation must be based on linking up the everyday demands of the working class with questions of high politics, first and foremost with the question of war, and on this basis we must lead the masses towards the main slogan—the slogan of working-class dictatorship.

### VIII. COLONIAL QUESTIONS AND THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

I will deal now with the colonial question. All that I have already said shows how important this question now is in connection with the international revolution and the position of world capitalism (the problem of markets). If the capitalist world in general feels at present the shortage of markets, and if the problem of colonial re-partition has become very acute, this means that the crisis of the entire capitalist world economy is most marked in its colonial sphere. A number of colonial rebellions, the rising in Syria, the movement in Egypt, the rebellion in Morocco, the big rising in the Dutch Indies, continuous ferment in India, and, finally, the Great Chinese Revolution—all these combined make the colonial problem very acute so far as the capitalist world is concerned. In addition, there are numerous conflicts and differences between powerful capitalist countries and semi-colonial countries which are the object of the colonial policy of the biggest imperialist countries. Lately such differences and conflicts have become extremely acute between the United States and the countries of Latin America, Mexico and Nicaragua. You know that in his recent speech Coolidge, the President of the United States, thought it necessary to emphasise the "pacifying" rôle of the United States—a "pacifying" rôle which consists in the United States suppressing by force of arms and other methods the liberation aspirations of Central and South American countries.

In spite of its great similarity in the various countries,

the colonial problem is such a complicated and varied problem that it cannot possibly be solved in exactly the same manner in all these countries. Certainly, different tactical policies are needed here, because economic conditions, and consequently class relations in the various colonial and semi-colonial countries, differ considerably. If you take, for instance, a country like India, with its comparatively developed capitalist industry, its comparatively developed towns and a fairly numerous industrial proletariat, and then again countries, let us say, such as Persia, Afghanistan, or Egypt, you will immediately discover how different are the conditions of our struggle. Therefore, it would be utterly wrong to bring forward just one tactical formula for all the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The difference between them is so considerable that, on the strength of Lenin's conception of the colonial question, we will have to make decisions—and this is the only correct point of view—in regard to our tactics in this or that colonial or semi-colonial country on the basis of a concrete analysis of the economic, social, and political conditions of the given country.

Comrades, you know that at the 2nd Congress of the Communist International the question of colonies, colonial movements, colonial risings and wars, was raised with a full appreciation of its importance. During our pre-Congress discussion reference was made to the conception, so strongly and stubbornly propagated by Vladimir Ilyitch, that we must differentiate very definitely between imperialist countries—subjects of colonial policy and oppressed countries—colonies which are objects of colonial policy, of exploitation and oppression on the part of the big imperialist powers.

You probably remember that during the war a number of comrades in our Party, particularly those who had come into our ranks from other camps, had a different conception of this question from Vladimir Ilyitch. They thought that in colonial countries oppressed by imperialism our policy must be about the same as in countries which are subject to imperialist policy—*i.e.*, imperialist countries. During the war Comrade Radek wrote an article on the occasion of the Irish Rebellion, in which he said that this rebellion



was something alien to us, because at the head of it was not the proletariat, but the bourgeoisie (a section of the Irish bourgeoisie). Vladimir Ilyitch then vigorously attacked this point of view, declaring that non-support of such national-liberation risings is tantamount to giving direct help to the ruling imperialist nations. In substance, Radek was voicing then what can be justly called a Social Democratic tendency in regard to the national question, because the Social Democratic viewpoint consists precisely in non-support of the national revolutionary and colonial movements under the pretext that frequently—particularly in the first stage of their development—they are not headed by the working class, and therefore proletarian revolutionists can have nothing to do with these national bourgeois movements.

Vladimir Ilyitch said in argument against this that, from the point of view of the international revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against imperialism, national liberation movements, colonial movements and rebellions, etc., are factors which weaken our main imperialist enemy, and that non-support of such movements—even when they are not headed by the proletariat, but, let us say, by the national revolutionary bourgeoisie—is direct help to the chauvinism of the big Powers, to the imperialist States. Comrade Lenin thought that in regard to national liberation movements it is possible for us to support, under definite conditions, the national revolutionary bourgeoisie. We have mentioned repeatedly in our literature and speeches the conditions under which Vladimir Ilyitch thought it possible to support national liberation movements. If the national revolutionary bourgeoisie is struggling against imperialism, and if it gives us an opportunity to organise and educate masses of workers and peasants on a revolutionary basis, we must support it and make common cause with it. We have already given a series of quotations from Lenin, and I will not repeat them. But, with your permission, I will give you other quotations from Vladimir Ilyitch which have not yet been given, and which put this question into a nutshell. In his polemics with Comrade Piatakov, who at the time wrote under the *nom de plume* "Kievsky," Vladimir Ilyitch brought forward numerous

arguments against Comrade Piatakov's theses in which he asserted that in the epoch of imperialism there is no room for national community of interests, that the slogan "national self-determination" is recognition of the right to defend the State as a whole, that the point of view developed by Comrade Lenin means nothing but the establishment of a national bloc between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and that, in substance, this point of view leads to social "patriotism." Vladimir Ilyitch wrote a remarkably interesting article against Piatakov's views. It would be useful to read this article once more, because it contains such a wealth of ideas in various directions, and above all in connection with the national and colonial question. Vladimir Ilyitch tackles first of all the question of whether a proletarian party can speak, under certain conditions, of national community of interests? Comrade Piatakov asserts that it cannot; Vladimir Ilyitch asserts that it can. He says:

"In these advanced countries (Great Britain, France, Germany, etc.) the national question is solved long ago, national community [*i.e.*, community between classes.—N.B.] has long ago outlived itself objectively, "common national tasks" do not exist. Therefore, only in these countries is it possible now 'to explode' national community and to establish class community.

"Matters are different in undeveloped countries, in countries which we place (in Paragraph 6 of our Theses) into the second and third category, *i.e.*, in the entire European East and in all colonies and semi-colonies. As a general rule, there are still oppressed and undeveloped capitalist nations here. Objectively there are still in these nations common national tasks, namely, Democratic tasks, tasks connected with the overthrow of foreign national oppression." (Lenin's Works, vol. XIII., p. 369. Russian Edition.)

Vladimir Ilyitch connects this problem with the general problem of international revolution. Frequently, many comrades considered international Socialist revolution as a purely proletarian movement, uniform in its composition, as an act which happens only once and the

component parts of which come about almost simultaneously. On the other hand, Comrade Lenin pointed out that in the overthrow of Imperialism a big rôle will also be played by colonial national movements, which will become linked up with the Socialist movement of the proletariat and will develop under the leadership of the latter.

In his polemic with Piatakov he wrote as follows on the conditions of the international revolution: "Social Revolution can only take place in an epoch which links up civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in advanced countries with a whole series of democratic and revolutionary movements, including national liberation movements in undeveloped, backward, and oppressed nations." (Lenin's Works, Vol. XIII., p. 369-370. Russian Edition.)

Consequently, Vladimir Ilyitch also considered rebellions of colonial and semi-colonial nations and national-liberation wars a necessary part of the great international revolutionary process spread over a whole epoch, and it is from this point of view that he estimated the national-liberation movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Such is Comrade Lenin's preliminary, general argument.

Vladimir Ilyitch also deals straightforwardly with the question of the possibility of making—at a definite stage—common cause with the bourgeoisie of colonial and semi-colonial countries. Thus, Comrade Lenin's first thesis is that, objectively, there still exist in a number of countries common national tasks, that in a whole series of Eastern countries it is as yet impossible to set ourselves the task of destroying general national unity. This is, of course, a general formula, the application of which depends on the complete analysis of this or that country, on a correct appreciation of the stages of revolutionary development in this or that country. Vladimir Ilyitch certainly did not exclude support of general national unity (it is true that this was written in 1915). On the contrary, he considered it correct for a number of colonial countries. And then Lenin was very outspoken on the same problem which was discussed in our Party in connection with the Chinese

revolution. Comrade Piatakov thought that one can never make common cause with the bourgeoisie, that one can never support a general national bloc; he thought that this would mean fomenting national animosity, hatred not between classes, but between "nations." Comrade Piatakov thought that it was impossible for us to carry on one kind of policy in imperialist countries and another kind of policy in oppressed countries. He considered this, to use his philosophical expression, an infringement of the "monism" (*i.e.*, unity) of our policy. Against this Vladimir Ilyitch said:

"If national rebellions are impossible in the 'imperialist epoch,' then P. Kievsky has no right to speak of them. If they are possible, then all his interminable phrases about 'monism' and that we are 'inventing' examples of self-determination under imperialism, and so on and so forth, all go to smithereens. P. Kievsky is defeating himself.

"If 'we' are actively resisting the suppression of a national rebellion—a contingency considered possible by P. Kievsky himself—what does this mean?" (Lenin's Works, Vol. XIII., u. 371, Russian Edition.)

Lenin's answer to this is as follows:—

"This means that 'action' becomes twofold—'dual,' to use philosophical terminology with as little justification as our author. Firstly, 'action' by the nationally oppressed proletariat and peasantry, together with the nationally oppressed bourgeoisie, against the oppressed nation; secondly, 'action' by the proletariat or its class-conscious section within the oppressor nation against the bourgeoisie and all the elements of that nation which follow it." (Lenin's Works, Vol. XIII., pp. 371-372. Russian Edition.)

This formula is very significant. Let us apply it to China in the first stage of the development of the Chinese revolution. In China the national bourgeoisie was carrying on an energetic struggle against British imperialism. In accordance with this Lenin formula, what were our tactics to be? Tactics calculated for "dual action." In imperialist countries, for instance, Great Britain, the pro-

letariat must act against its own bourgeoisie; in an oppressed country such as China, according to this formula, it is essential for the nationally-oppressed proletariat and peasantry to make common cause with the nationally-oppressed bourgeoisie. Consequently, when the Opposition was asserting that Vladimir Ilyitch excluded, always and under all circumstances, joint action by the nationally-oppressed bourgeoisie on the plea that this is Menshevik tactics, these assertions of the Opposition have in reality nothing in common with Lenin's conception of the question. Lenin says definitely that, under certain circumstances, one must make common cause with the nationally-oppressed bourgeoisie. Just listen to what Vladimir Ilyitch wrote later on, it gives short shrift to all the arguments of our Opposition :—

“All the phrases against the ‘national bloc,’ ‘national illusions,’ the ‘poison’ of nationalism, the ‘fomenting of national hatred,’ and suchlike phrases of which P. Kievsky gave us plenty, have proved to be nonsense, for by advising the proletariat of the oppressor-countries (we must bear in mind that the author considers this proletariat a force to be reckoned with) ‘to put up active resistance to the suppression of national rebellion,’ the author, by this very fact, foments national hatred and supports ‘the bloc’ between the workers of the oppressed countries and the bourgeoisie.” (Lenin's Works. Vol. XIII., p. 372. Russ. Ed.)

Thus you see that Vladimir Ilyitch not only admits the possibility and expediency—in definite stages of development—of making common cause with the nationally oppressed bourgeoisie, but speaks even of the possibility of supporting a bloc with the bourgeoisie in oppressed countries. Naturally, this is not a sacred general formula to suit every stage and every period of even colonial revolutions. When Vladimir Ilyitch was speaking of the possibility of a “bloc with the bourgeoisie” he certainly made this bloc depend on a number of conditions. In certain of his other writings, which have already been repeatedly quoted by us, he formulated these conditions very accurately. Firstly, the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie must put up a genuine fight against imperialism; secondly,

our Party must be at liberty to organise the working class and the peasantry on the basis of revolutionary tactics, a revolutionary programme and revolutionary actions.

If these conditions exist, what Vladimir Ilyitch says comes into force; if these conditions do not exist, then matters are different, then there is a different correlation of classes, a different correlation of forces, different tactics. This is the way to look at this question. If we take into consideration that, let us say, such a gigantic revolution as the one in China, which has brought us face to face with numerous important questions of principle connected with colonial policy, is going on for years, it is but natural that, as this revolution develops, we witness various regroupings of forces and of classes, and hence various tactical changes on the part of the Communist Party and the working class. It seems to me that these fundamental premises have been made sufficiently clear and that we are justified in saying that the arguments of the Opposition against the tactics of the Communist International and our party do not bear criticism. They are a reversal of the Radek-Piatakov point of view of some time ago, and certainly not "100 per cent. Leninism," as our Opposition "friends" are endeavouring to assert. I think that it will be as well to deal also with another aspect of this problem. Let us assume that we go back a few years and have in China a state of affairs when the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie offers armed resistance to British, Japanese, and other imperialisms. Imagine that we are going through the period of two years ago. Under these circumstances, have we to support the movement, to remain neutral, or to fight against it? Answer me this: If we raise the question in this form, it becomes immediately clear and self-evident that in regard to this cardinal question the Opposition would be unable to prevaricate, for if there be armed struggle against imperialism, even under the leadership of the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie, is it possible for the workers' party to remain neutral in this struggle? Of course not. Can it offer opposition to this struggle? It is clear as daylight that this would be tantamount to direct help to the imperialist enemies. What it can and must do under the existing circumstances is to support the movement up to the moment

when it begins to turn against the working class. As soon as it begins to turn against the working class Vladimir Ilyitch's fundamental condition for this tactic—freedom of organisation and of revolutionary action for the Communist Party and the working class—disappears. As soon as this happens the correlation of forces in the country undergoes a radical change, the dividing line between the revolutionary and the counter-revolutionary camp runs along a different social territory. Then, quite naturally we get a situation similar to that *now* in China. It is quite impossible not to differentiate between these various stages and phases. To adopt the point of view that, during the period of actual struggle by the national bourgeoisie against imperialism, we must simply ignore this movement, is to adopt Radek's standpoint concerning the period of the Irish Rebellion; it would be tantamount to misunderstanding national and colonial questions, to getting down to the social democratic interpretation of this question, regardless of any Left phraseology by which such an attitude may be disguised. This is self-evident, because we have before our eyes the fact that while members of our Opposition were in the Polit-bureau and we were deciding, together with them, these questions in the preceding stage of the development of the Chinese revolution they did not raise their voice against this tactic—for instance, Zinoviev did not do so when he was chairman of the Chinese Commission; in fact, he never said a word against it, but voted for support of the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie. This is an absolute fact.

Comrades, I have dealt at considerable length on this question because it was absolutely unavoidable, especially as the Chinese revolution is not dead, but lives and develops, and it is our duty to support this revolution by every possible means, because it continues to be the greatest factor in the present history of the world. It is for these considerations that I have dealt so fully with the fundamental problem of the Chinese revolution. But we have now another stage; the bourgeoisie has long ago gone over to the counter-revolutionary camp; the correlation of class forces is now utterly different; now we can speak of the struggle of the working class, the peasantry and part of

the petty urban bourgeoisie against the joint forces of foreign imperialism, feudalism and the national bourgeoisie, which has become a counter-revolutionary force. The big bourgeoisie had the support of the urban petty bourgeoisie, and at a certain stage also the support of the peasantry and the proletariat. But these united forces produced such a powerful agrarian and working class movement that the frightened bourgeoisie went over openly to the counter-revolutionary camp and had, of course, to follow the path of greater and lesser compromises with imperialism.

Let us consider now the present state of affairs in China. The Chinese revolution is certainly not dead, and it seems to me that we are about to move on a new revolutionary basis, with other class forces—we are, in fact, on the eve of new actions by the working class and the peasantry. The likelihood of another revolutionary wave is due to the situation which has now arisen in China. First of all, just a few words concerning imperialism. Have the imperialists succeeded in subduing China, in solving in their own fashion, in an imperialist fashion, the Chinese problem? Have they succeeded in getting the best of the anti-imperialist movement? If we raise the question in this manner the clear answer is: No, they have not succeeded in throttling the Chinese revolution. True, the imperialists have occupied very important strategical and economic positions, they have achieved certain successes; the British again hold their concession in Hankow, in spite of the agreement made by the British representative, O'Malley, with the former representative of the Wuhan Government, Eugene Chen; Japan is proceeding to conquer Manchuria and Inner Mongolia and has strengthened its position there very much. It has put forward the following "conditions" in regard to Manchuria and Inner Mongolia:—

1. The right to build six railway branches leading to the South Manchurian Railway.
2. The right for the Japanese to raise cattle and sheep in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.
3. The right for Japanese enterprises to exploit forests and the mineral wealth of Manchuria and Inner Mongolia, which will guarantee to Japan a continuous supply of timber and minerals.



4. The right for the Japanese to settle anywhere in Manchuria and Mongolia on the same basis as the Chinese.

5. The right for the Japanese to own, purchase, and sell plots of land through Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.

6. The right for Japan to have police protection for its subjects throughout Manchuria and Mongolia.

7. The Japanese to receive preference in regard to the development of any local wealth in these districts.

8. The Chinese are to have only Japanese military advisors for the Chinese forces in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.

9. The Japanese to have the right to build schools and temples throughout Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.

10. Manchuria and Inner Mongolia must be protected against the possibility of any political disturbances whatever, and no outside armed forces, be they Chinese or foreign, must be allowed to enter the territory of Manchuria and Inner Mongolia.

These draconic demands practically reduce to nought even the semblance of independence of these two countries. It seems to me that of all the imperial groupings the greatest conquests in China have been made by Japan, which adopted a very cautious attitude, whose diplomats are comparatively very discreet, and which has certainly secured the greatest booty in China. But, nevertheless, we are justified in asserting that the imperialists have not succeeded in solving the general Chinese problem. They are in China as a hostile force, they have torn off pieces of China, they have their fleets there, they have occupied certain districts, but one certainly cannot assert that they have "pacified" the country—even by imperialist methods—and that they have broken the backbone of the Chinese revolution. Has this Chinese problem been solved by the formerly national-revolutionary and at present nation-counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie? It seems to me that the latter has not solved this problem; on the contrary, the development of objective differences between the bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the workers' and peasants' movement on the other, have not only prevented the weak native bourgeoisie from solving in its own fashion the Chinese problem, they have even created a situation in which the Chinese bour-

geoisie, which has come under the sway of the semi-feudal militarist apparatus, has been weakened, has been divided up into groups and is no longer able to act as a united class force. We witness now a state of affairs when various military groupings, led by different politicians, have split up into generals' cliques, far from independent, which justifies us in saying that the forces of the national bourgeoisie are anything but united. The situation there is such that North, South and Central China have all of them their own groupings.

I have here, for instance, a Press resumé concerning the Central provinces :—

Chu Pei-de has established himself on the Yang-tse.  
Chen Chin had designs on Hupeh, but was unsuccessful.

Ten In-kai evidently aspires to Hunan.

Ho Tsun-do is establishing himself in Hupeh.

Ba Tsun-tsi—in Nanking.

Chen Dyao-Yuan—in the Anhui Province.

Chiang Kai-shek with Ho In-tsin—in the Che-kiang province.

Chan Kin-hsui—in the Fu Kiang province.

Huan Shao-taun—in the Kwangsi province.

Similar things are happening in the South. In Canton there are also four different groupings, and there is the same state of affairs in other places. We see a remarkable differentiation and division of counter-revolutionary forces into groups and cliques.

But what is going on at the same time in the lower strata, among the masses of workers and peasants? Although our Chinese comrades organised demonstrations on the occasion of Sacco and Vanzetti's execution and because of White Terror in America, "at home" they are "accustomed" to White Terror, the brutality of which is difficult to imagine. Tens of thousands of our followers have already perished there. Mass ill-treatment of the most brutal kind and extermination of enormous numbers of our comrades—members and sympathisers of our Party—are taking place there. The bestiality and horrors of

the White Terror of the Chinese counter-revolution beggar description.

But the most surprising thing is—that in spite of all this it would be utterly untrue to assert that in China we now have a throttled movement. On the contrary, we witness lately signs of a certain revival of the movement. The peasant movement is spreading. We recently-received news about a rising in North Hupeh, peasant detachments have occupied a town and are holding it. There is ferment in a number of provinces and—if I am not mistaken—in five districts of the Kwantung' region peasant Soviets and Soviet power have been established. For the first time in the history of the Chinese peasant movement, Soviet power on a peasant basis has been established, a power which has initiated a war of extermination against landlords. About 300 to 400 landlords have been beheaded. (Applause. A voice from the body of the hall: "Not enough, there should be more.")

On this territory, which has a population of several million, landlords have been exterminated.

Finally, there is at present a situation of extreme tension throughout the Kwantung Province, particularly around Canton.

On the basis of numerous data it can be said that very serious events are brewing in China.

Attempts have been made to crush and disintegrate the working class, not only by means of white terror, but also by means of yellow trade unions controlled by "leaders" appointed by Chiang Kai-shek and other generals. Furthermore, it is very remarkable that in this respect, too, the Chinese working class has exhibited supreme heroism, sacrificing an enormous number of its best sons, and that it continues to defend its own organisations and to attack the yellow leaders in spite of an incredible white terror. Moreover, the struggle there is so fierce and bitter that even if our men are killed in batches, our side succeeds in getting even with the yellow "leaders" appointed by the generals (commotion in the hall). Yes, the fierceness of the struggle there is unprecedented. Recently there was a big strike wave in Shanghai, Wuhan and Canton, the workers' spirit being very

militant. Moreover, we must remember that remnants of Ye Tin's army are still in Kwantung, and if events in Canton develop favourably for the workers and peasants, these forces could play the role of the mailed fist on our side.

Such is approximately the state of affairs in China.

If we sum up what I have said, I think that we cannot help arriving at the following conclusion :

Firstly, the imperialists have not solved and cannot solve the Chinese problem; secondly, the national bourgeoisie, far from getting nearer to the solution of this problem by its own methods—throttling the working class bloc and compromise with the imperialists—is becoming more and more divided and ineffective as a political force. It has now divided its forces between those generals and their cliques who, seemingly, have established themselves and who are fighting for the immediate sources of existence, for they must live and maintain their armies. These armies are considerable. The forces of the Nanking grouping are 270,000 strong, the forces of the Tan Chen-shi group are 150,000 strong, there are tens of thousands of soldiers in Kwantung, etc. All this requires enormous resources, these forces can only be maintained by enormous pressure being brought to bear on the population. A fight is going on between these cliques for any province which has big stores of rice and a certain amount of money. Thus, these big military groups are becoming disintegrated together with their bourgeois leaders who have become entangled by their own contradictions.

There remain two big classes—the working class and the peasantry—for whom the national problem does not clash with the problem of class struggle. There remain two social class forces which are not destroyed in spite of the enormous losses they have suffered. At present these class forces are developing, growing and organising themselves. Therefore, it seems to me that in regard to the prospects of the Chinese revolution we have no right at all to be pessimistic.

As to the political or Party political expression of all these processes, I must say a few words here. The Kuo-mintang and all its groupings have ceased long ago to

exist as a revolutionary force. I think that that is firmly established, and need not be discussed any further. Moreover, the Kuomintang is also ceasing to play a role as a counter-revolutionary force of any importance; not in the sense that it is "absolved" of its counter-revolutionary crimes, but in that the logic of the struggle has transferred the centre of gravity to "the military groupings, whose appendages are the various chips off the various Kuomintang tendencies. Such is the state of affairs. Therefore, this once powerful organisation is now destroyed, reduced to nought, and is being rendered futile even as a counter-revolutionary force.

It goes without saying that at the present juncture our main slogan is the Soviet slogan which will grow in importance as the Chinese revolution develops. Maximum importance attaches to the question of the firmer establishment of the Chinese Communist Party, which has gone through a series of very trying stages of development, has at present purged itself—although not sufficiently—of petty bourgeois intellectual "companions," and is making heroic efforts to weld together its organisation in spite of the fact that tens of thousands of its followers are either incapacitated or have been exterminated. The Party has at present between 20,000 and 25,000 members, and the Young Communist organisation about 15,000. A purging process is now going on the upper stratum of the Communist Party: Tan Tin-hsiang has been expelled for his opportunist policy in the agrarian question. I reiterate, in spite of the enormous difficulties which confronted and are confronting the Chinese Communist Party, we undoubtedly witness an internal consolidation of the Party. Naturally, frictions, partial defeats, etc., will also occur in future, but the correlation of class forces and the internal consolidation of our Party are at present such that I am justified in saying once more: We have no ground whatever to be pessimistic in regard to the prospects of the great Chinese revolution.

The experience of the Chinese revolution is of enormous importance to us, and not only from the point of view of the further successful development of the revolutionary struggle in China. Firstly, the Chinese revolution has

confronted us with the Colonial problem in its most concrete form. We have repeatedly approached this colonial problem, and in principle its importance was clear to us all. But the complicated nature of its social class aspect and of the tasks connected with control over such an enormous colonial revolution have only recently confronted us in their full magnitude.\* The experience of the Chinese revolution has brought us into actual touch with a diversity of problems of colonial revolutions in general. At the same time, the experience of the Chinese revolution shows very clearly how cautious one must be when deciding in concrete political tactics, how necessary it is to take into careful consideration the peculiarities of development in this or that country. Drawing a parallel with the Chinese revolution, I want to say just a few words regarding the problem of revolution in India, a problem which will soon be one of the biggest problems confronting the Comintern and our Party as a whole. India is also a colonial country, oppressed by British imperialism; India, too, has a National-Liberation movement. But it would be unpardonable folly if we tried to transfer mechanically the experience of our Chinese tactics to Indian territory, and to the definition of our tactics in India. Why? Because the correlation of class forces there is utterly different; because from the very beginning we shall be confronted there with an utterly different state of affairs from that in China at the beginning of the Chinese revolution. Recently, the British Government has been manoeuvring very cleverly in regard to India. It has certainly not succeeded in bringing the masses over to its side. The Government of Great Britain has recently made a number of concessions to native industry. Formerly, India was a country which exported raw material and imported manufactured articles from the mother country—Great Britain. Formerly, Great Britain treated India as a purveyor of raw material who was not given an opportunity to develop its own industry. But under the influence of the growing Russian revolution, of the Chinese revolution and of the development of the capitalist classes, and first and foremost under the influence of the movement in India itself, the government of Great Britain carried out a rather

clever manœuvre. It allowed customs tariffs to be introduced into India. It ceased sitting on the safety valve by giving freer play to the development of native industry. It gave India an opportunity of becoming industrialised, and the Indian bourgeoisie an opportunity of developing. It began to coquet more and more with the upper stratum of the intelligentsia and the Indian bourgeoisie in regard to Home Rule, autonomy for India, etc. By these manœuvres, which were put on a definite economic basis, it brought about a state of affairs when a considerable section of the Indian bourgeoisie, which was formerly decidedly revolutionary, is now forming a bloc with British imperialism and is in many cases declaring that it is its duty to fight against the "Moscow agents" on the plea that the old master (Great Britain) is better than the "unknown new master" (Moscow).

What does this fact imply? It implies that in India there is a different correlation of classes from that in China, that a considerable section of the national bourgeoisie will be, from the very beginning, on the other side of the barricade. Therefore, the tactics which we applied in the first stages of the revolution in China will not be applicable in India.

Is it out of the question in India for proletarians and peasants to co-operate in any way with the native bourgeoisie? I think that this is not out of the question. Is it out of the question for us Communists to have in India, for any length of time, blocs in the form of an organisation such as the Kuomintang? I think that such a combination is out of the question for us. Can one contemplate temporary parallel actions or agreements from time to time? I think so. Can one contemplate a prolonged bloc, prolonged support on our part of the Indian bourgeoisie? Certainly not, because from the very beginning it will be our duty not only to criticise severely but to expose the native bourgeoisie, for this bourgeoisie, or at least its most important circles, does not satisfy the conditions laid down by Lenin. Firstly, it has not been carrying on a prolonged struggle against imperialism. Secondly, and this is also very important, it is carrying on an active struggle against Communists, interfering with their freedom of action. As

far as we are concerned, it is already now an actively hostile force. All this goes to show that our attitude here must be quite different. The correlation of classes is different, the problem appears in a different form although India is also a colonial country.

If I were to take as an example countries like Egypt, Persia, or any other country, I could prove without much difficulty that in every one of these countries there are specific features in regard to social relations, which make it incumbent on us to analyse attentively and concretely the situation in the country instead of resting content with generalisations about the colonial problem. That is, of course, inadmissible, it would not do at all.

The colonial problem is assuming an ever-growing importance for us. The growing acuteness of the colonial problem is shown by the fact that this problem is beginning to worry our imperialist opponents more and more, and by the fact that the forces of the growing national liberation movements are rallying and organising their ranks, although, of course, this process is not always smooth. An outward sign of the rally of colonial forces is the organisation of the Anti-Imperialist League.

Time will not permit me to speak here at length on its work and activity. But all of you know from the reports what a deep impression was created even in East Europe by the Brussels Conference of the Anti-Imperialist League, in which the Communist Parties took a prominent part.

The Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League is just now in session. It is obvious that very soon we shall have a good many difficulties in this League, and for two reasons: Firstly, because there will be a branching off of certain national bourgeois elements in connection with events in China and the exit of the Kuomintang into the counter-revolutionary camp. This will complicate relations with a number of groupings belonging to the League. Secondly, we shall have here a series of difficulties arising out of the fact that social democratic parties, which at first boycotted this League—a tactical stupidity from their point of view—have now recognised this stupidity and are endeavouring to get



into the Anti-Imperialist League in order to gain influence there.

A fierce struggle against the social democrats will be carried not only throughout Western Europe, but also in Eastern countries, because social democratic orientation is an orientation towards Chiang Kai-shek and Co., an orientation towards the yellow trade unions and all the enemies we now have in the colonial countries. They worm their way into the ranks of the working class, into the Anti-Imperialist League, by semi-Fascist methods, and in this connection we are faced with innumerable vast problems of an organisational and tactical nature.

Hence, the E.C.C.I. has decided—it is as yet only a preliminary decision, which will be probably endorsed by the Plenum of the E.C.C.I.—to place the colonial question in all its magnitude on the agenda of the next International Congress of the Comintern. Everyone knows that the colonial question is acute. We have accumulated much experience; the experience of the Chinese revolution is truly inexhaustible; one can and must sum up results in this sphere and adopt a definite line of policy for various other countries. That is why this question will play an exceptionally important and big rôle at the Congress of the Comintern in May, 1928.

#### **IX. THE COMINTERN AND ITS SECTIONS.**

Another question which we must consider is the position of the Communist Parties, the Sections of the Comintern. It is all the more necessary to deal with this, as we are not only able to sum up our development throughout a number of years, but can also register the beginning of a certain growth of our ranks just recently.

One must admit that in the course of the recent years, let us say up to the middle of 1926, membership in the foreign Communist Parties was almost continually dwindling. But during the revolutionary era in the West there was an enormous influx into the ranks of the Comintern, and we had even to erect special barriers in the shape of 21 conditions to prevent our ranks being flooded with elements that were rather doubtful from a Com-

munist point of view. After a series of proletarian defeats in Italy, Germany and other countries, and after the beginning of stabilisation came the low tide of revolution accompanied by a considerable dwindling in the membership of Communist Parties. It is true that in some cases this was compensated by the growing influence of this or that Communist Party over the masses. Nevertheless, there was a steady diminution of Party members. In 1926—owing to the turning to the Left within the working class which I have already mentioned—we witnessed in a number of countries a definite growth in the Communist Parties. For instance, in Germany the Party had about one hundred thousand members in 1925, present membership—128,000; in France the membership has grown from 50,000 in 1926 to 60,000; in Czecho-Slovakia from 98,000 in 1926 to 138,000. We have to reckon at the same time with the destruction of our Parties in the Balkans through White Terror. In Bulgaria, Roumania and Jugo-Slavia our membership dwindled considerably. In Italy, however, in spite of Mussolini's terrorism, the illegal Communist Party is growing. But it is quite clear that this Party, which lives in exceptional illegal conditions and is subject to fierce attacks on the part of the whole Government apparatus, cannot extend rapidly. Nevertheless, the Italian Communist Party is the only opposition Party in the whole country. Reformist, Catholic and other parties have ceased to exist, their leaders have emigrated or are leading a miserable political existence or have gone over to the Fascists. The Polish Communist Party is also working under conditions of fierce terrorism, but it is a strong Party which is winning over more and more workers from its P.P.S. rival. In Great Britain Party membership is dwindling, in spite of the heroic work of the Communist Party in the general strike and coal dispute. This is to a great extent due to Communist workers, members of factory and workshop nuclei and others being exposed not only to political persecution but also to economic pressure they are dismissed from enterprises, are black-listed and subjected to all sorts of economic persecution. These workers are deprived of all means of livelihood, and this explains to a great extent

the dwindling membership of our British brother Party. In most of the Northern countries, except Sweden, where the Party is growing, Communist Parties are very small. However, we can say that in the most important European Parties membership is growing. In two other big illegal Parties—the Italian and Polish—the state of affairs is also improving. In Great Britain we witness a decline. But we must take into consideration that in spite of this decline the membership of the British Communist Party is bigger than before the beginning of the general strike and Coal Lock out.

At the same time it should be pointed out that membership fluctuation does not go parallel with the growth of political influence, *i.e.*, the political influence of our Parties grows much more rapidly than their membership. In some countries where the numerical strength of the Parties is not increasing, their political influence is steadily growing. This is due to the fact that a considerable number of the big, and also of the smaller, Communist Parties have not yet learned to consolidate organisationally the political successes which they had achieved. I reiterate that this is noticeable in a considerable number of our Parties, including even the German Communist Party. This is due, among other things, to the, as yet, inadequate work of Communist fractions in trade unions—the strongholds of social democracy and of the Amsterdam International—the most important mass organisations of the working class, although this work is the foremost duty of Communist Parties. But in spite of all this the growth of the political influence of our Communist Parties is unquestionable; it exceeds considerably the growth of Party membership.

This again is due to the fact that recently our Parties have been organising numerous political campaigns through which, as well as through strike struggles, they succeeded in attracting broad sections of the working class. In Great Britain the Communist Party came forward as a Party which supported the strike movement, as the only consistent propagator of the slogan "Defence of the Chinese revolution," as the only Party which fearlessly makes war against war, as the most loyal friend

and ally of the U.S.S.R., as the only Party which consistently defended the working class against the Trade Disputes and Trade Union Bill, as a Party which consistently supported the miners to the bitter end. The recent miners' march on London which took place under the leadership of the Communist Party, was undertaken against the will of the Labour Party and trade union organs, and is one of the most significant events in British public life.

The French Communist Party has also organised a whole series of big political campaigns. It was at the head of a number of strikes connected with the strike wave which I have already mentioned; in some districts it carried out very successful anti-militarist campaigns and also a campaign for the U.S.S.R. and another against Fascists. You all know through the Press about the demonstration in Clichy in connection with the parade of the American Legion in France. The Party organised a splendid demonstration in connection with Sacco and Vanzetti's execution which was accompanied by street collisions.

The German Party also succeeded in mobilising considerable sections of the working class by means of big political campaigns. All of you, of course, remember the campaign in connection with compensation to the ex-ruling houses and the referendum on this question. Not only did the German Communist Party mobilise big sections of workers, it drove the social democrats into a defensive position and subsequently compelled them to follow in its wake. This campaign is certainly to the credit of the Communist Party of Germany. In connection with this, there was a big campaign for the convocation of the Toilers Congress which you all no doubt remember. There was also a campaign in support of the Chinese revolution and another for higher wages. You all remember the struggle of the German Communist Party which brought together the various sections of the working class in a common struggle against Fascism. You remember the counter-demonstration of the working class in Germany in connection with the Fascist parade in Berlin. On this occasion the leadership of the Com-

munist Party was indisputable. You probably also remember the Red ex-soldiers' day, and how they pledged themselves to defend the U.S.S.R. This Red ex-soldiers' day was an important historical event in Germany. You know, of course, that the ex-soldiers are under the sole guidance and control of our Communist Party.

The miners' strike in Central Germany was greatly influenced by our Party. Election results are a testimony to the growing political influence of our German section. It achieved much in connection with the tenth anniversary of the U.S.S.R. : despatch of delegations, mass demonstrations, etc.

A very curious situation has arisen in Italy. As I have already mentioned, our Italian Party, in spite of being an illegal Party, is the only oppositional revolutionary Party in the country. The social democratic organisations have been destroyed. Attempts were made to destroy the Italian Communist Party, but it succeeded in establishing its illegal apparatus, which struggles successfully with the powerful apparatus of the Mussolini régime. Moreover, you know that the reformist Confederation of Labour could not resist the attacks of the Fascists and their trade unions, and fell to pieces. Some of the leaders of this confederation fled abroad, others went over to the Fascists of their own accord, not one of them had the courage to defend even the most elementary trade union rights. The Communist Party is the only body which puts up a real fight for the re-establishment of free trade union organisations. It has achieved considerable success in this sphere. In spite of terrorist conditions, the Italian Communist Party has taken the lead in a number of strikes, which were characteristic of the state of affairs in Italy. It carried out a big campaign in some rural districts, and gained political influence in a good many of them.

The illegal Polish Communist Party has also increased its political influence by a whole series of political campaigns. Although White Terror is raging and a fierce campaign against the C.P. is carried on by the P.P.S. which, despite the fact that a considerable section of it is opposed to Pilsudski, is a component part of the

general Fascist apparatus. Although P.P.S. armed forces have on many occasions attacked members of the Communist Party under very difficult circumstances, the Communist Party has been able to bring the workers of some of the biggest Polish towns, including Warsaw, out into the streets. One must say that at very critical moments, for instance, in connection with the position of the Soviet Union, the Polish Party, which in this respect occupies a very dangerous and important position, showed itself to be a true Communist Party by carrying on mass demonstration work in spite of all difficulties. This was for instance the case at the time when Comrade Voikov was assassinated; the demonstration of the Polish workers in those days is still fresh in our memories. There was a typical case recently: a working man in sympathy with us was shot at while he was writing on the walls slogans in honour of the Soviet Union. Elections for insurance funds committees and to municipal councils showed that the political influence of our Polish section is growing. The Polish Party has been able to bring a section of the peasant movement under its influence. This is particularly the case in regard to the peasant movement of the national minorities.

If we turn our attention from the most important Communist Parties in Europe to the United States, we must say that in spite of extremely difficult conditions of struggle the Communist Party is at the head of a considerable movement, which sprang up in connection with the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti. In New York alone 200—300,000 workers were on strike. Street collections took place. The Communist Party was at the head of this movement. It fought on several fronts, liberals and anarchists being amongst its opponents. This also helped to increase its political influence. But it would be a mistake to over-estimate this influence.

Generally speaking, the political influence of the Communist Parties is an incontrovertible fact. There is also no doubt whatever that the numerical strength of the most important Communist Sections has increased lately, and that the political influence of the most important illegal Communist Parties has also increased. Just now

we are also justified in saying that we have considerable achievements to our account in regard to the internal consolidation of the Communist Parties, to the growing activity of their members, their growing experience in illegal work and struggle, and also in regard to the development of trade union work which is one of the most important tasks and a criterion of growing or dwindling experience. Another achievement is the growing influence of Communist Parties among broad sections of the working class. This is greatly due to the veering to the left of the masses, noticeable in Europe in connection with the development of internal differences caused by capitalist stabilisation. Such are the main achievements of the Communist International.

But comrades, I must also deal here quite openly with a number of questions which show up our shortcomings. I must deal here with defects of which the Communist International and our Party must be made fully aware, so as to be able to remedy them. This is the only way to guarantee their further success and consolidation.

I must first of all say a few words about the general shortcomings of the sections of the Communist International, which I consider to be as follows: Firstly, the still inadequate internationality of the Communist Parties. The strike in Great Britain, for instance, has shown us that a number of the biggest sections of the Communist International failed to respond with the necessary promptness and in an adequate way to the call for support of the general strike, and subsequently of the coal lock out in Great Britain, as we already pointed out in resolutions passed by the Communist International.

Secondly, Communist Parties are still not adepts at consolidating their political successes organisationally. This applies almost to all our Parties. Political campaigns are carried out brilliantly, for instance, the anti-war campaign in France or the campaign against the compensation of the ex-ruling houses in Germany. Time passes, political successes are not consolidated organisationally, and consequently results in increased membership are comparatively small. This is closely connected with the third shortcoming, namely, weak leadership in

the Communist Fractions within trade unions and also within other mass non-party and semi-party organisations. For a long time we have been insisting on the importance of trade union work. In spite of a certain amount of success, we must admit that much still remains to be done in this direction, that this task remains the most important task of the Communist movement, that this problem must occupy the attention of the Communist Parties more than ever before, and that we will not be able to get hold of the trade union apparatus, which is now controlled by the social democratic parties and the second international unless we show more organisational aptitude than before. Then we will witness a change all along the front and the growth of our Communist Parties will be guaranteed.

Finally, I am going to deal with a defect which is common to all our Communist Parties—weakness of their theoretical level. I will say quite openly that while in its first stage the Communist International was providing broad sections of the working class and its own Parties, which were then in the making, with a considerable amount of fresh ideological material, this is certainly not the case now, at least not to a sufficient extent. This is partly due to the fact that the series of crises which we witnessed in our Communist Parties since the time when the revolutionary wave subsided, affected first of all the intellectual upper stratum. We had, as you all know, a considerable percentage of intellectuals in our Communist Parties; at present our Parties—not only the rank and file, but all the leading cadres—consist, as far as their social composition is concerned, almost entirely of manual workers.

At the same time our Party, the C.P.S.U. (B.), and its leaders are over-burdened with general work and cannot give enough attention to the theoretical work. This does not mean that the theoretical level is lower than before. It is higher, but the situation now is much more complicated and much greater demands are made on the executive than before. Connected with this is another defect which must be pointed out—weakness of the Party Press, including even the central organs of the Communist Parties. Even in the newspaper with the biggest circulation (several hundred



thousands), the "Humanité," gross errors have frequently crept in.

With your permission, I will deal now briefly with the shortcomings of some of our Sections so as to make clear to you generally, the position of these Sections. I reiterate, I will take only the main shortcomings. When I analyse them, I do not want you to forget for a minute the big successes achieved recently by these Communist Parties.

I will deal first of all with the Czecho-Slovakian Party, one of the biggest sections of the Comintern. What are the shortcomings in the work of this Party? We must point out a certain passivity during the British strike and the rising of the Vienna proletariat and during the campaign in connection with the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti. There have also been mistakes and incorrect moves of a Right type; for instance, the draft law on factory and workshop committees elaborated by the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia contains paragraphs reminiscent of Social Democratic "economic democracy." Numerous errors of an opportunist character crept into the central organ of the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia "Rude Pravo." Only the timely intervention of the Comintern prevented our Czecho-Slovak Party committing during the presidential elections the mistake of setting Masaryk against Kramarcz, of making capital out of of the antagonism between the two, of almost voting for Masaryk.

A small Right wing was formed lately in Czecho-Slovakia with Hula and Skala (the latter was recently expelled from the Party) at the head, which together with the little group consisting of Michaletz and Neurath sympathises with our Trotskyite opposition.

By the way, speaking of Czecho-Slovakia, I must point out to you another phenomenon which is rather interesting from the point of view of our disputes with the opposition. There is in Czecho-Slovakia a Trotskyite, a certain Dr. Pollack, who published recently a pamphlet on the international situation. This pamphlet was quoted in the central organ of the Czecho-Slovak Party, "Rude Pravo," on November 25th. Dr. Pollack deals, among

other things, with one of the problems of our disputes, namely, the problem of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. He gives a truly brilliant illustration of Comrade Rakovsky's statement about war which the latter subsequently endeavoured (unsuccessfully) to disown. This Dr. Pollack, who, by the way, has been recently publishing all the documents of the opposition, demands of us war in support of British strikers. I will read you the exact text taken from this pamphlet:

"Let us assume that as a consequence of real support to the locked out and striking British workers, Soviet Russia becomes involved in an armed conflict with Great Britain and its followers . . . what would be the result of such a war? At best a very considerable extension of the Soviet Union, in the worst case . . . technical military (!) defeat in the proletarian-revolutionary offensive war, which would, however, mean, in the historic-dialectical sense, a magnificent victory of the proletariat, *i.e.*, magnificent progress of world revolution."

I have given this quotation to show that Comrade Rakovsky's well-known phrase about war was certainly not a chance statement. The pearls of international oppositional strategy can be seen by anyone. On the assumption that we are going under in the morass of "Thermidorian degeneration" the Opposition wishes to draw us into some armed conflict in order to utilise it for its own objects, dragging thereby the country out of the imaginary "Thermidorian morass," dispelling the "political twilight," etc., etc.

As to the substance of the nonsense written here, I think that it speaks, nay, shouts, for itself. To demand of us, at the present juncture, an offensive war, to speculate on our defeat, to call this defeat "technical-military" (as if "technical-military" defeat has no political aspects). And to add that the defeat of the U.S.S.R. means "a magnificent victory" of the proletariat—all this pre-supposes that the author has truly super-donkey ears. (Applause. Laughter.)

I will deal now with the errors and shortcomings of the French Party. In this connection I would like to point out that in certain circles of the French Party

there are still relics of a purely "parliamentary" orientation. Because of this the French Communist Party, which has been and is carrying on brilliant anti-militarist work, is committing at the same time a good many undoubtedly opportunist errors.

The Party did not react in time to the most important event in the political life of the country, when power was shifted from the left bloc to Poincaré, coming much too late with its slogans and the mobilisation of the masses. Errors were also committed in the application of united front tactics. The Party Executive recently made a very curious mistake in connection with repression. When the Government launched against the Communist Party a series of repressive measures, our Party comrades, including members of the Polit-Bureau, showed an inclination to be "loyal" to the laws of the bourgeois state, and almost went to prison on their own accord. True, they subsequently recognised and remedied this mistake, but the orientation itself is rather significant. We can say, on the whole, that this is a case of inadequate leadership in regard to the fighting mood and spirit of the working class. It frequently happens that the Party fails to make use of these moods at the right moment. Although the "Humanité" has a circulation of over 200,000, it is not a strong organ, its trade union work is weak. There are right tendencies in the Party, the representatives of which have leanings towards Souvarine, Rosmer and Monatte, and also ultra-left tendencies (Suzanne Girault, Treint and others), which have also leanings towards a bloc with elements outside the Party. To show you the character of these elements (of the Souvarine type) who are outside the Party, I will give you a couple of quotations from the "writings" of Souvarine in reference to our disputes. Speaking of the deception of the Party by the Opposition through the declaration of October 16th, Souvarine says:

"Since when is it customary to fulfil obligations made under duress? All civil and criminal codes throughout the world provide for cases of extortion of signatures and for punishment not of those who sign under duress but of the blackmailers."

Thus, according to Souvarine the Party is a blackmailer

and must be indicated in accordance with the criminal codes"; the Opposition, on the other hand, acted correctly by deceiving the Party, because it was, so to speak, acting with a revolver at its head and was being blackmailed by the Party. No less curious is the appreciation of our Party in general. Souvarine says: "The Party is not a Party, but a herd. The degeneration to which we already drew attention in 1924 is taking its course," etc. Comrades, you have here an appreciation on the part of this ultra-Right renegade who is making common cause with our would-be "Left" opposition.

A few words about the British Section. Like the French, the British Section is doing satisfactory anti-militarist work. Work among soldiers, sailors, and particularly among the forces sent to China, was carried out by the Communist Party to the best of its ability and as far as circumstances would permit. This work is decidedly revolutionary and extremely dangerous. But side by side with such splendid anti-militarist work, the Executive and individual members of the Party have committed decidedly opportunist errors. When, in its Manifesto, the A.R.T.U.C. blamed the General Council many British comrades thought that we were too hard on the General Council, they were not at all pleased with the Manifesto of the A.R.T.U.C. In connection with the discussion of the election tactics of the British Communist Party by the Comintern there was a certain amount of uneasiness within the Party; are these tactics correct, are not we veering too much to the Left, etc., etc.? We are here face to face with the paradoxical phenomenon when a Party which does excellent work on the most extreme fronts is at the same time committing serious errors of a Right character. Neither was the work of the representatives of the Party at the Trade Union Congress very satisfactory (policy not clear enough, inadequate criticism of the trade union upper stratum and the Labour Party, excessive "loyalty" to the trade union "upper stratum" and the Labour Party in general, and so on, and so forth). Such vacillations, which were lately coupled with an enormous pressure on the part of all the enemies of the Party and with a certain psychological depression in the ranks of the working class in

general, made their appearance also at the recent Party Congress. It is the task of the Comintern to put all this right and to ensure greater steadfastness of the political lines on which the Party is working.

As to the German Communist Party, its main weakness is, that in spite of a series of very considerable achievements it has not sufficiently permeated the masses. Consolidation is certainly the key-note of the internal life of the German Communist Party. The so-called Right group has now much less influence than before. It is characteristic that at the recent conference of Communist trade union workers one voice only was raised in favour of a less severe policy in regard to the Social Democrats, particularly in the trade unions. There was no response to this and all the other comrades at this conference would have nothing to do with it. Other proposals—the slogan “Control over production,” etc.—indicative of a Right tendency fail also to receive support in the ranks of the German Communist Party. On the contrary, they are energetically opposed. As to the so-called ultra-Left Opposition, that section of it which is no longer in the ranks of our German Party constitutes the embryo of a new Party which is a branch of the Trotskyist Opposition in the U.S.S.R. I am not going to dwell on this question because quotations from Korsch, Katz, Maslow, Ruth Fischer, and others, as an illustration of it, were poured out on us from the horn of plenty during the recent discussion. I will just give you one quotation from the last number of Maslow's organ, which is at the same time the central organ of “our” Trotskyite Opposition. I will give you this quotation not in connection with the famous “degeneration,” “Bonapartism,” etc., because all of you know perfectly well that one can find this kind of counter-revolutionary stuff in any number of this Trotskyite organ. I said at one of the regular Plenums of the Central Committee that the Maslow-Trotsky organ did not even scruple to denounce an illegal worker of the Comintern. Although Zinoviev put up the queer defence that not a hair on this comrade's head was hurt, I must say that this was not due to Comrade Zinoviev—it might have been hurt. The last number of this organ of the Opposition contains an appreciation of the foreign policy of the Soviet

Union. Under the leadership of Vladimir Ilyitch we made several times proposals *re* general disarmament, etc. Everyone knows that in regard to this question we are not inventing anything new, but are continuing the policy of our Party under Lenin's leadership. Would you like to hear what Messrs. Maslow, Trotsky and Co. are writing about Litvinov's Geneva statement? Here it is:—

“This farce has nothing in common with Marxism. The stupid talk that by such means one can “expose” the imperialists is, during the period of feverish armaments, not only stupid, but downright treacherous.” (“Fahne des Kommunismus,” No. 38, 1927.)

This is the central organ of the Trotskyites about Litvinov's Geneva statement. Is this stupidity? Certainly not. It is something much more than stupidity. It is the other side of the tactic which was propagated in regard to the war question by Rakovsky in Moscow and by Dr. Pollack in “golden” Prague. This is connected with the “clever” strategy of these would-be generals who have already landed themselves in a blind alley, but who are ready to run their heads against the stone walls of our Party provided they get an opportunity to drive our entire proletarian country into a blind alley by securing for it a “military technical” defeat which, translated into Opposition language, is supposed to mean “magnificent victory.” (Laughter.) This is the Opposition platform which is to lure the working class.

I am not going to dwell on the Chinese Communist Party, because I have already dealt with this question, and also because it is sufficiently known to the comrades from our literature. It played a considerable rôle during the entire pre-discussion and discussion period.

I must say a few words about the Japanese and Polish Communist Parties. In Japan, the Party is very small, although the objective situation in Japan provides a basis for work and the establishment of a genuine mass Communist Party in spite of fierce police persecution let loose by the Government against Communists. From the example of this Party, which works in exceptional conditions, one can see how difficult it is for “newly fledged” Communists to deal with problems of the present day

movement; one can also see here the transformation of ideological products imported from the West into a very peculiar theory, and a theory which impedes the movement. Such a theory is, for instance, that of Comrade K., who was for a time at the head of the Party. This theory is approximately as follows: According to Hegel, one should adhere to the point of view of a self-developing subject; this is the proletariat; but its development has inevitably ups and downs, which means that it must split and unite. Therefore, we must set ourselves the task to be continually splitting and then uniting. (Laughter.) On the other hand, Lenin is supposed to have said in his book "What is to be done?" that the working class itself cannot elaborate a Socialist ideology, that in the first stages of development it receives this ideology from the intelligentsia, and that it is essential to organise professional revolutionists, *i.e.*, revolutionary intellectuals. Therefore, one must form in Japan an intellectual-Marxist group, and not go now (when there is already a mass movement in Japan!!!) to the masses. Thus, Comrade K. (He has already given up these "views" and their propagation) built up on the basis of "Hegel" and "Lenin," a sectarian doctrine which for a long time hampered the development of the Party.

On the other hand, the Labour cadre of the Communist Party of Japan felt instinctively that this theoretical abracadabra did not in the least meet the real requirements of a mass movement. Therefore the labour section of the Party instinctively protested. But, crushed by the weight of "self-developing subjects" and such like things it was unable to formulate its own "theory." Other groups again went to the other extreme, and almost deduced from the slogan "Nearer to the masses!" the liquidation of the Communist Party as an independent party of the Japanese proletariat.

The Comintern helped the Japanese comrades to overcome these ideological and political abnormalities and to adopt a correct policy. If it is possible to put it into practice, one can expect the movement to be successful, for there are in Japan all the pre-requisites of agrarian as well as proletarian revolution. The masses are already on

the move; mass workers' and peasant organisations are springing up which pave the way for the transformation of the Japanese Communist Party into a mass revolutionary party of the proletariat.

It cost us considerable efforts in the Communist International to overcome internal frictions in the Polish Communist Party. Comrades, you probably remember that the Polish Communist Party as a whole, all its groups and fractions, during the Pilsudsky coup d'état made a big and very dangerous opportunist error which landed them in the Pilsudsky camp, not because they wanted it, but because they could not turn against Pilsudsky when this was necessary.

I will not take up your time telling you of all the theoretical conceptions which arose in connection with the discussion on this question. Generally speaking, this error has been remedied as far as the rank and file and also the Party leaders are concerned. The executive of the Communist International had to make many efforts to restore peace within the Polish Communist Party and to induce it to concentrate attention on the solution of fundamental tasks worthy of a Party occupying one of the most responsible posts one can imagine. The last Party Congress did a great deal towards fixing the policy of the Party, and, in spite of the resistance of the "right" and "left" fractions of the Polish Party, a limit to the divergences which existed and still partly exist within it.

One may, however, hope that this internal struggle in the Polish Communist Party will gradually subside, particularly because of important coming events and because of the truly colossal tasks which confront the Polish Communist Party.

To sum up the general results of the work, we can say that the political influence of the Comintern and of some of its sections has grown, and that the most important European sections of the Comintern have become consolidated ideologically. As to the prospects of the further development of the Communist Parties, we can safely say that an objective base for the further growth of our Communist Parties exists. In Europe this base consists in the turning to the left of the working class and



in the growing acuteness of the class struggle, which is self-evident. In the East, too, there is a base for our further development. This is first and foremost the development and intensification of the great Chinese revolution, the development and growing acuteness of class differences and the struggle against British imperialism in India, the development of the revolutionary movement in other colonial and semi-colonial countries. We can also say that the base for the development of the Communist Parties and the increase of our political influence is becoming broader, because the question of defence of the Soviet Union is looming big just now. Therefore, the well-known thesis of the Trotskyite Opposition about the labour movement "taking a back seat" is as contrary to facts as its "twilight" thesis in regard to the U.S.S.R. Having been beaten and crushed by our Party and rejected by the mass of Soviet workers, the leaders of the opposition turned westwards—they rally there all the elements who go against a correct Leninist attitude; they are now carrying on a fiercer campaign against the U.S.S.R., the C.P.S.U., and against the leadership of the Comintern than the social democrats. Nothing is too base to be taken up in the opposition Press against our Party and the Comintern by the emissaries of belligerent Trotskyism, who readily form a bloc with any "stranger" and any adventurer who happens to be on the anti-Bolshevik path. The Trotskyite "Party" is undoubtedly manufacturing another "International" (I have lost count of all these internationals) for which Zinoviev has already written his 21 conditions, "arranging" à la Trotsky the conditions elaborated by Lenin. The Trotskyite-"party" is picking up elements which have more to do with Buddhism or the holy See of Rome than with Leninism. Not so long ago Henrietta Roland-Holst left the Dutch Communist Party because of our struggle with the opposition; she wrote recently "to Russian fellow-fighters," imploring them to give "full freedom" to our Opposition to defend all its views on the plea that the most important thing in the world is the "struggle for truth." She follows this up with the following remarkable argument:

" For Communists truth is justice and humaneness, and no Marx, Lenin, Christ or any God can reveal them to us. They dwell in the equilibrium of human passions and human ideals." (Laughter.)

This from the pen of one of the most honest followers of Trotskyism! To place on a par Marx, Christ, God, Lenin; to seek "Communist truth" not in Marxist analysis of social development, but in the "equilibrium of human passions," and to defend in this manner Trotskyism—isn't that delightful? Isn't it just something for the platform of "Bolshevik-Leninists"? Maybe Dr. Pollack has ferreted out his tactic of offensive war from the "equilibrium" of human passions,

The same Roland-Holst together with her companion Mannuri wrote:

" We greet you in the name of the dead, we love you in the name of the living, and we call you in the name of the unborn." (Laughter.)

This sickly sentimental phraseology, which is organically alien to the spirit of Marxism, is remarkably reminiscent of the old-German "true socialism" which Marx and Engels called old-woman ideology. However, this sentimental rigmarole is not so innocent after all. The same Mannuri wrote a declaration on July 18th, 1927, with the sanction of the C.C. of the Dutch Party, which was read at the Party Conference. In this declaration he says:

" 1. It seems to me that the shootings which have taken place in Moscow as a result of the assassination of Comrade Voikov, whom we all mourn, transgress the limit which separates human society's right to existence from an individual's right to existence. 2. I fully recognise the justice and necessity of terrorism in defence of the bulwark which has been erected by the Russian comrades for the protection of Communism. But I must add that those who are tempted to make people, who had nothing to do with it, responsible for a crime which has been committed are thereby allowing themselves to be carried away by feelings of revenge utterly alien to Communism, and are thus doing harm to the fundamentals which they are supposed to defend. 3. On the strength of this con-

viction I deem it necessary to say a few warning words to our comrades in the G.P.U.: 'The truth of Communism is its humaneness and justice.' 4. I fully realise the consequences of this act, but I think that even in the heat of battle we must not forget the ideals for which we are fighting."

Here you have practical-political "deductions." Another step—and we will find ourselves among 'barbarians,' enemies of "truth," "justice," and "humaneness."

It will be as well to bear in mind that Roland Holst proposed at the same time (evidently also for considerations of the "equilibrium of passion") to amalgamate with the 2nd International. We get a remarkable picture: Maslow and Co. charge the C.P.S.U. and C.I. with degeneration, Bonapartism, peace proposals, and treachery. Pollack demands of us immediate offensive war. Souvarine champions "freedom of opinion" and freedom of lies and slander. Roland Holst and Mannuri accuse us of infringing all rules of justice and humaneness, and demand our amalgamation with the 2nd International. Trotsky and Co. are slandering us, saying that we intend to carry out the wish of a most Christian Dutch lady. And all this is going on under the cloak of Trotskyism. A farcical "organisation," a strange "Fourth Trotskyite International," I must say! Nevertheless, one must admit that these heterogeneous elements are playing an extremely harmful role.

This is evident, for instance, in the article "The Platform of the Opposition," published in "Vorwärts." This is what the organ of Noske-Scheidemann and Co. has to say about this platform:

"The platform of the Russian Opposition issued by the publishing house of 'The Banner of Communism,' is a startling document because of the facts it gives about the situation in Russia. When one reads the paragraphs dealing with the position of agricultural labourers one fancies oneself reading about conditions unworthy of a human being, conditions which prevailed in the times of fierce capitalist development as described in the British

Blue Books of the middle of the last century and in Marx's works."

A "startling" document, "exposing," according to the "Vorwärts," the entire Soviet Union, which in regard to the exploitation of the working class had outstripped even the abominable British regime of the 19th century! Comrades, you can now understand how the Opposition is defending the country of Proletarian Dictatorship. The Opposition has become the chief source of the most objectionable slander against the U.S.S.R. and the Party. It has become the world's chief purveyor of slanders "ordered" by the Social Democrats, becoming thereby also the purveyor of the masters of the latter.

As to the international connections of the Opposition, they have been established with a whole series of groupings which have never belonged to the Communist International.

There are, for instance, the Dutch grouping "Nas," the semi-anarchist elements among the Italian emigré, etc. All the elements who can do us harm are rallying around the Opposition, and I declare, with a full sense of responsibility, that in regard to the defence of the U.S.S.R. the greatest harm has been done by "our" Opposition. Comrades, it is more than a joke if former leaders of the Communist Party begin to copy their lies from the Mensheviks. ("Sozialistichesky Vestnik," No. 23, declares: "A true and exact picture does not lose anything by the fact that it literally repeats the 'Sozialistichesky Vestnik.'" Things have come to a nice pass!) It must be pointed out that, for instance, members of the Congress of Friends of the Soviet Union, even non-Party elements, told us that there is no more harmful anti-Soviet force than the "revelations," "sensations," etc., spread by the Opposition. The Party Congress was absolutely right when it said that such a "defence" of the U.S.S.R. is incompatible with adherence to the Party. (Hear, hear.)

#### **X. THE COMINTERN AND ITS APPARATUS.**

I will deal now with the question of the Comintern apparatus and with some of our organisational tasks.

In connection with the report of the delegation of the

Comintern Executive a resolution was passed at the last Party Congress by which we made it obligatory for the delegation of the C.P.S.U. (B) in the E.C.C.I. to secure collective leadership in the Communist International and to draw representatives of foreign Communist Parties into direct control over the Communist International to a greater extent than has been hitherto the case.

Has this resolution of the Party Congress been carried out? Comrades, I will say quite openly that this resolution of the Party Congress has not been fully carried out. This is to the detriment of the leadership and apparatus of the Comintern. We have not succeeded in making arrangements for full and permanent representation on the part of the Communist Parties. Our foreign comrades are compelled to go back to their countries to look after their own internal affairs. Control by the Communist Parties is still very inadequate. There is one task which we must solve at any cost—securing the permanent presence here of a sufficiently broad nucleus with full responsibility and authority to decide important and political questions.

We must secure permanent representation here of the most important Communist Parties, we must have here in Moscow a strongly welded-together leading nucleus. On the other hand, I consider it my duty to say that our Party must provide a sufficient force for the support of the Comintern apparatus. ("Hear! hear!")

I emphatically declare that this applies also to the R.I.L.U. I began my report with our defects and shortcomings. I dealt with them openly, but I assure you that whatever resolutions we pass (on the necessity to strengthen the work of the R.I.L.U. to secure more united and co-ordinated actions of the R.I.L.U. and the A.R.T.U.C., to secure more energetic A.R.T.U.C. work within the R.I.L.U., and to give an impetus to the work which the A.R.T.U.C. is carrying on in West European and other countries) they will remain more or less pious resolutions unless we strengthen our apparatus organisationally, for if this does not happen it will not be possible to carry out our directions in spite of the correctness of the policy of the Communist International. We frequently do not react quickly enough to some very important events.

Then there is also the fact that the representatives of our Party were lately over-burdened with internal work to a greater extent than ever before. There is nothing to guarantee that we shall be able to give more time in future to Comintern affairs, for the situation is very complicated, and one cannot be active on all the fronts. That is why I think it essential to insist that representatives of the most important Communist Parties should be here permanently. At the same time I ask the Party Congress to consider favourably the very modest demand for additional forces. The same applies to the R.I.L.U. It cannot be asked to develop its work if no help is given with the consolidation of its organisational apparatus. Above all, we must turn our attention to the problem of the leading cadres of the Comintern. Something is being done in this direction. We have an International Lenin-school where people are being trained, but as I have already said, everything is not as it should be in regard to the formation of leading cadres and the selection of suitable people. This question must receive our immediate attention, particularly as part of our forces are drawn into West Europe. (We had a resolution on the organisation of a West European Secretariat of the Comintern). Then I have also to draw your attention to another question which will make great demands on our Party. I mean, we must prepare for the next International Congress of the Comintern, which makes on us bigger demands than any other congress: Firstly, we will place before it for the first time in a very concrete form the colonial question which, needless to say, is a question of paramount importance; we will sum up the very important question of the Chinese revolution; we will deal with the new phenomenon—the veering to the Left of the entire West-European movement; we will have to consider the growing acuteness of the war danger which makes it incumbent on the Communist International to study once more all the questions connected with it. Last, but not least, we must appear at this Congress with a complete plan for the programme of the Comintern. This again raises the question of the remodelling of our Party programme. We cannot postpone for the third time adoption of the programme.

Social democratic parties elaborated at their recent congresses new programmes, and we must set against them our own fighting programme—the programme of the Comintern. This will require additional efforts. We must properly prepare and carry out the next Congress of the Comintern which we are convening for May, 1928.

This is how matters stand in regard to some of our organisational problems.

### CONCLUSION.

I will now conclude.

If we consider now the general deductions which we can make from my report, we cannot help saying that we are entering upon a stage of international development favourable to the Comintern. In West Europe we witness the development of differences in capitalist stabilisation, and in connection with it a decisive veering to the left on the part of big sections of the working class. We notice that internal economic stabilisation differences are reflected first and foremost in the growing acuteness of social-class differences, that the working class, which has somewhat recovered from the defeats suffered in the past, is beginning to weld together its ranks, to raise its banner aloft, to veer to the Left, to revolutionise itself and to turn its attention once more to the problems of class struggle, paving thereby the way for mass work by the Communist Parties. We are entering now, not upon a phase of pacification, but upon a phase of more acute colonial struggle, because the great Chinese revolution is not dead, it lives and develops, because by its example it inspires the Indian revolution, which is now passing through the stage of ferment, but will inevitably come out into the great historical arena of struggle against imperialism. We notice that European capitalism is endeavouring to corrupt the working class by new methods, that it is forming blocs with the social democrats; but we see at the same time that European capitalism has no proper base for these methods, and that in spite of temporary booms it is on the eve of new colossal differences which are more and more accompanied by acute class struggle. Comrades, we also see that in spite of pacifist illusions idylls and decep-

tion on the part of social democrats, conflicts of an enormous and monstrous magnitude are brewing within capitalist society. Let social democratic philistines and petty bourgeois elements seek consolation in illusions concerning "peaceful existence" and another peaceful epoch of the capitalist order which will presumably deliver mankind from wars, Sane Marxist analysis shows up relentlessly the character of our epoch: the capitalist régime is inevitably leading mankind towards gigantic catastrophes which by their magnitude will exceed the world war, 1914-18. At the same time this Marxist analysis shows us how within capitalist society itself forces of resistance to the destructive catastrophes of the imperialist period are gradually ripening. The future has in store for us not quiet and rest, but fierce struggle. However, Communist workers are no longer entering into this struggle in the person of individual Liebknichts. They are entering into the struggle as an organised force which has brought forward its Communist vanguard which enters in all consciousness upon the new stage of conflicts in the history of mankind. Even if we cannot guarantee that at the first shot directed against the Soviet Union the working class as a whole will rise, we are convinced that this first shot will bring to its feet, will mobilise what is best in the labour movement, and may be through agonising struggle and through various stages of doubt and vacillations, we will in the end rouse such an enormous revolutionary wave that it will wash away capitalist barbarism. (Loud and prolonged applause. Comrade Bukharin receives an ovation. All rise and cheer.)



## DISCUSSION ON COMRADE BUKHARIN'S REPORT

### COMRADE LOZOVSKY'S SPEECH.

Comrades, assuming that the premise of Comrade Bukharin's report concerning the transference of economic centres is correct (and undoubtedly it is correct) then simultaneously there also occurs—this can be proved by experience—a transference of the centres of the labour movement. Together with the loss of the industrial and financial leadership of Europe, the European or West European labour movement loses the leadership of the world labour movement, which is transferred to and concentrated in two points: On the one hand, the Soviet point, in so far as it is a question of the revolutionary wing of the labour movement, and on the other hand, the American point in so far as it is a question of consistent and absolute reformism.

At the sametime as this transference of the ideological political centres and the peculiar evolution of the European Social Democratic labour movement, there is still another very highly important phenomenon, which is playing and will yet play a tremendous part in our future struggle. During the last few years a gigantic labour movement has developed and become organised on the Pacific, as a result of the industrialisation of the Pacific countries. This new labour movement is subject primarily to the influence of Moscow. But attempts have been made by the Amsterdam International (so far with slight success) and also by some leaders of the American Labour Movement to influence this labour movement.

The present period is characterised by a tremendous growth of the labour movement on the Pacific. If we examine China, Japan, India, the Philippines, Java, and Australia, we shall find that a powerful labour movement

has already become crystalised. The leadership of this labour movement is beyond a doubt not in the hands of European-American reformism, not in the hands of the Amsterdam International, but in the hands of the Red International of Labour Unions.

Together with the growing financial economic power of the United States attempts are being made by the American bourgeoisie to convert the Pacific Ocean into an American lake. The 14th and 18th centuries mark the period of the Mediterranean Sea. The 19th century was the period of the Atlantic Ocean, the 20th century is the age of the Pacific Ocean. The United States aim at the subjugation of the whole Pan-Pacific coast both ideologically and by war. It is interesting to note that, with the help of the United States and under the patronage of Coolidge and others, several special Pacific organisations have been organised during the past few years, such as, for instance, the Pacific Union in Honolulu, the Institute of Pacific Relations and others. Attempts are being made through that institute to unite all the countries on the Pacific and to subordinate them ideologically. Special scientific, political and even women's conferences are being convened to bring about an ideological and political Americanisation of all countries on the Pacific and to prepare them for the coming battles on the Pacific.

On the other hand, the bourgeoisie of Japan is trying to organise Asia against Europe. Only recently, in July and November of this year, two Pan-Asiatic Conferences were held; one in Shanghai, which considered rather extensive plans for the organisation of a Pan-Asiatic bloc, a Pan-Asiatic railway, Pan-Asiatic reconstruction societies, and so on. The underlying idea was to set up Asia against Europe, to set up Asia against America. Both the United States and Japan have made it their task to subordinate the Pacific coasts to their influence, with a view to using them in the coming wars.

And now, in connection with this peculiar situation, with the growing and accentuating conflicts on the Pacific, the growing labour movement in the Pacific countries, assume special importance.

You know from the Press, that the whole labour move-

ment of China is under the influence of Communists, that the whole labour movement of China which, despite illegality, comprises about 3,000,000 workers, is in its entirety a part of the Profintern.

The attempts to organise yellow unions, headed by generals and ex-generals, only increased the acuteness of the struggle, the Reds treating the Yellows ruthlessly. The Yellow unions, similar to the Italian Fascist Unions, play a very unimportant role in the labour movement of China. The basic mass—99 per cent. of the Chinese proletariat, both industrial and handicraft—are under the ideological leadership of militant illegal Chinese trade unions affiliated to the Profintern.

It is of the greatest importance also to take note of the growing labour movement in Japan. There, the Party being very small and weak, but ideologically consistent to a high degree, we now have a labour movement which is in search of new forms so as to counteract in an organised manner the still fairly strong capitalist order of Japan. There is a vast proletariat in Japan (five million industrial workers alone), but the labour movement is very poorly organised. There are altogether 300,000 organised workers in various unions; the most energetic and most militant section of this organised Japanese labour movement being amalgamated in the Unity League (100,000 members) which is fully linked up with the revolutionary wing of the international labour movement through the Pacific Trade Union Secretariat.

Thanks to the revival of the labour movement on the Pacific coasts, there is a powerful development of the trade unions. Although in some countries—Japan and India—the Communist Parties are very small, the mass movement is fairly big. This fact served as an incentive for the convocation of a Pacific Trade Union Conference (which took place June 1925-1927 in Hankow) and the creation of a Pacific Trade Union Secretariat. After the conference the whole organised labour movement of the Philippines (about 70,000 workers) and the entire trade union movement of Australia (about 500,000 organised workers) affiliated to the Secretariat. The Pacific Secretariat is thus a means of drawing into the struggle of the revolutionary labour move-

ment as represented by the Profintern, those proletarian detachments not connected with the labour movement in general.

The contradictions that we witness in Japan, namely, a small Party and a big revolutionary movement not yet definite in form and in the processes of crystallisation, is being solved by the fact that the most active section of the Japanese proletariat has already been drawn into the international labour movement, and is subject to the ideological political influence of the Pacific Secretariat of the R.I.L.U. It is interesting to note here the methods by which the reformists are trying to dominate the labour movement of the Pacific countries. The Japanese reformist, Bundji Suzuki, advanced the idea of creating an Asiatic trade union international. The Geneva International Labour Office decided to send Albert Thomas to the Far East to influence the trade unions. Bundji Suzuki's plan failed, as has also the Albert Thomas plan. The British reformists are very closely occupied with India. About two years ago the Labour Party and the General Council sent to India Social-Imperialist enthusiasts, but all of them failed. Now, the "Lefts" are doing their best in India. The famous phrasemonger Purcell, the Left miner M.P., M. Jones, and Fenner Brockway, the leader of the Independent Labour Party, have gone to India. All these "Lefts" went there on a purely imperialist mission, namely, to keep the masses of the Indian people, who are fighting for freedom, in the clutches of the Empire. These "Lefts" will hardly have more success than their Right friends.

Thus, if we examine the labour movement of the Pacific Coasts, we shall find that a systematic growth of the influence of revolutionary ideas—a systematic growth of Profintern influence is taking place. In this respect the Profintern generally differs from the Amsterdam International, which primarily is an organisation of European workers, and only a part of the Eutopean workers at that. Two or three years ago we could say, in comparing the Amsterdam International with the Profintern, that the former was numerically stronger than the latter, but now this can no longer be asserted. The trade union move-

ment of the U.S.S.R., China, Indonesia, a part of the Japanese trade union movement, the trade unions which are affiliated to us in Chili and Columbia, plus the organisations which we have in the centre of Europe—France and Czecho-Slovakia have already a larger membership than Amsterdam, and this is without including those minorities which we have within the Amsterdam International which total about three million members. Thus, the correlation of forces between Amsterdam and the Profintern is now already in favour of the latter, which is not only a European organisation, but an organisation extending far beyond the borders of Europe, an organisation with a firm footing in the most important countries of Asia and in several South American countries.

In describing the present situation, primarily of European and American capitalism, Comrade Bukharin called attention in his report to the fact that a period of State capitalism is now setting in, accompanied by the growing strength of syndicates and of private monopoly organisations. This phenomenon he joined under one heading—State capitalism. I think that from a terminological point of view this is not quite correct. Is there a difference between private monopoly organisations and State capitalism? Hitherto, such a difference existed. What is happening? The trusts and combines, private monopoly organisations, lead the bourgeois states. This is true, it is also true that this leadership has strengthened. If we may express it so these concerns and trusts are being "statisfied," and the State apparatus is to a certain extent being trustified. (Bukharin: I think I mentioned that.) But can this be called State capitalism? It seems to me that it cannot. It seems to me that, from such terminology, there may follow a certain theoretical and subsequently political confusion.

Neither do I agree with Comrade Bukharin about the contention that the slogan of Nationalisation has now become out of date and that we cannot champion it. Let us take Great Britain. There the struggle between the labour party and our Party has been carried on all these years around the mining industry along the following lines. The labour party says: Nationalisation of the

mines with compensation. Whereas the Communist Party says: Nationalisation of the mines without compensation. I ask Comrade Bukharin what is there opportunist in the slogan "Nationalisation without compensation"? Can we, after six years of struggle, renounce this slogan in Great Britain? What has changed in Great Britain? Was there a revolutionary situation there before which does not exist now? To put the question in this way would be wrong, we would only confuse our Parties. It is another matter when we speak of workers' control. Workers' control—that is a pre-revolutionary slogan. It can be advanced only when there is a rising revolutionary wave.

To advance the slogan of workers' control as a practical immediate slogan at the present time, let us say in Germany, would be a mistake, because there we have no direct rise of a revolutionary wave. This slogan will become again absolutely indispensable when another general revolutionary wave sets in.

So far as the question of the nationalisation slogan is concerned, it seems to me that to abandon the slogan of nationalisation without compensation would be wrong. It is a splendid counter-slogan to that of social democracy, it is a splendid slogan in the matter of exposing all those tricks which the social democratic and reformist trade unions are playing with their economic councils in Germany and France, the rights of which are supposed to be extending now both in Germany and France and about which the International Company Union, known as the Amsterdam International, is making a lot of noise.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### COMRADE SHATZKIN'S SPEECH.

Comrade Lozovsky pointed out correctly that the growing trusts and their growing influence on the State does not yet mean a strengthening of the tendencies of State capitalism. I also think that Comrade Bukharin is not altogether right about this question, which is of tremendous importance in an evaluation of the present international situation.

Comrade Bukharin himself said in his theoretical

works, particularly in his book "Imperialism and World Economy," that State capitalism is a new form of capitalism. Of course, it is not a question of the peculiar form of State capitalism which now exists in the U.S.S.R., but, so to speak, the "classical" State capitalism which exists in bourgeois countries.

What did we understand hitherto by the term "State capitalism"? I will read a definition given by Comrade Bukharin in the book I have mentioned. He said:

"The requirements of war and imperialist preparedness for war drive the bourgeoisie to a new form of capitalism, to the statification of production and distribution, to the complete abolition of the old bourgeois individualism. Of course, not all these measures by a long way will remain in force after the war. Such measures, for instance, as the rationing of the consumption of bread and meat, the prohibition of manufacture of various products, the prohibition of exports, etc., will disappear on the conclusion of peace. But undoubtedly the tendency of the State to get possession of industry will increase continuously." (P. 154. Russ. Ed.)

Thus, Comrade Bukharin and all of us hitherto understood by State capitalism interference of the State in economic life, its direct influence on production and distribution by a direct transformation of various enterprises into State property or by being placed at the disposal of the State, or by establishing various forms of State control.

If we approach the question as to whether there are State capitalist tendencies at the present-time from this point of view, we must say that on an international scale this thesis is wrong. It applies only to some countries.

In France, the big bourgeoisie carried on a feverish campaign for the abolition of the State monopoly. There exists in that country a monopoly in the telephone, tobacco, matches, etc. The Left bourgeois—the radicals and socialists—defend this monopoly. The monopoly on matches no longer exists in France since the Swedish Match Trust has been allowed to do business in the country.

The conclusion is that, in some countries, state

capitalism is becoming stronger, whereas in other countries there is a process of liquidation of the remnants of state capitalism which have been retained. Hence, we cannot speak of stronger tendencies of state capitalism on an international scale.

Another question with which I want to deal is the question of the situation of the Comintern, and in this case I will take the advice of Comrade Ordjonikidze concerning self-criticism

If we consider the question of the situation in the Comintern in the sense of where the greatest danger for the Comintern lies, the answer will be that the main danger is that of the Trotskyist Opposition and its international alliance, which actually exists, and constitutes something between a 3½ and a 4th International. Is that a Right or a Left danger? It is a mixture of ultra-Lefts and ultra-Rights, and all of them essentially constitute a Right danger. This is the main danger, not because the Opposition is influential among the masses in the West, but because it stands for the Social Democratic position in its attitude to the Soviet Union and in its attitude to the proletarian dictatorship. It is even more harmful than the Social Democratic attitude, because open Menshevism is a lesser danger than Menshevism concealed under a Communist banner.

But the question of the international situation in the Comintern is not exhausted by the Opposition question. Neither does this exhaust the dangers for the Comintern sections. The Opposition we shall liquidate, but the Comintern will remain and our Communist Parties will remain, and we shall have to observe carefully the processes taking place in those Communist Parties.

If we speak about our Communist International, about that giant standing on a Leninist position, what tendencies do we find there during the last two years? Which is the greatest danger in this respect? I think that the Rights constitute the greater danger. Compared with the 5th congress of the Communist International, this danger has perhaps become less, but compared with the period of the 14th Congress of the C.P.S.U. it has become greater. This does not mean that we have had no successful bolshe-



visation. It does not mean that we have had no colossal achievements in our Communist Parties. We have had them, but at the same time there are certain shortcomings, and the main shortcoming is the growth of Right deviations.

Let us begin with the British Party, which is one of the main parties of the Communist International. Comrade Bukharin said here that the Central Committee of the British Party was opposed to the manifesto of the A.R.T.U.C. in connection with the general strike. He even mentioned certain "individual vacillations," as he called them, in connection with the change of tactics in relation to a Labour Government and the Labour party. We had, in the British party, a group, true, a minority, which disclosed a clearly pacifist attitude on the question of work among the forces, regarding this work as unnecessary. We saw a negative attitude on the part of the minority of the C.C. to the slogan of a general strike against the anti-Trade Union Law.

Let us take the French party. Comrade Bukharin spoke also in this connection of certain mistakes, but he did not mention that of the greatest importance. There is now a discussion going on in the French party on various questions, the most important of which is the question of election tactics. Properly speaking, this is not merely a question of elections, but a question of the attitude of the Communist Party to the petty and middle bourgeoisie. It should be mentioned that there is a considerably strong group (not the majority) in the C.C. of the French party of fairly prominent leaders, opposed to the point of view of the majority, who insist on supporting the Radicals all along the line during the elections, who want to support the Left bloc, and which is permeated with parliamentary cretinism. Moreover, there are comrades in the C.C. of the French party, who voted for the open letter on the elections, who vacillate on this question. The exception made on the question of a certain agreement with the radicals which the Comintern admits, they try to develop into a general line for the French party. This is especially dangerous for the French party with its parliamentary traditions.

Comrade Bukharin did not mention the Austrian party, which has become very important since the July rising. What was the attitude of the Austrian party to the rising itself? At one time it did not even recognise that it was a rising—(not the whole party as such, but a considerable section of the C.C.).

The Communist Party of Bulgaria got a brilliant idea during the last elections, and helped to elect, with Communist votes, the Bulgarian Social Democrats, who are known as the most despicable members of the 2nd International, and thus created a fairly big Menshevik fraction. And, what is more, so far as I know, it has not as yet recognised its mistake, despite the criticism of the Comintern.

The Communist Party of Poland unanimously recognised at its last congress that for them the Right danger still continues to be the main danger.

The same is true of the Communist Party of China. The Central Committee has partly purged itself of its opportunist elements, but there are still many of them among the party leaders.

Reference is usually made to Germany on the ground that there the ultra-Lefts are the greatest danger. Of course, the Opposition is the greatest danger there as it is in all other countries. In 1925 the Rights, who were beaten after the defeat of 1923, did not dare to show their noses in Germany, but since the last Party Congress at Essen we have a definitely formed Right group, which not only advances the slogan of workers' control, but demands a revision of our attitude to the Left Social Democrats, on the ground that we cannot consider them our chief enemy, and that we must take into consideration that subjectively they are revolutionaries, etc., etc. As soon as the ultra-Left danger in Germany is liquidated, this Right group will inevitably start an offensive against its C.C.

What must our conclusions be? The main danger at the present time is the Opposition. But the Right danger in the ranks of our followers is very great. It is not a chance phenomenon in one country, it exists in several countries. We must take cognizance of this fact and intensify our struggle against it.

The Opposition lies in accusing the Comintern of having relinquished the fight against Right deviations. The Comintern criticised concretely in every given case all these Right deviations which I mentioned. Sometimes it criticised very sharply and endeavoured to rectify the blunders. It is not a question as to whether the Comintern criticises, it is a question of intensifying the struggle against the Right danger and of carrying it on internationally, not only in country after country, not only from time to time, but as an international policy.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### COMRADE LOMINADZE'S SPEECH.

Comrades, the first question is that of the Right danger in the Comintern. I agree with Comrade Shatzkin's formulation of the question, and I think that to criticise him will be fruitless. The ultra-Left tendencies in the Communist International, as well as our Opposition, represent a new form of Menshevism which differs little from the old. But we must not confuse the ultra-Left with the Right deviation. These two tendencies represent two sides of one phenomenon, with the exception that the "ultra-Lefts" enter the struggle employing Left phrases. We always differentiated the open Right Menshevik deviation from the open Left. Some comrades are of the opinion that these two extremes are now merging in the European Communist movement, merging into an open and tacit opportunism of Right and ultra-Left tendencies. (Varga-Lozovsky: "That is what it is!") This is true to a certain extent, but it would be wrong to assert that in general. We have a number of Right groups which the Comintern is fighting. These groups to a considerable extent do not merge with the ultra-lefts, and there is reason to maintain that they will be overcome within the Communist movement, and that the struggle against them will not assume such acute forms as the struggle against the ultra-lefts. But, at any rate, it must be admitted that if we are to eliminate, as Comrade Bukharin says, the question of our opposition and the ultra-Left opposition, we must recognise that during the last two years the Communist Parties

of all countries, when they did commit blunders, always committed Right blunders. (Lozovsky: "This is, if we are to 'eliminate,' we cannot eliminate in this manner.") Not a single Communist Party was guilty of Left blunders during the last two years, and this circumstance deserves attention. (Voice: "What were the Right blunders?") The ultra-Lefts have not the leadership of a single party. We can speak of Left errors only in some Party branches, but the leadership is guilty of Right mistakes only.

The second question is that of the Chinese revolution. In 1927, the Chinese revolution suffered three big defeats; the first in Shanghai, the second in Wuhan, and the third was the defeat of Ho Lun's and Ye Tin's army in Kwantung.

The objective causes of the defeat lie in the fact that in China—in 1927 this was manifested with particular sharpness—the rise of the labour and peasant movement did not occur at the same time.

The Revolution in Wuhan and Shanghai took place when the peasant movement had not assumed that profound revolutionary character which it now has. The September and October wave of peasant risings began when the labour movement had already been crushed. Speaking of the objective co-relation of forces, I refer to the forces of the working class and the peasantry; these forces are enough to overthrow the domination of the landlords of China, the Chinese bourgeoisie and international imperialism.

There are comrades who think that the forces of the proletariat and the peasants are insufficient to beat the enemy. I think that the forces of the Chinese proletariat and the peasantry are quite sufficient for a victorious revolution in China. The present period in China is distinguished by the fact that the development and spontaneous extension of the peasant movement finds an echo on the part of the working class in China in the form of a rising strike wage and an acute political struggle. If we take the four basic industrial centres of China—Shanghai, Kwantung, Hupei, and the North—we shall find that in every one of them the labour movement is on the rise, becoming at times of such a spontaneous character that the

Communist Party lags behind as regards watchwords, leads and organisational development.

In the same districts a wave of peasant revolts—different in qualitative character from those in spring—is spreading. At that time there were in Hunan and Kwantung powerful organisations embracing millions of peasants in the peasant leagues, but the struggle did not assume that sharp character which it bears to-day. In Kwantung, in those districts where Soviets have been set up, the peasants execute the landlords and the gentry. This is an absolutely new phenomenon in China. Things at that time did not develop to the extent of confiscation of land. If attempts were made to confiscate land in Hunan in the spring, they were not of a mass character, they were not typical of the entire peasant movement. Now this is a general phenomenon throughout all provinces in China where the peasant movement is in progress. In the merging of the two streams—the peasant revolts and the rise of the labour movement—there is to be found the key to a new upheaval in the revolutionary movement of the Chinese people.

A few words on the general crisis through which China is now going. First of all, I will deal with the economic crisis. Chinese agriculture declines from year to year. The causes of this decline are the existing social relations. The social relations in the Chinese village can be termed feudalist only conditionally, with the reservation that they resemble very little in the middle ages in Europe. The survivals of the peculiar form of Chinese feudalism, which it were better to call as Marx termed it an Asiatic method of production, are the causes giving rise to profound class struggle in rural districts. The peasantry is exploited by the landlords, the money-lender, and the merchant to an unusual degree. According to the figures of "impartial" American and other investigators, 80 per cent. of the Chinese peasants lead a life of starvation. The continuous wars and the break up of the Chinese State lead to a destruction of the irrigation and drainage systems upon which the rice crops of China depend.

The economic crisis is accompanied also by a govern-

ment and political crisis. After its betrayal of the revolution the bourgeoisie proved itself powerless to carry out the task of the unification of China. On the contrary, the bourgeois militarist reaction brought about a still greater division of China into several political independent and warring districts. These districts in turn are broken up into provinces which are also fighting against each other. This process develops rapidly, and at the same time the State machinery is also being destroyed. That State machine no longer performs any useful social functions, it degenerates and falls to pieces. And what is most important is that there is no class in China in a position to settle the differences which arise out of the Chinese revolution and drive that revolution onward.

Take the Kuomintang. It was a Party composed of an alliance of revolutionary classes. Since the coup d'état, the Kuomintang has not only ceased to be a revolutionary force but has actually ceased to exist as a political party. Can a party be called a political party which has three or four organisations claiming to be central committees, in which its cleansing takes place at the behest of non-party generals? The Kuomintang no longer exists as a political party. (Stalin: "And what has become of the bourgeoisie?") Of the bourgeoisie there only remain isolated individuals. (Laughter.)

I will not speak of the organisational defects of the Communist Party of China. They are very great. There is one organisational defect which is of great political significance.

This defect consists in the fact that having cleansed the leadership of opportunist elements and elected a new Central Committee, the Communist Party of China has as yet been unable to replace all functionaries which stand between the Central Committee and the rank and file.

These functionaries are not workers, they are not peasants, but petty bourgeois intellectuals who brought with them into the party all their prejudices, vacillations, hesitation and incapacity for an energetic struggle. Even correct resolutions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China are as a rule distorted by the leaders of the local party organisations.

The mistakes which the Communist Party of China recognised and openly criticised before the entire party membership at its conference were repeated again by the intellectual party leaders in the armies of Ho Lun and Ye Tin. The lack of connections with the peasant masses, insufficient work among the peasantry, absence of revolutionary mottoes—all this had as a result the fact that the army did not receive support from the peasantry in due time and suffered defeat.

The great success of the Communist Party of China lies in the fact that it recently avoided certain mistakes which even our European parties did not avoid. When the Pilsudski coup d'état took place in Poland, the Communist Party of Poland supported Pilsudski and committed serious opportunist blunders. The Communist Party of China, despite the fact that it committed a mass of Menshevik opportunist errors in the past, did not support Chang Fa-hui, although he made radical promises and used Left phrases, but assumed a very hostile attitude towards him. This circumstance is an indication that the state of affairs in that party has radically improved.

The question now confronting the party in Kwantung and several other provinces is that of taking up a struggle for power and the organisation of an armed insurrection. The party fights now under the general watchword of Soviets. It decided, however, to set up Soviets only in those places where and when there is a guarantee for a victory on a sound basis. The fact that the party has now undertaken the organisation of Soviets in Kwantung and that a Soviet Government exists in five districts of Kwantung, shows that apparently the situation in that province is sufficiently revolutionary to be able definitely to raise the question of power, and apparently we shall witness in the near future great revolutionary events in that province. We cannot of course guarantee full success, but we can guarantee that the Communist Party of China, despite the fact that Zinoviev intended to put it in Wan Tin-wei's waistcoat pocket in the battles now confronting it and already begun, will be equal to the situation as a leader of the workers' and peasants' revolution in China. (Applause.)

### COMRADE MANUILSKY'S SPEECH.

I want to deal mainly with the process of radicalisation of the European working class. I will not dwell on China because on that Comrade Lominadze made several extremely interesting remarks. Although I ought to say that some of them raise certain doubts in my mind. If there is no feudalism, no bourgeoisie, no trade unions in China, if 100 million Chinese people disappeared somewhere, the question arises of who does the fighting and against whom? But I think that this is over-exaggerated. There is no doubt that Comrade Lominadze in speaking on China did not give an accurate picture of the situation. But I leave these questions and will immediately deal with the situation in Europe.

I want to deal with the process of the radicalisation of the European working class first of all, because the Comintern must now decide on certain practical tasks in the sphere of Comintern penetration of our various sections into the broad masses of workers dependent on these processes. Secondly, because it is not at all immaterial to us in what form they occur, because the coming war will not only be an offensive of world capitalism on the Soviet Union, but the war of the U.S.S.R. against the imperialist aggressor, and the radicalisation of the international working class will constitute a part of these revolutionary processes. Thirdly, because the rate of decline of Trotskyist neo-Menshevism, which has now affected some parts of Europe, depends on that. Just as in 1912 the new impetus of the labour movement in our country wiped out the ultra-Left tendency as represented by the "V. period," so now will the rising wave of the labour movement wipe out Trotskyist neo-Menshevism, and disperse the ideological twilight of the Opposition. Trotskyist neo-Menshevism—a product of depression—will fail in the test of the coming great battles.

Where will the central positions of the coming revolutionary situation appear? Will they be in Europe or elsewhere—the colonies, or will they be in China? Will they occur on the Pacific? Despite the fact that the Pacific ocean is undoubtedly a very important arena where great



antagonisms are now maturing, I nevertheless think that the Pacific problem will not constitute the most burning problem. It is true that various fundamental antagonisms are developing on the Pacific, signalling a new world conflict. Capitalism is growing strong in many countries which were hitherto British colonies, and the process of emergence of these young capitalist countries revolutionises the Pacific relations just as they do in Europe. The development of Australia, Canada, and the Argentine, which are trying to play an independent role, will deliver a blow to the United States and to British imperialism. But many years are necessary for that. It is hard to say now how much time is still necessary to undermine the privileged position of the American worker, who, in relation to the European worker, plays the rôle of an aristocrat, *i.e.*, a rôle which the British worker played in relation to the proletariat on the continent for decades. This is a long process. In listening to Comrade Bukharin's report many comrades may have drawn pessimistic conclusions as regards the prospects of a Communist movement in America. If capitalism is so strong there what will be the processes of revolutionisation of the American Labour movement? I think that this revolutionisation of the American labour movement will be connected with two main phenomena: first, a war in the Pacific, but this is a perspective of the distant future; second, an industrial crisis in the United States—this is a perspective for the more immediate future. An industrial crisis in the United States, if it does not give rise to an immediate revolutionary situation, will at any rate accelerate the revolutionisation of the American workers.

A crisis in the United States, just because of the full maturity of American capitalism, will be much more serious in its consequences than a crisis in any other capitalist country. Capitalist economy in Europe has become adapted to the prolonged post-war crisis to a much greater extent than capitalist economy in the United States. Therefore a crisis in America will be more catastrophic. It will undermine the foundation of the American company unions. In this respect, consequently, we can also rely on the radicalisation of the proletariat in the future.

But, nevertheless, this is not a prospect of the immediate future. I do not intend to under-estimate the significance of the colonial movements. Nevertheless, despite the fact that China is now playing a tremendous rôle, I think that the decisive battles for the overthrow of capitalism will take place in the old capitalist countries of Europe. The colonial movements will play a tremendous rôle, but it will nevertheless be only a secondary rôle.

Thirdly and lastly, I think that the weaker links of capitalism may snap, just as happened last summer in Austria, but the decisive battles will depend on the outcome of the class conflicts in such countries of classical capitalism as Great Britain, France, Germany, etc. That is why the palpable radicalisation of the European labour movement is for us of tremendous significance.

What are the signs of radicalisation of the European labour movement. There are three. First, the growing strike wave; second, the demonstrations throughout the whole world in connection with the Sacco and Vanzetti case; and third, the elections in several European countries, which show that the 1928 elections will give rise to a somewhat different alignment of forces in the main countries of Europe.

#### **The Conquest of the Main Columns of the Working Class.**

In connection with the rise of the labour movement the question arises of winning the mass of the working class. This is now one of the principal tasks which have remained unsolved by the international Communist movement. A task like this is not solved from one Plenum of the E.C.C.I. to another, it is intended for a whole historical period preceding decisive conflicts of the working class for its emancipation.

I will mention some figures. In the United States of America, where the proletariat numbers 25 million, we have altogether 3 million organised workers in the extremely Right American Federation of Labour and a Communist Party with a membership of 10,000. In Great Britain there are 15 million proletarians, 5 millions of whom are in the trade unions, 7,500 in our Party. In Germany there are 20 million workers and employees, while

the number of trade union members—which no one definitely knows—is about 4 millions. Our Party has only 128,000 members. In France there is a proletariat of 11 millions, while the trade union organisations, both the Unitarian Confederation of Labour and the Reformist Confederation of Labour, have only 900,000 members and our Party 60,000, etc.

What does this show? We have mass Parties in three main countries: In Czecho-Slovakia (one of the biggest mass parties), in Germany and in France. But in the other countries we have so far splendid fighting cadres which in time of battle will perhaps work like an army of the militia system. We have no doubt that these cadres will rally new strata of the working class in the process of revolutionary mobilisation. But, nevertheless, they are only cadres. In many countries our Parties are small groups of one or two thousand members. This is particularly so in Denmark, Austria, Switzerland and Holland. Here our Parties still remind one of agitators and not real Communist parties. Under such conditions, when the Communist Parties are faced with a tremendous task of breaking through to the very midst of the working class, the disruptive work of Trotsky's and Zinoviev's followers abroad is especially detrimental, because it threatens to convert some Communist Parties into small sects, broken up into "currents" and factions, and to fossilise the Communist Parties.

#### **The Elections of 1928.**

Will the 1928 elections alter the European situation so that the pressure of European capitalism on us may diminish? The elections of 1928 will effect certain changes, but they will not do away with the war danger. We can say in advance that the Labour Party, together with the Liberals, will take power in Great Britain; in Germany there will probably be a great coalition, or perhaps only a small coalition; in France the Left bloc will probably take office. What will that mean? These elections will give rise to pacifist sentiments among the broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeoisie of Europe is afraid of war. Several small States voiced this fear very characteristically at the September

Session of the League of Nations in the speeches of the representatives of Holland, Latvia, etc. At the present time, world capitalism directly exerts its pressure on us. As a result of the elections, the pressure on us will assume more hypocritical forms; the 2nd International will play a greater rôle as an agent of the International bourgeoisie.

In so far as the 2nd International finds itself in the service of several bourgeois States, the struggle between capital and labour will be a struggle between the 2nd and 3rd Internationals. It will be a struggle between State systems, represented by two internationals. One State system will be the Soviet Union and the other the 2nd International, based on the bourgeois States. This will not at all be a pacifist phase such as that of 1924. On the contrary, this phase will be fraught with tremendous social conflicts; a sharpening of the struggle between Communists and Social Democrats, and will centre on the Labour movement. From this point of view it may be surmised that 1927 was the hardest year in the development of our country. From the point of view of revolutionary perspectives, from the point of view of the alteration of the forms of pressure, from the point of view of the power of resistance of the European working class to world capitalism, the year 1928 will be a much more favourable year for us.

In this connection the question arises: Where should we concentrate our fire? Comrades Lominadze and Schatzkin said that it is necessary to concentrate fire on the Right. This is true, but the geography of Comrade Lominadze and Comrade Schatzkin is not quite the same as to the question which is the Right and which is the Left. Now, we must concentrate the fire on the Right. The only enemy we now have is Social Democracy, and this Social Democracy must be fought both outside of our Party as well as within it in the shape of the tendencies which reflect Social Democratic influence. To fight against the Right means to fight against the Maslow and Korsch renegades. But Comrade Lominadze does not understand that international Social Democracy has an agency in the Labour movement in the form of neo-Menshevism, which covers its real nature by ultra-Left phrases. (Lominadze: "Do you think that is your discovery?") The tendencies

which exist in the European Communist movement, both Right and Left, cannot be compared with this class of renegades. Hitherto many comrades imagined that we have an ultra-Left danger as represented by Maslow, Ruth Fischer and others, and a Right danger represented by Brandler and certain Right elements in our Section, etc.

Brandler, although he has committed serious blunders, was never guilty of such betrayal as Trotsky, Zinoviev and Radek. (Voices: "Hear, hear!") Brandler, after his blunders were condemned by the E.C.C.I., really stood at attention. For four years he was dead silent; the discipline he showed was of such a kind that many of our followers may take an example from it. It is high time to dispel the legend that the radical workers who show revolutionary impatience group themselves around Maslow. There are no Left workers following the Maslow group, there are only disappointed and worn-out elements. There are such Left workers among the youth in the various countries. There are such Left workers also in Germany to be found in the Chemnitz organisations. These deviations, both Right and Left, within the Communist Parties will fight with comradely methods. Comrades Lominadze and Schatzkin maintain that the Right danger has increased during recent years. This is not true. Why do they contend that this is so? Because the Comintern hunted down Right mistakes during the past two years more than it ever did while Zinoviev was its chief. Compare the present situation with what we had a few years ago. In former years we had the Bubnik crisis in Czecho-Slovakia, the Brandler crisis in Germany, the Frossard crisis in France. Can we now make a serious comparison of the present situation in our Sections with what was before? The question cannot be put in this way. You are trying to be original, and create the impression at the Congress that the Comintern really does not carry on an adequate struggle against Right dangers.

\* \* \* \* \*

#### COMRADE MELNITCHANSKY'S SPEECH.

Comrade Lozovsky said that there is a disproportion between the political influence of the Profintern and Comintern, and that this influence does not find organisa-

tional expression. I will not try to compare the influence of the Profintern with the influence of the Comintern. The trouble with the Profintern, with our international work, is that this disproportion does not exist. The influence of the Profintern is not great in Communist Parties abroad, and it frequently happens that when the Profintern takes up some question or other it does not meet with the necessary support to be able to carry its suggestions into effect. We meet with a lack of understanding on questions of the international Trade Union Movement existing in the Communist Parties of the various countries.

It should be pointed out that the Profintern, by the nature of its work, reminds one more of an Agitprop or a big publishing house, than of an organisational centre, leading the Trade Union Movement. If we examine carefully how some organisations, affiliated to the Profintern, as, for instance, the French and Czecho-Slovakian Trade Union movement work, we get the impression that the leading groups of these revolutionary Trade Unions do not differ in their methods and forms of work from the reformist trade unions. If you come to the headquarters of the reformist trade unions, you feel the silence of the grave, an absence of live mass work. You feel no connection between the leading organ and the masses. When you come to the headquarters of the French, of Czecho-Slovakian trade unions affiliated to the Profintern you find the same trouble, the same forms and methods of work. The Textile Workers' Union of Czecho-Slovakia, one of the largest branches of the revolutionary movement, recently lost about 9,000-10,000 out of its 50,000 members. The situation of other Czecho-Slovakian trade unions is not more encouraging. This is because the leadership of the revolutionary trade unions is such that it does not differ from the leadership of the reformist trade unions. They administer the trade union movement, but they do not carry on mass work; they do not draw in the mass of rank and file members—not even the leaders of the lower nuclei—into the discussion of questions of the current work of the organisation. In the French unions the situation is the same. There is a revival there of strike

conflicts, but many of our unions are in such a position that they cannot independently call the workers out on strike.

The trade union movement affiliated to the Profintern will be unable to develop the class struggle, grow and strengthen, if it is not based on the activities of every rank and file member, on participation in his organisation, payment of dues, payment for the strike fund and participation in strikes. If the Profintern were a sufficiently influential leading organ of the international trade union movement, it would be able to rectify much in its work, it would be able to influence the Communist Parties through the Comintern and give corresponding directions for trade union work.

I will give you a characteristic example of how the revolutionary workers are trained by the work of their unions. During the past year the number of members of the Unitarian Textile, Tailors' and Capmakers' Union (in France they all belong to one union) has decreased by about 9,000 or 10,000. The main reason for the decline in the membership is the fact that it was decided at the last Congress to raise membership dues from 85 centimes to 1 franc 25 centimes, *i.e.*, from 7 to 9 kopeks a month.

The old French trade union movement was developed on low membership dues.

Just as soon as there is a question of a slight increase in the membership dues from 7 to 9 kopeks, which is necessary for everyday practical work (apart from strike struggle) a mass diminution in the membership takes place. This means that our trade union work in that country is in a very weak condition.

The Profintern must cease to be a publishing organisation, it must become an organisational centre.

In many countries time itself is working for us. Our political influence is increasing, but we are incapable of utilising this influence and solidifying it into organisational forms. The work for the organisation of fractions is not properly organised. This work must be undertaken in every country separately so that our influence in the reformist trade unions may increase.

Various facts concerning the work of our comrades

in the trade union movement abroad give proof of an incompetent approach and inadequate attention to the work of the trade unions. Tens of thousands of Communists do not belong to the trade unions in Czecho-Slovakia, tens of thousands of Communists are not organised in the trade unions in France, etc.

The situation being so in Europe, we must say: It is true that it is very good to float on the Pacific Ocean and to organise a Secretariat there, it is a good thing to organise a similar secretariat also in Latin America. But we must not forget that we cannot drift to the Pacific, we cannot drift to Honolulu and at the same time forget Europe. We must consolidate our positions in Europe and intensify our work.



## CONCLUDING SPEECH BY COMRADE BUKHARIN

### PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

Comrades, first of all I must say that the debate that took place on my report is of considerable interest, because the comrades who took part in it touched upon many of the questions I dealt with, made a number of supplementary as well as critical remarks and put forward a number of proper suggestions and proposals. Several complaints were made that I did not deal with certain questions, but these are not severe reproaches, because I could not in my report deal with all questions. Kusma Prutkov (+) has said: "No one can embrace the unembraceable," and Kusma Prutkov also said: "If anyone tells you that the unembraceable can be embraced spit in his eye"—(laughter)—and the subjects connected with the work of the Comintern, taken as a whole, are really "unembraceable." I do not think I said anything that was superfluous, but I must admit that a number of questions were not dealt with.

To the list of questions that were dealt with, I myself could add many more, and each of these taken by themselves is of considerable interest. For example, it was stated that I barely mentioned the Peasant question. This, of course, is true. It may be said that I "forgot the middle peasant"—(laughter)—but I did not touch upon that question because it is hardly possible to say anything new on that subject compared with what has been already said and one could hardly mention any special task that has not already been mentioned by the Comintern. I did not refer to such questions as the

\* The pseudonym of an author of a book of "wise sayings."

Youth movement, the state of the Young Communist International, etc., although this question, as you all perfectly well understand, is of considerable interest, particularly in connection with our anti-military work. I did not refer to the work of the Women's Organisations, although it cannot be denied that the work of the women's organisations is a matter which in itself is of considerable importance. Finally, I did not refer to questions like that of the work of Broad non-Party Organisations, which, in one way or another, are connected with and are under the influence of the Comintern or its various sections. I did not refer to the work of the I.C.W.P.A. and the I.R.A., the Co-operative section of the Communist International, the Sportintern (Tomsky: "The Chessintern"), etc., etc. The comrades who work in any one of these spheres have some reason to complain that I did not refer to these questions. But, comrades, I repeat, "no one can embrace the unembraceable," and it was on the basis of this wise rule that I refrained from dealing with them.

I received a note from one of the groups of delegates to the Party Congress asking me to deal to some extent with the internal organisational mechanism and the internal organisational life of the various sections of the Comintern. I cannot in my concluding remarks, develop this extensive subject as it should be done, and therefore I refer all those who are interested in this question to the series of special articles written by Comrade Piatnitsky on this subject and which deal in a most detailed manner with the internal organisational life of the Communist Parties, with the work of the Communist fractions in the trade unions and other organisations, with the distribution of our forces in various countries, in various branches of industry, etc, etc., and which brings to the front a number of practical organisational problems and the methods by which they can be solved.

Permit me to confine myself to a few brief remarks on this subject. If comrades ask how rapidly the process of the reorganisation of our Parties is proceeding on the basis of the factory nucleus system, my reply is that, taken on the whole, this transition is taking place every-

where, almost in all the important sections of the Communist International.

One of the great defects from which our organisational work suffers is the fact that in a number of places the Communists are weaker in the large enterprises than they are in the small enterprises. This is explained not only by the fact that the workers employed in large enterprises enjoy better conditions and are considerably better off, and therefore are more subject to Social Democratic influence than those employed in small enterprises, but also and principally by the fact that under the factory nucleus system which we are adopting the Communists as such, more quickly become "exposed" in the factory or workshop. The capitalists fight the active Communist nuclei in the factories by means of police and economic terror; they search out and sack Communists from the factories and workshops. Thus, while on the one hand the factory nucleus system is an essential organisational principle for us, because it enables us organisationally to embrace the masses of the workers in the best possible way, on the other hand it provides opportunities for the attack upon the members of our Party to be intensified.

Furthermore, it must be mentioned that a considerable percentage of the membership of a number of our Parties is unemployed. In several countries the percentage of unemployed Communists compared with the members employed is very high. This also can be easily explained: the more revolutionary section of the workers are "sacked"; the capitalists throw our comrades on to the street and not infrequently resort to so-called "black lists." Since the percentage of unemployed Communists is very high it follows that large numbers are not employed in any factory or workshop, and consequently the transition to the factory nucleus system is still further hindered.

The transition is hindered also by a number of specific difficulties. For example, the seasonal character of the work in which a certain section of the workers are employed, or the special character of the work—as, for example, dock workers, etc. All these additional diffi-

culties retard the process of transition; but, taken on the whole, it is proceeding successfully.

With regard to the question of embracing the peasantry—*i.e.*, of recruiting the peasantry into the ranks of our Party—it must be said that the peasantry represent an extremely small proportion of our membership. These are the remarks I have to make concerning the organisation question.

I must add two remarks of a personal character before dealing with certain fundamental problems which were raised by several comrades in the course of the debate. One refers to the controversy between Comrades Larin and Skrypnik on the one hand and between Skrypnik and the Polish Comrades on the other. As you see, the "link" between the two discussions is Comrade Skrypnik.

With regard to the discussion between Larin and Skrypnik, I must say the following:

It seems to me that Comrade Larin is right when he says that we should have a right to speak out openly and point out defects in all spheres of our work, including also our national policy. The national policy does not represent any exceptions whatever to any of the spheres of our work and policy. There are defects in it which must be criticised, and sometimes even very severely criticised.

Comrade Larin is not right, however, and this aspect predominates in his speech, when his criticism assumes a particular political significance—as, for example, in his article published in the "Bolshevik" containing the remark that our Ukrainian comrades were carrying out the policy of Ukrainisation "in a Petlura manner." The political weight of such remarks may be very considerable, particularly in a situation in which the national question is very acute; then it acquires a particular and disproportionately great significance. In this connection it may be stated that the editor of the "Bolshevik" committed a grave error in publishing Comrade Larin's article without comment, or in leaving this remark in the article at all. I think, however, that the matter should not be carried any further as far as this little "battle" between Comrade Larin and Comrade Skrypnik is concerned.

With regard to the controversy between Comrade

Skrypnik and the representative of the Polish C.C., it seems to me that Comrade Skrypnik should not have brought this question into the arena of the Party Congress. The Polish comrades of both groups have declared with absolute unanimity that the comrade referred to—the member of the Central Committee, who is not a Pole but a White Russian—did not say what Comrade Skrypnik ascribes to him in quoting from an uncorrected copy of the stenographic report. A mistake in reporting may quite easily occur, as everyone knows. It was tactless to use a text which everybody repudiated, the more so that at the present time the maintenance of the maximum of unanimity between the Ukrainian comrades and the comrades of the Polish Party is the fundamental condition for our victory. Permit me to state that there is not the slightest doubt about the existence of this unanimity.

These are the remarks that I thought necessary to make on this subject.

#### **I. The Analysis of Capitalist Economics and the Question of Tendencies Towards State Capitalism.**

Permit me now to reply to the remarks made concerning the substance of my report. First of all I must say a few words concerning the remarks made by Comrade Uglanov, who, generally speaking, gave utterance to a number of absolutely correct statements. In his speech Comrade Uglanov said, among other things, that I should have dealt with "the reverse side of stabilisation"—viz., the contradictions which accompany it, particularly in Germany—and when I interrupted with the remark that I had dealt with this in the most detailed manner, Comrade Uglanov retorted "that is not so." However, a reference to the stenographic report will prove that I am right. In the stenographic report it is stated:

"A number of contradictions are observed in Central Europe. If we were to seek for the principal touchstone of all European contradictions, you will find, I think, that that touchstone is Germany. Germany represents a whole bundle of contradictions."

And then follows the point about reparations, quotations from the "Rheinische-Westfälische Zeitung"; then

followed a detailed analysis of the question of the debts, of the exports necessary for covering payments, of the adverse trade balance of German foreign trade, of the contradictions between the economics of German capitalism and the "disarmament" of Germany, etc., etc. The idea that Germany is the classic land of the contradictions of the stabilisation process runs through it like a thread.

I am grateful for all criticism. I apologise for the great load of material I unloaded upon the delegates in the Party Congress; but I humbly assert that I said all this in the very beginning of my report.

I come now to the question of State Capitalism. First of all, I must again quote myself. Although this may be very unpleasant, it is absolutely necessary. What did I say on this question? Did I speak of State Capitalism as a fact? No. I spoke of the tendencies towards State Capitalism. Did I say that in the first place I emphasise *not* the formal State capitalist organisation—*i.e.*, not the direct interference of the State in economic life, or the nationalisation of economic organisations? I did. More than that, I said that in a number of countries I consider it necessary to emphasise the tendency that I would describe as a tendency towards the trustification of the State itself. Did I present the question in such a manner as to suggest that a new process was taking place that differed in principle from the one that has been going on hitherto? No, I did not. I made a proper reservation when I said that there was nothing new in principle in this, but that quantitatively this process, particularly in recent times, has been going on at such a rate that it must be noted as one of the greatest phenomena of modern economic life. That is what I said. Now an attack on this position was made by Comrade Lozovsky and Comrade Schatzkin. As these comrades have declared that this question is of enormous theoretical and practical significance, and that a wrong solution of this question may give rise to a very considerable confusion, I consider it necessary to deal with it somewhat in detail. I will start with the speech delivered by Comrade Lozovsky. Addressing his remarks to me, Comrade Lozovsky said [quotes from the stenographic report]:—

"In describing the present state of capitalism, particularly of European and American capitalism, Comrade Bukharin drew attention to the fact that at the present time a period of State capitalism is commencing or is becoming observable, a period of growing syndicates and concerns; and syndicates, concerns, and trusts are growing. The growth of private monopolist organisations might be combined under the single term of State capitalism."

If I had really said what Comrade Lozovsky ascribes to me, I would have been entirely wrong all along the line. But, unfortunately for Comrade Lozovsky, he argued against something which he himself has imagined and ascribes to me. Did I really say that "at the present time" (!) "a period of State capitalism" (!!)" is commencing" (!!!) or "is becoming observed" (!!!!) I said nothing of the kind, and could not have said it. On the contrary, I said that nothing new in principle had taken place. I said, further, that we were discussing "tendencies in the direction of State capitalism"; for the first place, from below, *i.e.*, from among the capitalist economic organisations, a tendency was developing in the direction of these organisations becoming grafted with the organisations of the State. It is one thing to speak about these tendencies, but quite another thing to "combine" the growth of economic organisations "under the single term of State capitalism."

Comrade Lozovsky further stated:

"What is taking place? That these trusts, concerns, these monopolist organisations are being managed by bourgeois States is true. This kind of management has increased. What is taking place is, if one may so express it, not the nationalisation of these concerns and trusts, but to a certain extent the trustification (I think Bukharin said that) of the State apparatus which, theoretically, might be described as State capitalism. I think it cannot be so described."

I must observe that Comrade Lozovsky makes the same mistake here, or rather further develops the mistake I have already referred to. In the first place, one should

not argue like this when discussing a question that one regards as important. One should not say: "I think Bukharin said that." I really did say it. Not "I think," but simply "said." In the second place, I did not say (and this is the decisive point) that "the trustification of the State" "might be described as State capitalism." Had I asserted that I would have "skipped" across a great stage of development, I would have taken a tendency for a completed process, *i.e.*, I would have tried to fit life into a scheme that did not fit it. Fortunately, however, Comrade Lozovsky is wrong, for I spoke about tendencies in the direction of State capitalism, *i.e.*, about tendencies preparing the way for State capitalism. And this is not the same thing at all. We must be extremely exact in this matter. That is why Comrade Lozovsky's objections failed to hit the mark.

I come now to Comrade Schatzkin. Comrade Schatzkin tried to prove the heresy of my postulates by quotations even from the "A.B.C. of Communism." I of course do not share the view that we have all forgotten the "A.B.C. of Communism," nor can I agree to the statement that I have forgotten what is written in the "A.B.C. of Communism" or the "a.b.c." of Communism, written either in small or capital letters.

Comrade Schatzkin tried to make a "detailed analysis," and first of all he desired to "refute" certain of Comrade Bukharin's arguments and "reviewing" a number of countries, came to the conclusion that I was wrong all along the line.

I will follow in the footsteps of Comrade Schatzkin in this "review" and analysis. First of all, I must make a few general remarks. In reviewing the internal structure of Imperialist States and their economics we must draw a distinction between those elements of State capitalism in Western Europe which bear a specifically military character, and which to a certain degree may be taken as being parallel to the period of War Communism in Russia, and the modern elements or tendencies in the direction towards State capitalism in the Western European countries. We must do that because, while, for example, a number of enterprises of State capitalist character arose during the



war as a result of the war requirements of the capitalist countries in Western Europe, then it is quite natural that these forms of War-State capitalism should tend to die out after the war. But this does not imply that tendencies towards State capitalism in general tend to die out. This distinction must be drawn in order that certain false arguments may not be taken for genuine arguments, in order that temporary tendencies may not be taken for fundamental tendencies, in order not to mix up questions which differ in character—questions which are linked up with each other, but differ radically in their substance.

We will proceed, however, with a detailed examination of Comrade Schatzkin's arguments. Comrade Schatzkin commences with Italy, and asserts that the rise of the "Corporate State" in Italy cannot under any circumstances serve as an argument to prove the existence of State capitalist tendencies; that the reference to Italy is a wrong one. Why is it wrong? Because "during the war we had Parliamentary Governments, at least in their formal origin, in Germany and in England, nevertheless, these were more State capitalist in character than Mussolini's present corporate State." It follows, therefore, that Comrade Schatzkin's decisive argument, as far as Italy is concerned, is that during the War State capitalist elements in Germany and in England were more developed than in Mussolini's "corporate State" at the present time, when there is no war. But can this be called an argument? Of course not; because in post-war Fascist Italy there developed for the first time a number of tendencies of a State capitalist character which did not exist there during the war. Comrade Schatzkin, in arguing against me, is nevertheless himself compelled to admit that: "In passing, it must be said that these State capitalist strivings do really exist in Italy." If that is the case, what is the fuss about?

Comrade Schatzkin brought forward another "argument"—viz., that three years ago the Italian Government considered the idea of abolishing State monopolies. That is right. But nothing came of it! And this is most important! You set out to prove that my postulate was wrong, but you came to the same conclusion that I came

to. Consequently I am quite satisfied with the results of your "review" of Italy. (Schatzkin: "I argued against regarding the Corporate State as a symptom of State Capitalism.") In the stenographic report it says "these capitalist strivings do really exist." As regards the substance of the question, I quoted a number of facts, and you have not refuted them. You have not refuted the facts regarding the regulation of prices by the State, which is an essential point in the development of direct State capitalistic tendencies, nor have you refuted the fact of the nationalisation of the trade unions. Hence, Comrade Schatzkin's Italian argument is very, very weak.

Further, Comrade Schatzkin objects to my "Vienna" argument. In passing I must deny that I "flitted" haphazard from one country to another. I selected various types of countries in which the tendency towards State capitalist development revealed itself in various ways. I selected Germany, Italy, Austria and Japan as four types of countries in which these tendencies reveal themselves in various ways. Comrade Schatzkin hurriedly stalks on my trail and says: "I must refute Comrade Bukharin's second argument about the 'municipality of Vienna,' because 'the economic activities of the municipality of Vienna, apart from socialist demagogy, does not differ in principles from the activities of all other municipalities.'" From the point of view of its capitalistic character it goes without saying, of course, that it cannot differ in principle from the activities of other municipalities. "The municipality of Vienna does not touch the industries of Vienna, nor does it regulate them," Comrade Schatzkin asserts on one page of the stenographic report.

I turn over to the next page, and read: "It is true that its enterprises have somewhat greater weight in Austrian economics than municipal enterprises in other countries." But if the municipality of Vienna does not touch industrial life, then how can it have "enterprises"? (Schatzkin: "We are speaking of private.") But I am not speaking about that. On the one hand Comrade Schatzkin says that the municipality of Vienna does not touch industrial life, and on the other the astonished reader and listener learns that it has certain enterprises which have "somewhat

greater weight than municipal enterprises in other countries." These "enterprises" may be enumerated: the manufacture and supply of gas, electrical enterprises, the Arsenal (in which agricultural instruments are manufactured), house building, etc. In addition, there are concession enterprises, which are regulated by the municipalities of Vienna. These include the electric railway and means of transport generally. We will proceed further. Comrade Schatzkin says: "But this is explained by the fact that after the Saint Germain peace all that was left of Austria was the capital and its environs." And what is the name of that capital? (Schatzkin: "Vienna.") Yes, the name of that capital is indeed Vienna! How can you in the same breath say that the municipality of Vienna does not touch industrial life! This is indeed a case of being lost in a wood of two trees. (Laughter.) Nevertheless, the fact remains that Comrade Schatzkin admits that the enterprises of the municipality of Vienna have more weight than municipal enterprises in other countries, and that Vienna represents almost the whole of Austria. If he admits that—that is, if he admits that Vienna, almost the whole of Austria—that the municipality of Vienna "touches" industrial life, then this is absolutely all I want. Since he has admitted all that, there is no need for me to flay him any more. (Laughter.) (Schatzkin: "My skin is still whole.")

Comrade Schatzkin "refutes" my third argument—about Japan. "In Japan elements of State capitalism do really exist; but, in the first place, that is not new." That also is not new. (Laughter.) But I ask: Have these elements grown in recent times or have they not? This is the crux of the question. This is a new question, but you ignored it. I assert that these elements have grown. You, however, ignore this part; you talk about all kinds of other "interesting" things, but you are silent on this, you make no reply to this question. And yet this is precisely the crux of the whole discussion. Consequently this "argument" is as useless as the other. Continuing further to speak of Japan, Comrade Schatzkin says: "Comrade Bukharin himself admits that this arose on the basis of the peculiar transition of Japan from feudalism to capitalism, and consequently cannot be applied to the international situation in

the character of an international tendency." All right. The fact that State capitalistic tendencies in Japan arose on the basis of a peculiar transition indicates the special forms these tendencies assume. This is what I myself remarked. But is this an argument against mine? We will suppose I did say that these tendencies developed on the basis of a peculiar transition; but in addition to that I emphasised another important point—viz., that owing to its international position Japan was obliged to clench its fist over its own internal economy more tightly than any other imperialistic State, and for that reason the State capitalist elements necessarily had to grow more rapidly. But this fact proves the existence of international factors forcing the development of these tendencies in Japan. What happened to Comrade Schatzkin's argument? He spun round and round in one place, and finally was compelled to assert that which I have stated. Since he has come to this I want absolutely nothing more from him in the Japanese line.

As his principal argument Comrade Schatzkin refers to the conditions of the development of two other countries, and thinks that by that he has shattered my argument to fragments. He takes France and Germany, and asserts that in these two countries are observed not a process of growth of tendencies in the direction of State capitalism, but an opposite process. In the first place, I again emphasise most strongly the fact that I spoke of tendencies in the direction of State capitalism, and not of State capitalism as a completed form. Secondly, I emphasise that in this connection I am discussing in the first place the process that is taking place "from below" of the grafting of the large centralised enterprises concerns, trusts, etc., on to the organs of the State, which is taking place along the line of development of these tendencies. Do we really observe in France an "opposite process"? I do not know what a statement like this can be founded on. During the war, and particularly in the post-war period, France became for the first time a big industrial country. (Voices from the hall: "Speak louder, speak into the amplifier.") Comrades, why do you roar like walruses on the shores of the Arctic Ocean? (Laughter.) I will repeat what I said in

regard to France. Everybody knows that during the war and the post-war period France for the first time became a great industrial country, after she had seized a considerable part of Germany and "rounded off" her frontiers as a result of the victory. Notwithstanding all the misfortunes and hindrances arising from the post-war situation (inflation, depreciation of the franc, and a number of other things), she has in recent times advanced in Europe to the position of an industrially developed country with a trustified industry. This is a real fact in the development of post-war economics in France, a fact which must be noted in the first instance. The immutable fact remains that never before in the life of France has there been such a grafting of the big capitalist organisations directly on to the State as has taken place at the present time, particularly under the Poincaré Government. This has its political consequences precisely for the reason that the *Comité des Forges* is Poincaré, because the National Bloc is a direct expression of these large organisations, because it is a Government of the big trusts, banks and cartels. That is exactly what I emphasised.

Now with regard to Germany, Comrade Schatzkin ignored certain of the most important passages in my argument. For example, is it a fact or not that Germany is being transformed on the basis of electrification; is it true or not that four-fifths of the total output of electrical energy is in the hands of the State or municipal bodies? This is the technical-economic basis for the reorganisation of the whole economics of the country. Can a fundamental fact like this be ignored? And yet Comrade Schatzkin did not utter a single word on this, but advanced something altogether different as the decisive argument. But, Comrade Schatzkin, even your other "argument," your example of the railways, is absolutely useless. He said that the railways have been transferred to private companies, that the State railways were sold out and that this is an opposite process to the development of the tendency towards State capitalism. But in whose hands are the railways? Practically they are in the hands of the Reparations agent. The company which owns the railways is a special company that was established for the purpose of trans-

ferring the control of the railways to other States. As a matter of fact, the actions of the Reparations agent illustrate a clearly expressed political State principle, only it is that of other States. Other States control the railways. But to attempt to use this example for the purpose of destroying my argument is absolutely futile.

I assert that big combines like the Steel Trust have never been so closely grafted to the State, with the German Government, as they are at the present time. Secondly, I assert that four-fifths of the production of electrical energy is in the hands of the State or municipal bodies.

(Schatzkin: "Was not this the case two years ago?")

Bukharin: But it is the case now, and this tendency is growing all the time.

(Schatzkin: "Everything grows.")

Bukharin: How can one argue with him? Everything grows! You compel me to state that the value of your arguments does not grow, but, on the contrary, it declines. (Laughter and applause.) I think that I will express the general opinion if I say that in this respect Comrade Schatzkin betrays a peculiar "opposite process." (Laughter.)

It is now possible to sum up the results of the debate on this question—a debate which in my view has been fairly useful.

We observe that the development of the tendencies towards State capitalism is proceeding along two main lines. On the one hand (and this is the principal tendency) there is a process "from below" of the economic organisations of capital becoming grafted on to the organs of the State (what I have termed "the trustification" of the State); no formal aspects of State capitalism are observed, but these tendencies very strikingly and very materially are preparing the ground for State capitalism. For that reason they may be quite justly described as "tendencies in the direction of State capitalism," for they express a real process of "grafting."

On the other hand, we observe a certain growth of formal State capitalist elements (State enterprises, the ownership of shares in trusts, municipal enterprises,

nationalisation of trade unions, regulation of prices, etc., etc.). This process, as it were, proceeds "from above."

Each country has its own variation of development. It would be incorrect, rash, and harmful to skip over the various stages of development and to pronounce the present phase of development to be an "era," "period," etc., of State capitalism. But it would be equally wrong to fail to observe the above-mentioned tendencies which more and more confront the proletariat as the sum total of the forces of the combined bourgeoisie, which finds full support in Social Democratic opportunism. These are the pros and cons in this question.

Before proceeding to discuss tactical problems I desire to make just one more remark. I must say that in my opinion Comrade Lozovsky quite rightly emphasised the problem of the Labour movement in the Pacific. That in itself is correct, for as the afore-mentioned Kusma Prutkov has said: "The most remote places of the earth are near to some place or other, and the nearest places are remote from some place or other." (Laughter.) And then he gave utterance to another piece of wisdom: "Every part of the globe has its, sometimes rather curious, other part." (Laughter.) I think that Comrade Lozovsky did the right thing when he laid stress on certain particularly curious "parts" of the great continent where the Labour movement is developing for the first time. (Lozovsky: "But the Pacific Ocean is not the continent!") The Pacific Ocean is adjacent to the Continent. I did not think that the workers affiliated to the Profintern were literally swimming about in the Pacific Ocean. (Laughter and applause.)

Nevertheless, comrades, I must make one remark concerning Comrade Lozovsky's general appreciation of the problem he touched upon. I think Comrade Lozovsky when speaking of these problems considerably over-estimates our strength, i.e., the strength of the R.I.L.U. and of Communism as a whole at the present stage. Take, for example, the Australian trade union movement. Comrade Lozovsky talks of it as if it were his own and had it in his pocket. But that is not altogether the case. Representatives of the Australian trade union movement may come to

our conferences, etc., scores of times, but we know very well that the trade unionists in the Australian trade union movement are as yet, in the main, extremely reformist, and to register—I do not know how many you estimate the number—about 500,000 members of the Australian trade union movement in “your department” is a very incautious thing to do. We have certain contacts there, we are putting out feelers, we must carry on work there with increasing energy, but I personally do not expect big successes there in the immediate future. The base for our successes there is not large as yet, because the Australian workers enjoy a relatively privileged position: we have discussed with the Australian comrades the situation in their country in detail, and after a prolonged discussion we came to the conclusion that we cannot look forward to extremely rosy prospects there in the immediate future. It would be more correct to put it that way.

## 2. The Principal Line of Tactics.

Now about the principal line of tactics. I must first of all state that all the comrades who have spoken, without exception, have with complete unanimity expressed their agreement with the line of tactics recently adopted by the Executive Committee of the Comintern in relation to reformism, the tactics of the united front—especially in relation to the election campaign, and especially in relation to trade union tactics.

In parenthesis I must say, however, that as regards the last question, the question of trade union tactics, neither I nor Comrade Lozovsky, nor the comrade speaking in the name of the All-Russian Trade Unions Council, developed it in detail. The formulas which we have adopted do not by a long way solve the whole of this problem, because in each country we are confronted with a number of concrete problems which cannot be solved by general, universal formulas on the principles of work in the trade unions. A whole series of more concrete, special questions arises. For example, should we, in those countries where both reformist and our organisations exist, simultaneously recruit workers directly into our organisations? Should we pluck the organisations which have



come over to our side, but which are still affiliated to Amsterdam, out of the reformist trade unions, or, on the contrary, should we allow the matter to mature in order that our adherents may serve as a basis for internal work to win over the whole mass of the membership out of the reformist trade unions, etc., etc.? In my opinion it is impossible to have one solution for all these questions, because each country has its own special conditions which vary so much from those in other countries that we cannot tie our hands by general formulas that compel us to act in a stereotyped fashion amidst extremely diverse conditions.

However, we must emphasise with all our might that we do not change the principles of our tactics in the trade union movement, and that we do not in the least desire, in the present conditions, to come out of the reformist trade union organisations. Such an idea would be absolutely wrong, and such tactics would be harmful to the cause of the proletarian revolution. The tactics we must now carry out in a number of countries, in the domain of politics as well as in the other spheres of our work, do not in the least imply a radical change in our previous course.

However, notwithstanding the fact that all the comrades were unanimously in favour of the line of tactics which we advocated here, I still consider it to be my duty to deal with certain disagreements on tactics which became revealed in the course of the debate at this Party Congress. First of all, I must examine the arguments advanced by Comrade Losovsky concerning our slogans. In my report I put forward the postulate that at the present time we cannot, under any circumstances, put forward the slogan of the bourgeois nationalisation of enterprises, of certain industries, etc. Nor can we at the present time use the slogan of "workers' control," in so far as we are not in an immediately revolutionary situation. Comrade Losovsky argued against this rather energetically.

His chief argument concerning the question of nationalisation was as follows:—If we advocated nationalisation with compensation, it would be opportunism. If, however, we advocated nationalisation without compensation, there would be nothing opportunistic about it.

Comrade Losovsky's second argument consisted merely in a reference to practice. He said: Take England. Can we reject, say, the slogan of nationalising the coal mines, a slogan which has been continuously brought forward, which has been always supported, a slogan around which a severe class struggle has raged? He used the example of England as proof of his general thesis that we must support the slogan of nationalisation. I consider this argument to be incorrect. The fundamental conclusion I arrived at in my report was that we must, more determinedly than we have done hitherto, attack Social Democracy along the whole line. What is it that is decisive in the Social Democratic ideology and in its line of tactics? It is its *orientation* towards State capitalism; it is that it strives to drag the working class into a system of co-operation with the capitalist bourgeoisie, ranging from work in the factory councils to work in the League of Nations. This is the decisive point. Therefore, since this is the actual position adopted by Social Democracy, then we must tear down this "State capitalist" curtain from top to bottom. This must be our line of tactics. If at the present time we were to advance the slogan of nationalisation of some branch of industry—*i.e.*, its transference to the bourgeois State—then we should in no way be distinguished in principle from Social Democracy. We should then have to advocate bourgeois nationalisation, municipalisation, etc., of a number of other branches. What would the factory committees in these enterprises have to do? They would have to assist in all this. They would, little by little, crawl on to the road of capitalist rationalisation, etc. This would represent a complete line of tactics which, particularly at the present time, would be utterly wrong and opportunist.

This is how the matter stands in its essentials. And now permit me to state how the matter stood formally. On this point we have the decision of the 3rd Congress of the Comintern. 3rd Congress! Why do I lay emphasis on the 3rd Congress? I do so because at the 3rd Congress, under the leadership of Lenin, a great tactical turn-about was made, due, as has now become absolutely clear, to the transition from an immediately revolutionary situation to

a period of temporary stabilisation of capital. Consequently the 3rd Congress can be charged with anything in the world, but not with an excess of radicalism. Well, what is said in the resolutions of the 3rd Congress? In section 5, in the resolution on tactics, under the heading "Partial Struggles and Partial Demands," we read:—

"Similarly, the demand advanced by the Centrist Parties for the socialisation, or nationalisation, of the important branches of industry, but without victory over the bourgeoisie, is a deception of the masses of the people. These parties strive to divert the workers from the really vital struggle for their immediate aims in the hope of gradually capturing one industrial enterprise after another, to be followed by 'planned' economic construction. Thus the Social Democrats are reverting to the Social Democratic minimum programme, which has become converted into an obvious counter-revolutionary deception."

You see how severely the demand for nationalisation is dealt with! Considering the strong language in which this decision is formulated, I think it should be clear to everyone that the argument about whether I was right or wrong in arguing against the slogan of nationalisation was absolutely superfluous.

It is true, however, that we made an exception in the case of England. Why did we make an exception in the case of England? In England a fierce struggle has raged around that question; this slogan has been a tradition among even revolutionary proletarian groups. An exception was made in the case of England because this slogan had strong traditions and because the fight was actually proceeding around it. It is well known that we make a number of other exceptions in the case of England. For example, we recommend remaining in the Labour Party, notwithstanding the fact that the leadership of that Party is utterly decayed. Lenin presented the arguments for these tactics in a number of his works. It is precisely the exceptional position of England that prohibits us from generalising these exceptions and converting them into a rule.

What is the situation with regard to the slogan of control of production? In the resolution on tactics of the

3rd Congress to which I have referred, the question of the slogan of control of industry is very precisely formulated. The resolution says :—

“To the extent that the fight for partial demands and the partial struggle of separate groups of workers grows into a general struggle of the working class against capitalism, the Communist Party must also deepen its slogans and combine them under the single slogan of—Overthrow the enemy. In advancing their partial demands the Communist Party must see to it that these demands, while corresponding to the requirements of the broad masses, shall not only lead these masses into the fight, but by their very nature serve as an organising principle. All the concrete slogans arising from the economic needs of the masses of the workers must be diverted into the channel of the struggle for the control of production, not on the basis of a plan of bureaucratic organisation of national economy under the capitalist régime, but through the medium of factory councils and revolutionary trade unions.”

In other words, it is directly stated here that to the extent that the labour struggle becomes combined, and to the extent that this struggle becomes transformed into a struggle for power, to that extent we must deepen our slogans and combine our economic demands with the demand for labour control.

But this means that the question of the slogan of labour control is linked up with a growing revolutionary situation. I do not object to this slogan in general; in a growing, immediate, revolutionary situation it is absolutely correct. But it is absolutely incorrect at the present time, when there is not an immediate revolutionary situation. The slogan of control of industry becomes utterly wrong if it is combined with the slogan of bourgeois nationalisation, because it then acquires a direct Social Democratic orientation.

### 3. Right and “ Left ” Deviations.

I come now to the question concerning Right and Left deviations. First of all, I will deal with what Com-

rade Schatzkin has said. Comrade Schatzkin, generally speaking, quite correctly supplemented the facts I quoted concerning Right deviations and the mistakes of a Right Wing nature, committed by the various Parties. I must observe, however, that in two instances Comrade Schatzkin sinned against truth; for example, when he said concerning the French Party that "A considerable group of French comrades are adopting the position of supporting the radicals along the whole line," he said what was not true. The group of wavering comrades—members of the Political Bureau, to whom Comrade Schatzkin referred, do not advocate support for the Radicals "*along the whole line*"—(Schatzkin: "This shows that you are badly informed!") No, I am quite adequately "informed," and on several occasions I have spoken about this with a number of French comrades. In my opinion you exaggerate this point. Comrade Schatzkin exaggerates a second time when he asserts that lately in Germany the Right group has become more crystallised, whereas up till recently it did not dare even to squeak. I regard this statement also to be incorrect. Only a little while ago comparatively a large section of the former Right Wingers combined with the so-called Ernst Meyer group. Here in Moscow, with our support and assistance, an agreement was concluded between Comrade Meyer's group and the Central Committee by which Comrade Meyer, as the leader of this ex-Right Wing group, signed a declaration to the effect that he abandoned his past errors and will work in conjunction with the Central Committee. We placed the leaders of this group, which had so worked in Germany, on the road to consolidation with the Central Committee, and they are now working together fairly well. This is a fact. What does it prove? Does it prove the growth, the crystallisation of a Right Wing group, or the contrary? In my opinion it proves the contrary, and no one can deny it. A little while ago Comrade Meyer, who headed this group, in which Gerhard was practically the leader—(Schatzkin: "This is not true")—you may shake your head as much as you like, but I say that it is true, and everyone who is at all acquainted with the life of the German Party is aware of it. (Schatzkin: "I can speak, too.")

Very well then, Comrade Meyer at one time stood in opposition to the policy of the Central Committee, and now he supports that policy. This is a real fact which cannot be denied. These are the two rather material remarks I desired to make on the actual state of affairs. •

With regard to the position laid down by Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadze on the question of the character and the relationship of the deviations in the Comintern, it seems to me that these two comrades to a certain extent have given things a wrong turn. What was this turn? To my mind it is that Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadze, but particularly Comrade Schatzkin, under-estimate the Trotskyist danger in the Comintern. Secondly, they under-estimate the fact that the Trotskyists of the "Left" stamp, in the conventional sense of the term, have combined with the avowedly Right Wing elements, i.e., that Trotskyism has grown into Menshevism. (Schatzkin: "I spoke about that.") Wait a minute. Herein lies the error of the statements of Comrades Lominadze and Schatzkin. Don't be in a hurry. I will show your mistakes immediately. These comrades juggle with things like the following. Lominadze says: "If we eliminate, to use Bukharin's favourite expression, i.e., if we eliminate completely from our analysis the question of Trotsky's circles, Rights and Lefts, call them as you will, then what is left are Right Wing errors. Such, for example, is Comrade Lominadze's formula. Comrade Schatzkin's formula is as follows: Let us leave Trotskyists alone, let us see what is going on in our own Communist International, this enormous machine which manipulates a number of parties, etc., etc. Is this a correct presentation of the question? I consider it to be incorrect. What does Comrade Schatzkin mean when he says, for example: What is going on in our own Communist International? What does this mean? It means Let us inquire into those groups which now exist within the framework of our Communist International and are not expelled from it. What other meaning can this have? (Schatzkin: "Not being in the Trotskyist International.")

(Voice: "He has got himself muddled up.")

Bukharin: When you say "In our own Comintern," can anyone who has retained common sense and a good

memory take this to mean anything else but that in taking the Communist International together with all its component parts we do not take Ruth Fischer (expelled), Maslow (expelled) who are not in our international? It can be taken to mean only that. Now I ask you, can we "eliminate" from our Communist International" the Trotskyist or semi-Trotskyist elements and say that we are one hundred per cent. pure? No, we cannot. The situation at the present moment is that the Trotskyists in our parties abroad are manœuvring in the same way as they are manœuvring in our C.P.S.U. What is Maslow, for example, doing? Does he call upon all his adherents to leave the Communist Party? Not at all! He keeps control of his small party and has his tentacles in our Communist Party. It is here precisely that the danger lies. It implies that these elements still exist in "our own Communist International." Is it true that they are becoming, as is the Trotskyist Opposition in our country, the centre of attraction of all the "discontented"? In the other Communist Parties and in the Communist International the Trotskyist groups are also becoming the centre of attraction of all those who are discontented with the régime, with the policy and tactics of the Comintern. Is that right or not? (Schatzkin: "Not altogether.") It is absolutely right. I will tell you in a moment what kind of discontented ones. All the "discontented," who are now forming their own tendencies and factions, who are conducting a factional fight against the Comintern, who hold to a complete system of erroneous views, are striving towards them. The argument that an ultra-Left wing exists that stands to the Left of us, and of which Trotskyism is the embodiment, is exceedingly wrong.

(Schatzkin: "But who says that?")

Bukharin: You ought not to repeat like a parrot "Who says that?" I say that you under-estimate the Trotskyist danger in the Comintern itself; and permit me to say why you, in my opinion, under-estimate it. I quoted an example—Roland Holst, who recently joined a Catholic society or some other mystical or religious society from which she resigned subsequently as a result of our insistence; who even, prior to the war, associated with Trotsky;

who now advocates our amalgamation with the Second International, and who sent us the Christian message which I quoted—she is a most ardent adherent of Trotsky. Mannuri, who is also a “Christian”-minded lover of humanity, whose letter I quoted to you; he is a most ardent adherent of Trotsky, although he writes that he does not understand anything about our “scissors,” etc.

Dr. Pollack is also an ardent adherent of Trotsky. Souvarine—they all associate with Trotsky. This is a real fact; and this cannot be eliminated. If you do not speak of the groups outside of the Communist International, but of those which are inside the Communist International, then you must note in the first place that the groups outside of the Comintern have their tentacles inside the Comintern in the shape of certain groups that are still inside it. What we are discussing now is nothing more or less than the tendency for the groups to set up their own “International.”

This must be understood! How can anyone, speaking on the question of the Comintern, “eliminate” this problem—this most important international problem? Let us examine this from the point of view of “high politics.” Tell me, please, how does this or that Right wing error committed by this or that Communist Party, no matter how serious, compare with, say, the “Thermidor” campaign (Right wing! Social Democratic! but in actual fact counter-revolutionary!) against the U.S.S.R., which is being conducted by all these Trotskyist groups? Why, this treacherous campaign far exceeds all the rest because it is the most important political question, because from the point of view of “high politics” there is no question more important than this. Hence, it is precisely this question that represents the criterion for the estimation of the danger. I will try to approach the estimation of this question from another angle.

If we discuss, not the broad contours of foreign politics, but the important problem of winning over the masses, what do we find is the most detrimental from this point of view? I frankly assert that not a single group has done us so much harm in this matter as the Trotskyist opposition (being a barrier on the road to our winning over the



masses). (Voice: "Quite true!") The Social Democratic workers, who are coming towards us on a wide front and who are full of sympathy towards the U.S.S.R., must now contend not only against official Social Democratic slander, but also against the slander that is poured out from the alleged Communist camp. Tseretelli is now conducting a campaign in Stockholm against us, in the course of which the first weapon he uses is Trotsky. "Vorwärts" quotes from the Opposition platform, and so it is everywhere. Everywhere Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie are now carrying "our" oppositionists on their shields. Just as within the U.S.S.R. the Opposition is dangerous because of its appeals to the "third force," so in capitalist countries it now serves as the megaphone for Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie standing behind it. It is "the vehicle of bourgeois influence over the proletariat"; for all the enemies of the U.S.S.R., of the C.P.S.U. and of the Comintern clutch at them and utilise them. Therefore to attempt logically and formally to "eliminate" this question is a virtue of a low order, because it means to fail to see big things, to fail to see the wood for the trees. Comrade Schatzkin himself betrayed tiny waverings in regard to the Opposition. It is quite probable that his present "turn" is connected with this circumstance.

Quite naturally the under-estimation of the Trotskyist danger within the Communist International leads to serious consequences. Comrade Lominadze advanced the postulate that the mistakes made by the Parties and the Party leadership were primarily of a Right Wing order. This is not true. With regard to this, I must ask: Is it true or not that, although they committed these errors, which I do not deny in the least, the Central Committees of the various Parties, with the aid of the Comintern, rectified them, desired to rectify them and carried out the instructions of the Executive Committee who pointed the errors out to them? There are mistakes and "mistakes." Some mistakes become congealed into a factional system, they are fought over, they are insisted upon, they are "deepened," they are converted into a "theory." This is one type of mistake. The other type is: they are made but afterwards rectified. Comrades Schatzkin and Lominadze,

who are very well informed about the activities of the Communist International, must agree with me on this point. Comrade Schatzkin in his speech openly declared that the Communist International combated these mistakes, that it uttered warnings against them and rectified them. This is a fact. But did we in "rectifying" these mistakes, as a rule, meet with any resistance? No. In the overwhelming majority of cases the instructions of the C.I. were immediately "noted and acted upon." To fail to observe this means to be unjust to the leading cadres of the overwhelming majority of the Sections.

Do we, does the Comintern, deny the Right wing danger? Not a bit.

The question of the Right wing danger can be formulated somewhat differently. A number of Parties, which have not yet come under the shrapnel fire of the enemy, may experience considerable internal crises in coming events. (Voice: "True.") I do not deny for a moment that such crises may break out in the French Party, in the Czecho-Slovak Party, and other big Parties who have never yet been under direct shrapnel fire. We do not in the least ignore this; on the contrary, we recognise that the Right wing danger exists and that it is fairly considerable. But this is not the point under discussion. At a meeting which took place in the Comintern, Comrade Schatzkin advanced the thesis that the Right wing dangers are growing with extreme rapidity in the Communist International. With this thesis I do not agree. It is true that at this Party Congress Comrade Schatzkin kept this thesis in his pocket, or in his portfolio, I don't know. (Schatzkin: "I said that the Right wing danger has grown.") I agree that a Right wing danger has existed and exists now, but I do not agree with the postulate that it has grown in recent times among the leading circles in the Sections of the Comintern. If it has grown at all it has grown in the shape of the Trotskyist groups, in the process of the ex-ultra Leftist growth into Menshevism. This is the crux of the matter. In so far as Right wing errors are committed (and will be committed) by the leading cadres of our Sections, we must combat them with all our might; we must rectify them, we

must warn against them beforehand; we must carefully and systematically watch for the slightest errors in this direction, for even comparatively insignificant errors (if they are not resisted) may grow into errors of great political significance.

#### 4. The Question of the Chinese Revolution.

A few brief remarks concerning the Chinese revolution. Comrade Lominadze delivered what was on the whole a very interesting speech and I think that all the comrades listened to him with pleasure. However, Comrade Lominadze's speech contains several obvious exaggerations.

First remark. Comrade Lominadze submitted a very vague definition of feudalism. The principal point at issue is not what sort of feudalism exists in China, a "special sort" or a "European sort," but whether feudalism exists at all in China. This point is closely connected with the estimation of classes; for the denial of feudalism was linked up with the denial of the existence of a landlord class (Radek, for example), which in its turn led to further consequences. Comrade Lominadze, however, laid stress on the form of feudalism and did it in such a way that all present associated him with those who deny the existence of feudalism in China.

Second remark. Comrade Lominadze concentrated his mind on a "witty" definition of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Statements to the effect that the bourgeoisie does not represent a class, and that what we have are individual bourgeois, are obviously wrong. It does not follow that because we assert that a process is going on of various bourgeois groups being formed as a result of mutual rivalry, therefore we deny the existence of the bourgeoisie as a social class force. Clearly we have before us a case of exaggeration, a case of reducing what in principle is a correct idea to absurdity.

In the main, I absolutely agree with the prognosis made by Comrade Lominadze concerning the Chinese revolution. I have already stressed in my report that we have absolutely no reason to be pessimistic in regard

to the Chinese revolution and that we are undoubtedly on the threshold of new revolutionary outbreaks.

With regard to the speech delivered by Comrade Myff, his analysis of the question of feudalism in China may be regarded as absolutely correct. Comrade Myff, in my opinion, quite rightly took the "Asiatic method of production" as a "form of the manifestation" of feudalism in the broad sense of the term. The peculiar character of this feudalism is reflected and expressed in the peculiar character of the landlord class in China and in the special features of its economic and political life. Only on this basis can the problem of the agrarian revolution be properly understood.

But with regard to Comrade Myff's speech I must also make two reservations.

Firstly, I do not agree with the thesis concerning the possibility of Chinese Stolypinism. Its practical probability is equal to zero. China has not the reserves of vacant land which could be manipulated for the purpose of solving the fundamental contradictions of Chinese economics "à la Russe." The Stolypin policy, which was based on the "prosperous" farmer, pre-supposed, not only the law of the 9th of November, but also a real redistribution of land (the mobilisation of lands, through private purchases, through the peasant bank, etc., etc.). This path is closed in China; it lacks the economic basis in its principal territories.

Secondly, I think that Comrade Myff has improperly brought to the forefront the fight against the Chinese kulak. This is not the question of the moment. The question of the moment is the abolition of the landlord class. It goes without saying that in those places (conditions in China vary considerably) where the kulak fights on the side of the landlord against the masses of the peasantry, he too must be fought, but this is not the way Comrade Myff presents the question.

With regard to the tactical conclusions to be drawn on the question of the Chinese revolution, it seems to me that no material differences were revealed on the subject in the course of the debate, although quite a number of comrades took part in it and dealt with it in detail.

I now draw to a close. What lesson can we learn from the debate that is taking place here? All you comrades now see that in spite of the considerable difficulties that have confronted the leadership, the Comintern has drawn up a correct line of tactics which apparently will be unanimously approved at this Party Congress. In future we must systematically anticipate and rectify errors; we will do that as we have done up till now; but we may say that in spite of the enormous difficulties that have confronted us during the past two years, taken on the whole, the balance of our work is favourable. The Communist Parties have displayed great unanimity in the fight against our Opposition and with Trotskyism in the Comintern generally. Our Party has received enormous support from the other Parties in its fight against the Trotskyist Menshevist deviation. Our Party received this aid because it is the great Party of the International Workers' Revolution.

Comrades, in all probability we shall be faced with a series of big battles. We do not know when these battles will commence; we cannot fix their date beforehand. But we are firmly convinced that in the great contests between labour and capital, which we are destined by the whole progress of history to enter, we shall have hardened, brave and sufficiently experienced cadres leading the broad masses of the working class, who will be at their posts when the war trumpets blow.

Unlike the Social Democratic parties and the other parties and groups of our enemies, we lack the ability to advertise our own work, the heroism of the Communist Parties and of its individual warriors, our successes and our trials. The Comintern loses thousands and thousands of its men; the bourgeois White Terror is aimed directly against us. Every day we Communists send out cohorts of gallant fighters and real martyrs in the cause of the working class. Comrade Lominadze related to you what is taking place in China. But, notwithstanding all the horrors of the White Terror, we Communists—in China, in Poland, in the Balkans, in Italy—again and again send forth our ranks of dauntless warriors, who fear nothing, who suffer and harden themselves in order to lead Labour's

columns into battle. Comrades, we are now beginning to grow, the basis for the growth of the Comintern is again expanding. We Communists must sustain this movement; we must intensify our work among the masses; we must more boldly, more strenuously and determinedly come out as organisations which are the only revolutionary working-class organisations, the only revolutionary workers' parties.

We must more boldly and determinedly enter the fight against both our capitalist and against our Social Democratic enemies. We must more determinedly eliminate the various remnants of wavering and pessimism.

We need have no fear for the future; for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is growing. The mighty Chinese revolution is growing. The broad columns of the European working class are wheeling to the Left, and we will march forward, maintaining within our own ranks an iron unity under the banner of Leninism, under the banner of the militant Communist International. (Loud and prolonged applause. Delegates rise and give Comrade Bukharin an ovation. All sing the "International.")

**RESOLUTION**  
**on the Report of the C.P.S.U. Delegation to**  
**the E.C.C.I.**  
**(Unanimously Adopted)**

Having heard and discussed Comrade Bukharin's report, the 15th Congress approves of the activities of the C.P.S.U. delegation to the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

The Congress records that the period under report is characterised by an accentuation of the main contradictions both within the world capitalist system and between the capitalist world and the U.S.S.R. ; the accentuation in this connection of the war menace is primarily a menace of war against the U.S.S.R. ; a sharp accentuation of the colonial problem in general and the development of the great Chinese Revolution in particular ; a beginning of a new accentuation of the class struggle between the European working class and the bourgeoisie.

The partial stabilisation of capitalism has not eliminated, but, on the contrary, increased the development of, antagonisms between individual imperialist countries and their groupings. The growth of production, the restoration of trade relations, and the stabilisation of the financial credit system raise before the bourgeoisie very acutely the problem of markets, sources of raw material and spheres for capital investment. The transference of the centre of world capitalism to the United States, the industrial decline and parasitic decay of Great Britain, the discrepancies between the growing productive forces and the limitations of the Dawes Plan in Germany, the Balkanisation of Europe, the impoverishment of the masses and the contraction of the home market—all these bring the attempt at a new re-division of the world among the imperialist robbers nearer,

and make new armed encounters and war catastrophes more inevitable.

Side by side with the extreme accentuation of the international situation and international relations there is also a considerable growth of class antagonisms and the other struggle. Capitalist stabilisation is enforced at the expense of a systematic deterioration of the standard of living and intensification of the exploitation of the working class. The process of stabilisation is accompanied by unemployment, which is several times greater than before the war. After a prolonged period of relative quietness we have now a new rise in the revolutionary Labour movement and a considerable radicalisation of the broad working masses. All this shows an intensified process of the downfall of capitalist stabilisation.

The radicalisation of the working masses is countered by sharp veerings to the right of the heads of the 2nd Amsterdam Internationals. The Social Democrats, openly renouncing the class struggle, has gone over entirely to the bourgeoisie, trying to permeate the working masses with the idea of class collaboration (so-called "Americanisation" of the Labour movement, the ideology of "industrial peace," and the policy of collaboration), and by deceiving the working class with a prospect of a "peaceful" transition to Socialism through "industrial democracy" within capitalist countries, and a new period of "peaceful" capitalism (by democratisation of the so-called "League of Nations") in the sphere of international relations.

On the basis of the beginning of the revolutionary rise of the Labour movement, the most important task of the Communist International is to accentuate the international struggle against reformism, which comprises also a struggle against the Trotskyist Opposition, that disrupts the united front policy in the international Labour movement and hampers the work of winning the working masses over to Communism.

The Congress deems it necessary to intensify the struggle for trade union unity, to begin the mass work of the Communist Parties in the ranks of the working masses (particularly in the trade unions), and also to strengthen in every way the Profintern and the Minority Movements



side by side with the energetic development of the united front tactic and the struggle for the removal of the Social Democratic leaders of the reformist bureaucracy from their positions (the General Council, etc.). In this connection the Congress considers it necessary to establish closer contact and more active relations between the Profintern and the A.R.T.U.C.

The offensive of world capitalism on the working class finds its most concentrated expression in the preparation of war against the U.S.S.R. The influence and revolutionary activity of the U.S.S.R. in the capitalist world has largely increased and become stronger owing to the fact that despite the bourgeoisie, the Social Democratic and Trotskyist slander, the U.S.S.R. is, in the opinion of the toilers of the world, now a country engaged in the building of Socialism. The building up of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and its economic transformation represent at the present time the most important element in the world revolutionary movement. The Congress recognises the slogan of defence of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Revolution, which was advanced by the last plenum of the E.C.C.I., to be absolutely correct and the main slogan of the moment. The attitude to the question of defence of the U.S.S.R. constitutes the dividing line between revolution and counter-revolution. We see a spontaneous process of radicalisation of the masses in the growth of active sympathy for the U.S.S.R. among ever-larger sections of toilers. Despite all kinds of hypocritical manoeuvres on this question, we also see the true nature of Social Democracy which is actually helping the imperialists to start war against the U.S.S.R.

In close connection with the slogan of defence of the U.S.S.R., there is also the question of the defence of the colonial revolutions, particularly the Chinese revolution. Despite the temporary defeat of the Chinese revolution, particularly the crushing of the Canton Soviet rising, the Chinese revolution is still alive and gathering its forces for a new beginning and a broader offensive all along the front. The new rise in the revolutionary movement of China will take place on a new foundation. The Nationalist Chinese bourgeoisie has exhausted its revolutionary possibilities and has definitely gone over to the

service of international imperialism. The Kuomintang has become a direct instrument of the counter-revolutionary military cliques. The Chinese revolution can, and will, develop at the present time exclusively as a revolution of workers, peasants and the urban poor under the Soviet banner and the leadership of the working class.

The Communist Party, which made opportunist mistakes, was able to change its leadership and is now re-arranging its ranks so as to be able to fight victoriously in the cause of the Chinese Revolution under the banner of Soviets of workers and peasants.

The extraordinary complexity of the tasks facing the Communist proletariat requires absolute ideological unity and iron organisational solidity in the ranks of the Comintern. The Congress places on record that the Sections of the Comintern and its Executive Committee rendered cordial and wholehearted support to the C.P.S.U. in the struggle against the Trotskyist Opposition, whose conduct the E.C.C.I. branded as a betrayal of Communism. The Trotskyist Opposition, which, definitely deviating from Leninism adopted a Menshevist liquidatory platform, helped and is now helping by its slander the worst enemies of the U.S.S.R., the openly carried on unprecedentedly audacious disruptive work, rallied to its banners the worst renegades and disrupters from Korsch and Ruth Fisher to Souvarine and Liebers. Such Opposition cannot be tolerated any longer in the ranks of the Comintern. Our task is now to purge the Comintern thoroughly of all anti-Communist elements rallying to the Trotskyist Opposition.

During the last two years, despite individual opportunist errors in several Communist Parties which were systematically rectified by the leadership of the E.C.C.I., the Bolshevisation of the Comintern Sections has made further considerable successes. The Congress expresses the conviction that the Comintern leadership will achieve the further Bolshevisation of its ranks and their further training in the spirit of genuine Leninism. Of particular importance from this point of view, the Congress regards on the one hand the overcoming of parliamentary traditions and illusions and a determined struggle against Opportunist deviations in general and on the other hand

strengthening and developing in every way of mass work and work in the trade unions.

The most important Sections of the Comintern, and the Communist International as a whole, have developed sufficiently, both ideologically and organisationally, to take the lead politically in the new rise of the Labour movement and direct it along a revolutionary channel.

The Congress instructs the C.C. of the Party to help in every way the further strengthening of the Comintern, to raise its authority among the proletarian masses, and increase its work in general, especially its organisational apparatus.

# THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

## Comrade Rykov's Report

### I. THE ECONOMIC SITUATION.

A distinguishing feature of the economic situation is the series of unfavourable, unhealthy phenomena in the development of home trade apparent during the last quarter of the last financial year which are felt to this day. The facts of the existing conditions of our economics, being expressed in the accentuation of the shortage of manufactured goods on the market and in some cases also the shortage of flour, are generally known to all of you at this Congress.

Under what conditions do we encounter these difficulties of the buying capacity of the population being greater than the supply of goods? In considering the peculiarity of these difficulties we cannot pass over the circumstance that the mass of merchandise now brought to the market is in volume considerably greater than last year. We, therefore, experience a certain commodity famine under the conditions of a higher supply of goods compared with last year. The discrepancy between the supply and demand takes place on a higher stage of development of economy as a whole and at a higher level of satisfying the requirements of the broad masses of the population. According to the control figures of the State Planning Commission, the volume of manufactured goods in large-scale industry must increase more than 13 per cent. in 1927-28, prices remaining stable. This increase in the supply is, however, counter-balanced by a still greater increase in the demand. This results on the one hand from the greater income of the population (particularly at the end of last and the beginning of this year), in view of

the reduced prices of manufactured goods, higher wages and income of peasantry in marketing farm products and handicraft, etc., and on the other by a certain influence of non-economic factors. (The accentuation of foreign political relations.)

An acute shortage in manufactured goods arose because of the discrepancy—so typical for our economy—between the period when the basic mass of farm products reached the market and the growth of industrial output. According to figures given me, the general situation on the market in the fourth quarter compared with the corresponding period of 1925-26 is described as follows: Means of production have increased, taking the reduced prices into account, by  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., the aggregate wage of workers employed in State industry increased 16 per cent.; the income of the peasantry (from the grain purchase of the State, excluding the agricultural tax) increased 31 per cent.; the general buying capacity of town and country increased a little over 20 per cent.

It is possible that these figures are not accurate. But on the whole it seems to me they reflect the tendencies characterising our economic situation at the beginning of this financial year.

Are these difficulties and discrepancies in the development of trade an index of a general economic crisis? Is not the commodity exchange between town and country as a whole unbalanced? Such are the questions we face in discussing the present economic situation of the Union. It seems to me that there is no reason for characterising our situation this way. In analysing the economic relations between town and country we usually deal with the figures concerning the grain purchases, whereas the income from this item will on the whole hardly constitute more than 20 per cent. of the entire peasant income. The peasants have derived their remaining income from domestic animals, commercial crops and handicraft. If we regard the relations between town and country, not from the point of view of buying and selling grain, but from the point of view of domestic animals, commercial crops and other farm produce, we will find

this year a considerably higher turnover in the villages than was the case before.

These are the main figures concerning the purchases of such farm products in October, 1927, as compared with the same month in 1926. In October, 1927, bigger purchases were made than the previous year of the following products: Flax, 51 per cent.; sunflower seeds, 54 per cent.; hemp, 104.7 per cent.; beets, 53.9 per cent.; cotton, 24.7 per cent.; butter, 12 per cent.; eggs, 53 per cent.; meat, 58 per cent.; hides, 25 per cent.; wool, 23 per cent., etc.

## II. THE MAIN IDEA OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN.

The main idea of the five-year plan arises out of our former decisions on economic construction. It is the idea of industrialisation of the country as the main way to organise Socialist economy. We must take full account of this fact, that the realisation of this plan is connected with the overcoming of numerous obstacles and hardships. Some of these hardships, as I already said in characterising the economic situation, are to be felt even now. With an inadequately efficient guidance in the economic life of the country these difficulties may at different moments deprive out national economy of its equilibrium, and result in temporary, partial and general economic difficulties. The plan must be so elaborated that these economic difficulties and fluctuations in the situation may be reduced to the lowest possible minimum. That, by the way, is the importance of the directives brought to the attention of the Congress for the elaboration of the five-year plan. They map out the basic points of possible complications and contradictions in the development of our national economy, and point out the method for their elimination.

### The Problem of Accumulation.

The fact that the reorganisation of national economy on the basis of industrial development and the development of agriculture are now faced by the necessity of vast new investments constitutes a considerable part of our difficulties. The general tempo of our Socialist construction, and the possibility of guaranteeing a painless transition from one

phase of economic development to another, depends on the amount we shall be able to take from the national revenue, and from the lines along which we will invest these resources.

Is it possible to solve the difficulties arising therefrom by taking a greater share from the savings of private capital? It stands to reason that we cannot guarantee that everything that can be taken for the requirements of the country from the private capitalist branch of economy has been taken at the present time. Probably we have now many shortcomings in the sphere of taxation of private capital. In some cases we probably take sufficient, in others perhaps even more than what we should take, and in others again not enough. But it would be a big mistake to regard the private capitalist branch of economy as an unfathomable and ever-growing source of taxation. Our policy hitherto led to a decline in the importance of private capital in national economy. In the course of the next five years the rôle of private capital must fall much lower when compared with what it is now. We shall have two dividing lines; one the one hand a rising curve of industrial and agricultural investment, and on the other a declining curve of the private capitalist sector in national economy as a whole. This process of intensive elimination of private capital excludes the possibility of finding a means of solving the general problem of capital investment by raising the taxes on private capital.

The other supposition that the industrialisation of the country can be realised in the course of several years only by transferring increasingly large funds from other economic branches, particularly peasant economy, into industry, is also wrong. Such transfer of funds (of course, within certain limits) is unavoidable and admissible only at the given phase of development when industry has not yet sufficiently grown up, and does not yet stand firmly on its feet. But in future, when industry becomes stronger and the level of industrial development of the country rises much higher than now, the reverse possibility is conceivable, namely, the transfer of funds from industry into agriculture for its more intensive development along Socialist lines.

### III. ACCUMULATION AND AGRICULTURE.

In the sphere of agriculture, the question of its reconstruction by investing new capital in it is of a different character. In the sphere of State industry, State trade, and, to a considerable extent, of co-operation, we are in a position to fix, on the basis of the balance, the exact extent of accumulation, and utilise the accumulations in a centralised and systematic manner. In the rural districts accumulation takes place in millions of individual enterprises, and we cannot direct such accumulated resources by the same methods and success or as systematically as we can resources in the socialised branch of economy.

The distance between the level of our agriculture and the level of agriculture in the advanced capitalist countries is much greater than, for instance, between the level of development of our textile industry and the textile industry of Germany, Great Britain and America. The vast mass of the peasants still carry on their farming along the paths laid down by centuries of routine.

In industry we possess all advantages resulting from the very nature of large-scale industry and a comparatively high technique. The October Revolution added to the advantages of large-scale production the Socialist character of our industry and the full possibility of systematic guidance.

In agriculture we have a large number of small and very small productive units where the advantages of large-scale production are absent, as in every other case of petty, individual enterprise. Large-scale kulak farming, because of technical productive possibilities and the fact that primarily it is large-scale production, is more promising. It possesses under similar conditions considerable general advantages, not only profits, but also from the point of view of the advantages of the application of more advanced technique. Better technique in the poor and also the middle enterprises often costs much more than in big enterprises. In relation to the very small peasant enterprises, Comrade Molotov told me that many of them cannot even support their own horses.

In what direction must a radical change be made in



agriculture? It must be made in the direction of large-scale farming, with the help of co-operation and collective enterprise. With all forces of the State and the Party, we shall curtail the exploiting tendencies of the Kulak, and help in every way the poor and middle peasants. But it is necessary to bring this prospect of agricultural development along the paths of large-scale farming to the mind of the poor and middle peasants and the peasantry as a whole. Therein lies one of the main tasks in the sphere of agriculture. Accumulation in agriculture, in contradistinction to accumulation in the branch of State economy, takes place in millions of disjointed, inadequately organised peasant households. A stimulus must be created for the direction of these private accumulations in such a way as to assist in the merging of the peasantry for the organisation of agriculture on the basis of large-scale productive units.

#### IV. LIGHT AND HEAVY INDUSTRY.

The question of accumulation in national economy is related also to the question of a more expedient distribution of resources between the various branches, particularly between heavy and light industry. I have already received several notes complaining that light industry is being injured, that its inadequate development has already caused complications on the market this year, and that in the five-year plan it is necessary so to divide resources in its favour as absolutely to exclude the possibility of occasional hitches on the market. In a conversation with comrades who share this point of view, I told them that I should object to their ideas at the Congress. (Voices: "Quite right!") We cannot develop heavy industry with our own means, without any help from abroad, and safeguard at the same time a full economic development also in all other directions. Many branches of heavy industry are still below the pre-war level. But even the pre-war level was not high. A more rapid rate of development in heavy industry in the course of the next few years is absolutely necessary. The industrialisation of the whole country, apart from defence, is based at the present time on the development of heavy industry. On the development of heavy industry, and par-

ticularly machinery, depends also the development of light industry and agriculture. Our dependence in the sphere of heavy industry on foreign countries is particularly great. We can solve the task of the development of heavy industry, and we shall solve it with our own resources, even though this should prevent us from liquidating the so-called commodity famine in the course of the next few years. Hitherto, not a single country was able to restore and develop its heavy industry without extensive help from other countries. If we want to develop heavy industry—and we must do so—with our own resources, then we will have to suffer for it for some time. There is no way out for us.

#### V. THE UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEM.

Another problem of the five-year plan I wish to deal with is the problem of unemployment and culture. Without going into details about the actual state of unemployment, which has been sufficiently elucidated in the Press, I want to point out certain specific difficulties which are at the present time connected with the surplus agrarian population. How do capitalist States usually solve the difficulties connected with the surplus agrarian population? Primarily, by means of mass emigration. We do not put any obstacles in the way of emigration to other countries, but, nevertheless, this does not develop into palpable dimensions. Moreover, we notice a contrary phenomenon, namely, immigration.

The path of elimination of the surplus agrarian population by emigration is almost entirely closed to us. True, there are vast territories in the Soviet Union suitable for the migration of the surplus population; but this requires such big investments that during the next few years we shall hardly be able to exert any decisive influence in this way either for the benefit of unemployment or the surplus agrarian population. Therefore, the questions of unemployment and surplus agrarian population should be dealt with, first of all, by the intensification of agriculture, the development of crops, which require more labour, and the development of industry. In connection with the introduction of the seven-hour day during the coming year, the

number of workers employed in industry must increase considerably. But even under these conditions we shall hardly be able, in the course of the next few years, to solve the problems of unemployment and surplus agrarian population entirely.

In discussing the unemployment problem, we all usually commit the same mistake as to figures. All unemployed of all labour categories, of all districts, are bundled together, and one prescription is written for all of them in the struggle against unemployment. This is wrong. We have special kinds of unemployment. For instance, we can hardly combat unemployment in White Russia and the border districts of the Ukraine with the same ways and means that are applicable when combating unemployment among the industrial workers in Leningrad and Moscow. The method of employing labour power and the struggle against unemployment vary not only in the various branches of labour, but also in different districts. It appears that there are no unemployed in the Union of skilled industrial workers. Individual cases of unemployment in this category are purely a result of bad organisation in the employment and distribution of skilled labour power throughout the Union. In many districts work could be provided by the irrigation, or drainage of soil, as the cultivated areas would be increased thereby for the benefit of the neighbouring surplus rural population. A considerable section of the unemployed of Moscow and Leningrad and other big towns are intellectual workers, whilst at the same time there is a great shortage in intellectual labour in the provinces and rural districts.

Unemployment among intellectual workers can hardly be overcome in the same way as among industrial workers. The first measure in combating unemployment among intellectual workers is to stop classifying as unemployed those who prefer unemployment in the towns rather than work in the villages. (Voices: "Hear, hear!" Applause.) Further, it is necessary to make a considerable increase in meeting the cultural requirements of the population, particularly in the provinces, and in many cases to improve the position of educational workers.

## VI. THE PROBLEMS OF CULTURE.

Questions of culture, which I shall touch on briefly, are also closely connected with this. In the first place, I think that there is absolutely no doubt that our cultural development lags considerably behind our economic development, and the rising standard of living of the workers and peasants. (Voices: "Quite so!")

Secondly, I think that the materialisation of our industrial plan and the economic boom in the future cannot proceed without a parallel rise in the cultural level of the country.

Thirdly, I think that the cultural requirements of the workers and peasants do not occupy an adequate position in their budget, not because they have no cultural requirements, but because we have not yet learned how to meet these requirements.

Fourthly, I think that with the further growth of our budget, from next year, we must make comparatively larger grants for cultural purposes than even for economic reconstruction. We cannot divorce the economic from the cultural revolution. A discrepancy in this sphere may cost us too dearly. (Voices: "Hear, hear!") And if with the rising material level of the workers and peasants we are unable to utilise their yearning for knowledge and culture, it will be reflected most painfully in all our work, in the whole life of the country, in the entire work of building up a Socialist society. To lag behind on the cultural front is hardly less dangerous than to lag behind in the reconstruction of one branch of our economy or another, or our industry. It is essential that all of us should clearly realise that at the given stage of development, culture is just as important for our successful economic construction as ammunition is in time of war. Without a rapid cultural development we cannot reconstruct our economy as it should be.

## VII. NEW TASKS AND THE ORGANISATION OF THE MASSES.

I have already had occasion to point out that the system of economic organisation which developed during the restoration period, and the methods of work of our

social and economic organisations which we inherited from that period, cannot be considered adequate for the realisation of new tasks—the reconstruction of the economic system of the whole country under the conditions of a powerful growth in the activity of the working class and the toiling masses in general.

Remember for a moment the period of war Communism and the forces which were then behind the Party. Lenin spoke at that time of a thin layer of the working class (because the working class was then scattered) which supported the Party to the end and unhesitatingly, and nevertheless, based on this thin layer, we overcame the tremendous difficulties connected with the civil war, the food crisis, the breakdown of economy, etc. We did that with comparatively small resources, either material or human. We have done so because we were able to make thorough use of all those who were then with the Party. Just as we were victorious in October, because we were able to rouse and organise the broad masses for victory, so also, after October, in the period of the civil war and war Communism, we were victorious because we were able to organise these masses for war and for the maintenance of the economic life of the country. Remember what large numbers of workers we sent out to fight for bread. Remember the enthusiasm with which Lenin at that time advocated "Saturdays" as one of the means of combating economic ruin. The same applies now to the present greatly increased and complicated tasks; these must be accomplished through the complete utilisation of the much larger material and human resources in town and country, which the Party can and should both mobilise and organise. (Voice: "Hear, hear.") Is that huge mass of friends of the Socialist system, friends of the Communist Party, builders of a new society, being utilised through the existing mass organisations and those methods of work now being applied? It seems to me that this is not the case. One of the most important parts of the work of our Party is the improvement of the forms and methods of organisation of the daily growing active cadres of toilers. The existing methods of social organisations, I think, are insufficient for the solution of that tremen-

dous problem which we are already solving—the problem of the building up of Socialism in our country. This shortcoming is due to the fact that our tasks have largely become complicated and the resources at our disposal for their solution have increased even to a still larger extent.

On the eve of the 15th Congress the Opposition suffered a complete and unusual defeat. It suffered that despite the fact that in the struggle against the Party, in appealing to the third force it resorted to all kinds of methods, promises and demagogy. No one went with them. Why? Because the millions of workers and peasants in our Union participate directly in the gigantic general work of Socialist construction. The millions of workers and peasants not only regard the cause of the building up of Socialism as their cause, but they take a directly active and daily part in it. This process of drawing the masses into the building up of a new society has only begun. In the future it will develop with a still greater impetus.

The five-year plan of Party work must ensure that these masses are enrolled in live, active, mobile, and sound organisations. The five-year plan of Party work must guarantee a full utilisation of these vast masses of active participants in the construction of Socialism for a complete victory of the working class in the struggle for the ushering in of a new society. (Stormy prolonged applause. The delegates rise.)

\* \* \* \* \*

## Comrade Krzhizhanovsky's Report

### RESUME AND PERSPECTIVE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

The question of a unified plan of national economy was raised for the first time on a broad scale in 1920 by the 9th Party Congress.

That year marked a turning point in the life of our country. The war period of our Revolution had just subsided, we were on the eve of a period of peace, but at the same time we were faced with terrible economic disaster.

Our country was at that time poverty-stricken in the real sense of the word.

We began to build up an economic system which was, as a result of the consolidation of the conquests of the October Revolution, placed on a new foundation absolutely unknown to the capitalist world. There are now certain economists who make a sharp division between the restoration period of our economy and the period of its transformation. They say that during the first stage of construction we had our pre-war inheritance which facilitated our progress. They speak ironically about the systematic construction of that time, because from their point of view the market gave us extraordinary help during the first period of the new economic policy, it corrected our mistakes, it was our teacher, and plans had nothing to do with it. At the bottom of these arguments there lies a certain mistrust in proletarian construction and in order to draw proper conclusions from it we must remember that proletarian construction since the beginning, and throughout the restoration period was not at all of a purely restoration character, but of an uninterrupted establishment of relations in economy unknown to the capitalist world and which go against the very foundations of the capitalist world.

Last year we were visited by an American delegation.

A few days ago I received the report of that delegation in the English language. They are far from being our people; they speak in terms "we" and "they" when they analyse our situation and their situation. They definitely state that "there is the East" and "there is the West," that our ways are not their ways. In evaluating the progress which the "Eastern" country made, *i.e.*, our country, they were forced to make the following statement. They mention that the new economic policy was introduced at a moment when our economy was practically at the zero point. Then they say the following:—

"From that zero point economic recovery has been phenomenal. Industrial production has increased by leaps and bounds, with agricultural production following behind. From a state of utter disorganisation and ruin the economic structure has come

back to normal in six years. This is an achievement for which history records few parallels. For the West it would be a seven days' wonder, for the East it is a miracle."

#### **STATE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ELECTRIFICATION**

According to the plan of the State Planning Commission for Electrification the construction of 30 district stations is to be undertaken. It was estimated that we will have to invest about 1,200,000,000 roubles in the course of 10-15 years for this purpose. It is estimated that we will have to build from 20 to 30,000 kilometres of new railways, for which an aggregate of about 8,000 million roubles will have to be invested. On the whole, it was estimated that about 17 billion roubles will have to be allotted for these items. Besides, it must be borne in mind that at that time we had a clear view of the fact that the accumulation of resources in industry will hardly suffice to cope with the economic and industrial ruin and we thought that for all this tremendous construction we might be able to utilise the tremendous shortage of food in Europe and develop our export and count particularly on the post-revolutionary development of peasant economy. We thought then that we should be able to accumulate a sufficient trade balance within 10-15 years amounting to about 11 billion roubles. We had a deficit of six milliard roubles on these three items. Further, we said that the West will probably have to establish business connections with us. We relied at that time on an extensive programme of concessions, we hoped for credits, and thought that with the help of our credit operations and concessions we would succeed in covering the deficit.

The famine of 1921 demonstrated all at once how wrong we were to depend on the export of primarily agriculture products. Only after 1921 did we begin to realise the tremendous ruin experienced in all branches of our economy, which pre-determined only a slow development of commodity production in agriculture and made it dependent—as we now see—on many intricate meshes in the whole of Soviet economy, which link up the whole of Soviet society to peasant labour.



And what have we now as our main basis for the five-year plan without expecting any considerable support from abroad and export possibilities, which, as you see, are very limited in our economy?

No matter what the miscalculations may be in our five-year plans, our industry will have risen by 1931 approximately from 80-100 per cent.

You can see that if we take even the minimum expectations of our five-year plans, the general task of our economic construction exactly corresponds with the plan which in the days of Comrade Lenin was known as a "plan of big work." We can only blush to see in our midst comrades who think that this task is too limited.

But this is not all. Remember how Lenin linked up all our construction work with the idea of the speedy supply of armies of skilled workers, an army of experts in the different lines of work without which such construction is impossible. What was the state of affairs at the beginning of our construction work? Allow me to quote a document. It refers to 1918. It was sent to the government on behalf of the All-Russian Engineers Union, the Moscow scientific technical organisations, the factory engineers and the provincial department of the Engineers' Union. It was received after we had been discussing for six days the nationalisation of industry. It is a regular indictment.

It says that the government which undertook economic construction in October is impotent in that construction, that the Soviets do not take orders from the government, that the Supreme Economic Council has no practical programme, that the whole nationalisation project of industry is built up on sand, that it undermines initiative, deprives the influx of foreign capital, etc.

Their statement ends as follows: "The nationalisation of industry, having no real foundation, hampering the influx of necessary capital and raw material and limiting the technical possibilities, must only make the catastrophic situation in industry worse and retard the revival which is necessary for the future of Russia, therefore we are absolutely opposed to the nationalisation of industry under the given conditions and place all responsibility for it on

the representatives of the working class and the government they set up."

We have now proved strong enough not only to have our technical intellectuals, but sufficiently strong to accomplish a tremendous change in the ideological make up of these intellectuals.

#### **Phases of Planned Work.**

I want to give you a more or less clear idea of the real phases of our planned work. I would like you to have a clear idea of what you can really expect from our workers engaged in the task of planning and of the importance of the figures and outlines, which we are now in a position to give in our five-year plan.

Every time we hear that certain efforts at planning are being made in capitalist countries, we must remember that although there were crises in capitalist economy, which forced the capitalist countries at times, as, for instance, during the war, to undertake the systematisation of economy in order to enable it to meet the greater requirements of war, yet, in so far as the power of gold prevails, the result of this power of yellow metal is yellow Socialism and what I would call yellow planning. These plans of the capitalist world give way just as soon as they meet with the resistance of powerful capitalist groups. We have no lessons to learn from them. We must rely only on ourselves, and if unity of will is our trump card, then just think what enormous harmony of will is necessary in order to sign a definite five-year Note, not under pressure, but from full conviction.

Let us take such a sphere as State industry. It would seem that here it would be especially easy to institute a systematic régime. In reality, however, we only approached the idea of a common plan for all industry, which would combine the industrial technique, economic analysis and the financial programme all in one, in 1925.

Beginning with 1925 a definite change occurred in our economic construction. An increased rate of construction and a rise in the rate of industrial restoration began. There is a time when it is necessary to make a summary, not only of the plans of various industries, but also plans

of the main divisions of our national economy. And it was in 1925-26 that we produced our first Control Figures of national economy to meet this requirement.

The figures of 1927-28 are the fruit of the work of a vast body of men. Here we find the work not merely of people working in the State Planning Commission and working out State plans, but the embodiment of the efforts of thousands of superintendents throughout the country in all our republics. Several Congresses were convened. At those Congresses general forms of elaboration of material were worked out and we see that as a result we have material which combines the budget, the industrial and financial plan, and our export and import plan as parts of one economic unit. This inter-connection is laid down in such a form that the government is able to rely on the Control Figures of 1927-28 for the elaboration of all operative economic plans.

It is absolutely clear that five-year plans are not all we want to attain. The extent of our construction is such that we cannot stop at this stage. If we remember how we were confronted with the most burning problems in reviewing our five-year perspectives, such as the question of unemployment, the question of the possibility of improving the welfare of the toiling masses and the fundamental questions of the correlation of forces between such tremendous divisions in our economy as industry and agriculture, it will be clear to us how we shall have to go from five-year perspectives to 10 and 15-year perspectives in the form of a general plan. The necessity of special activity along the lines of transport also makes us adopt this method.

#### **Lessons and Experience of the Restoration Period.**

The first and main lesson which we derive from the experience of the restoration period is that the New Economic Policy has vindicated itself. It will suffice to review the rate of our development, if only according to our control figures, to see that it was not only greater than our estimates, but also greater than the rate of development before the war.

The second lesson is that, based on this real experi-

ence, we can see a clear line before us of strengthening the key positions of which Comrade Stalin spoke, when he substantiated by facts and figures the extent of our achievements both in the sphere of industry and other spheres of our economy.

In approaching the pre-war economic level, accompanied by the social transformation and change accomplished by the October Revolution, we are faced with a series of glaring discrepancies and errors in our economy. It would be wrong to think that we can transform the whole type of our economy in a short time so as to eliminate all contradictions in the very first phases of our endeavours.

I am now coming first of all to what in my opinion are the main lessons of our industrial experience.

The greatest modern capitalist trusts reduce the cost of their production by means of mass and standardised production. These two methods constitute the basis in the competitive struggle on the world market. And in so far as these powerful amalgamations really have a tremendous output of goods, greatly surpassing ours in absolute figures, we must first of all see to it that the actual planning, technical and economic amalgamation of our nationalised industry should become strengthened and grow from year to year in the course of our economic work.

The new economic policy vindicated itself, the line of our general constructive plan was correct, The nationalisation of industry, the nationalisation of land, the Socialisation of home trade, and the monopoly of foreign trade have been absolutely vindicated by the general successes in production, and those outlines and perspectives which we are now elaborating even more energetically for the future in the same direction. We have still many survivals of the former anarchy in all branches of our economy. Our watchword is: General struggle against anarchy, general organised and systematic struggle. It must not become bureaucratic, it must give the necessary chance for economic manœuvres, particularly for the republics and economic districts. Confidence at the centre in the locals is only possible if the general aim is clear, and if a general unity is created, guaranteeing harmony in all our

economic work. The plan is a decisive instrument from the point of view of the final overcoming of anarchy in all spheres of economy. A plan cannot be created by a handful of individuals, but by all toilers collectively.

The slogan we are issuing for the coming five years, all along the economic front, the main slogan is: "Give us a plan." (Applause.)

#### **Lenin's Electrification Plan will be Realised.**

We pride ourselves on the fact that, with the frequent failure of our economic plans, we at the same time firmly and undeviatingly carry out one plan, namely, Lenin's electrification plan. Of course there are many defects in this sphere of our work. Of course the different stations do not become such industrial centres and factors of rationalisation from top to bottom as we picture them in our electrification programme. Of course, we meet with many irregularities, which Comrade Rykov justly pointed out and which we must overcome as soon as possible. But all these deficiencies are counteracted by the circumstance that since 1921, even during the period of our economic decline, we supported electrification plans to the utmost. We are now able to declare definitely and firmly that in 1931 we will not only have carried it out but most probably exceeded it.

Here are the main figures: In December, 1931, the aggregate power of our district stations, together with the branch stations, will be 2,141,000 kw. Without the branch stations it will amount to 1,800,000 kw. The increase as compared with 1921 will be over 1,500,000 kw. The work of the district electric stations in the last year of the five-year term will be from 6,320 million to 6,840 million kw. hours. The aggregate work will be 10-12 billion kilowatt hours. The capital investments during the five years will be, according to one estimate, 1,400 million roubles, and according to another 1,600 million roubles. There was also a suggestion of 1.2 billion pre-war roubles.

Can we retard the rate of this construction? I warned the 8th Soviet Congress that our enemies have an excellent electric equipment. What do the recent figures in Germany show? The production of electric energy in 1913 was 5,100

million kw. hours. In 1920 it was 9,555 million kw. hours, in 1925 it was 10,250 million kw. hours. We will catch up with Germany in 1931. Five years hence we shall supply our national industry with just as big a volume of electric power as an industrially advanced country such as Germany supplies to-day.

If you will analyse the form in which the new stations are distributed, you will find another characteristic picture. You will see that the agricultural centre of our country is gradually being surrounded by a gigantic network of electric stations, coming from the central industrial district of the Volga, running along the Volga through the districts of the Kazan, Saratov, and Stalingrad stations. From Stalingrad it goes through the Shakhtin Station to Donbas, the main mining centres, and the Shterovsk station. Further, you will see that another line of electric transmission extends from Moscow through Kashir, to the coal district near Moscow, and through Briansk to Kharkov, forming a tremendous ring around that agricultural centre. If you reckon up the power of these stations within the next ten years you will find that it will be about five million h.p. If you take into consideration the fact that about 70 million of peasants engaged in agriculture live in that centre, that in that gigantic ring of electric centres they receive mechanical energy to the extent of five million h.p., which equals the power of an army of 100 millions, you will find that every able-bodied peasant living in that agriculture centre can receive from that ring of electric transmission from 3-4 additional "automatic slaves." America prides itself on the fact that it supplies 30 such "automatic slaves" to every able-bodied citizen. But an analysis of American economy shows that owing to the lack of system about one-half of the electric power is wasted.

In realising Lenin's plan of electrification and co-operation we shall catch up with America.

## Comrade Molotov's Report Work in the Rural Districts

Comrades, the question of work in the villages is at the present time connected with important practical considerations. This compels me at the very beginning to emphasise the fact that the word "village" in this instance embraces extremely multifarious conditions of our rural life. After all, we have our central villages, the Ukrainian villages, the villages of the South, the Caucasian villages, etc. The enumeration of these different villages alone serves to indicate how multifarious are the conditions which we have to consider in analysing questions of rural work.

We have no single type of village. There are villages with a great variety of different features—social, economic and national.

Or another example. In connection with rural work we speak a good deal about livening up the Soviets. However, in respect to a good many districts, particularly of the Soviet East, we should speak not of livening up the Soviets, but of creating them. Yes, and even that requires a good deal of time. We shall undoubtedly need quite a long time to organise a real Soviet Government there.

Nevertheless, no matter what district or national republic we take in the Soviet Union, radical developments have occurred when compared with the pre-revolutionary period. The proletarian Government instituted that cardinal difference of economic, social, cultural and political conditions in the rural districts which give rise to an absolutely new path of development for the Soviet village. The line of the Party, the line of the working class, points out the path to Socialism in the villages. Moreover, the basic forms in which the villages will have to develop along this path have already been found in our rural districts. There are two basic forms—the Soviets and the co-operatives.

## 1. CHIEF POLITICAL RESUME.

(Or: The Fate of the Petty Bourgeois Parties in Our Country.)

Allow me now to deal with the real essence of my report. The main conclusion which must be drawn in connection with the development of our villages at the present time is clearly illustrated by what exists in the sphere of political development in the Soviet Union. Lenin often said that politics is the most concentrated expression of economics. It is precisely in the political sphere that our Soviet Union can draw one of the most remarkable conclusions at the present time. This conclusion concerns the fate of the petty bourgeois parties in our country.

We are so accustomed that we hardly notice any longer the fact that we have no signs of any importance of petty bourgeois political groupings such as the S.R.s, the Mensheviks, etc., since these two parties have been eradicated in our country. This is the only proper conclusion concerning these irrefutable facts. By smashing the bourgeoisie and the landowners we snatched the ground from under the feet of the S.R.s and Mensheviks, from under the feet of the bourgeois parties, the loyal servants and crafty agents of the bourgeoisie and the landowners.

The annihilation of the petty bourgeois parties was at the same time one of the main conditions of Socialist construction.

## 2. CLASSES AND THE PECULIARITIES OF SOCIAL Development in the Villages under the Dictatorship of the proletariat.

Now as to the social class groupings in our villages. The Revolution wrought cardinal changes in social and economic relations in the village. In order to characterise these changes I will give you the most important data on this question.

If we group the classes as Lenin grouped them in the pre-revolutionary period we get the following position: On the territory of the R.S.F.S.R. (excluding Siberia, the Far East, and several localities of Northern Caucasia), we find that the poor and middle peasants have in round



figures 60 million hectares and the agricultural bourgeoisie 40 million hectares of land.

How has the land been redistributed after the Revolution among the three main groups of the peasantry according to the changed post-revolutionary conditions?

Here we have to take into account first of all the fact that, as a result of the agrarian revolution, the aggregate area of land in the hands of the peasantry has increased in these areas, according to the figures of Comrade Smirnov, by 40 million hectares taken from the so-called "lands not in the hands of labouring elements."

As a result, we see that instead of the 60 million hectares which the poor and middle peasants had before the revolution they have now 136 million hectares—*i.e.*, more than double.

And how has the kulak land been affected since the revolution? It turns out that, instead of the former 40 million hectares, the kulaks have on the same territory of the R.S.F.S.R. at the present time a little over 4 million hectares—*i.e.*, hardly one-tenth of what they had before the revolution. Such is the difference (taking very rough and approximate figures) which exists in our agrarian relations since the revolution.

The poor and middle peasants received through the revolution 110 million hectares, of which at least 50 million were seized from the nobility, the landlords, and the churches; about 10 million hectares were taken from the State lands and forests, and about 50 million from the kulak elements for redistribution, primarily among the peasants who had no land or very little. These are figures which must be kept in mind, and which the peasants ought to know.

Such are the starting points determining the contemporary economic situation in the villages as compared with conditions before the revolution. Naturally, the results of the agrarian revolution, in the form of the nationalisation of the land, which gave 110 million hectares to the masses of poor and middle peasants, constitute the most vital and fundamental element of our agrarian revolution. Anyone who tries, directly or indirectly, to raise a hand against the nationalisation of land is the worst enemy of the broad

masses of the peasantry and the working class. Hence, the Party, the working class, and the basic mass of the peasantry must protect to the utmost the results of the agrarian revolution, the results of the nationalisation of land, accomplished as a result of the October Revolution.

What has happened in our villages since the Revolution?

I shall not try to prove something here which everybody knows. I shall say briefly that, as a result of the agrarian revolution, our village has become mainly a village of middle peasants. This fact has long been common knowledge.

We also know that the process of differentiation in the rural districts and the process of development of extremes (kulaks and agricultural proletarians) has now become more intense than was the case during the first few years after the Revolution. But at the same time it must be said that there are important peculiarities in the processes of socio-economic development of the Soviet village.

These peculiarities are characterised thus in the theses on work in the villages:—

“The peculiarities of that differentiation are a result of the altered social conditions. These peculiarities consist in the fact that, in contra-distinction to the capitalist type of development, which is expressed in the weakening of the middle peasantry, while the two extremes, the poor and rich farmers, grow, in our country it is the reverse. We have a process of strengthening the middle peasant group, accompanied, so far by a certain growth of the rich peasants from among the more well-to-do middle peasants, and a diminution of the poor groups, of which some become proletarianised and others—the greater part—are gradually transferring to the middle group.”

Further, the theses say:

“Thus the peculiarities of the processes of differentiation in our country lead to a further growth of the middle sections, which confirms once again the famous Lenin formula that the middle peasant is the ‘central agricultural figure.’”

Such is the basic process of social development in our

villages. To substantiate this we could supply a colossal mass of facts and figures.

Finally, the question of the kulak—the rich peasant.

On the question of the numerical strength of the rich peasants we have now a wealth of data. Of course, it is almost an impossible task to arrive at some general percentage of the agricultural bourgeoisie in the U.S.S.R. However, we can assert that the figures at our disposal, taken from Party, Soviet and other sources, and also from the Press, give us quite a complete picture of the relative strength of all basic rural groups. We can judge the strength of the kulak primarily by the figures concerning the development of wage labour in the villages, the development of letting land, and, during the last few years, the hiring out of agricultural implements. In some districts usury and trade are in this respect very important. Thus the figures which we have on the question of the development of wage labour in our villages show that wage labour increases considerably. In 1926, according to the figures of the Central Statistical Department, 3 per cent. of the farms, primarily kulak farms, of the grain-buying districts with most seasonal workers employed hired labour. Apart from that, 7.8 per cent. of farms employed day labourers. In the latter group the middle peasants predominate. As far as the grain-producing districts are concerned, the number of farms hiring seasonal workers last year was 2.9 per cent.; the number of households hiring day labourers constituted 8.4 per cent. These figures give an idea of the extent of development of wage labour in the villages.

I shall not quote many figures on renting land.

While there is an obvious growth in renting land, this is mostly done by middle peasants. In so far as a large section of wage labourers in the villages work for middle peasants, a large section of the leased land also concerns the middle peasant farms. If we take the cultivation of rented areas in relation to cultivation in general, it constitutes altogether 6.7 per cent. This is a very low percentage compared with pre-war. If, however, we take the percentage of farms which simultaneously rent land and employ hired labour—*i.e.*, farms which as a rule may be

considered kulak farms—we will find that they constitute 3.7 per cent. in the R.S.F.S.R., 2.4 per cent. in the Ukraine, 4.4 per cent. in Transcaucasia, and 3.7 per cent. throughout the U.S.S.R. I have given you only some of the figures which may serve as a general characteristic of the development of capitalist elements in our villages.

But if these figures in themselves show that the growth of capitalist elements in the villages is so far a negligible quantity, it should be pointed out that during the last few years the process of growth of these elements proceeds at a markedly accelerated rate. Although in some districts—as, for instance, North Caucasia—we notice this year a marked slowing down in the growth of the upper rural group (the decline of its relative strength in the cultivation of land and possession of draft cattle, in relation to the entire peasantry of that district), on the whole, however, the process of growth of capitalist elements in the villages during the last few years has markedly increased (the hiring out of agricultural implements to poor peasants has assumed considerable dimensions).

It is clear from this that we must pay the most earnest attention to the process of differentiation in the villages.

### **3. THE PATH OF FURTHER AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.**

We shall now take the question of our future path of rural development.

We know that the process of development of capitalist elements in our villages continues. This has been proved time and again. No one denies it, and it is not disputed in the Party. But we know at the same time that the Socialist elements have also increased to a much larger extent during these years. We also know that this is not the first year that a struggle has gone on between the Socialist and capitalist elements, and we know also that it will continue in the years to come—in some cases it will even become more intense. However, the anti-capitalist elements are definitely taking the upper hand. When we raise the question of the further prospects of rural development we must remember what Marx said concerning rural development under capitalism :

"Bourgeois society sucks the blood out of the heart and the brain from the head of the peasant, and throws it all into the melting-pot of capitalism—the alchemist."

That is what the development of capitalist elements means for the peasant, should they be victorious. It is our task to counter the development of these capitalist elements by developing our Socialist elements.

This requires special attention to the agrarian problem from us all.

We cannot forget the fact that our village represents, on the whole, a vast number of individual peasant enterprises. We know that the development of individual enterprise along the Socialist path is a long and tedious process. It will require many years to pass over from individual to communal farming. We know that the development of individual enterprises will still continue for many years; but nevertheless we must make it our task to strengthen and develop the relative strength of the Socialist elements in the villages, and find the surest path of a general and more intensive growth of Socialism. One of our tasks in respect to the small peasant is splendidly formulated in the following words of Engels:—

"The larger the number of peasants whom we prevent from becoming proletarians, and whom we win over to our side while they are still peasants, the quicker and the easier will the social transformation take place. . . ."

This means that it is our task to help the development of the productive forces of peasant economy. All measures of the Soviet Government are directed towards helping the development of the productive forces of our villages. We know very well that the New Economic Policy in itself was a concession to the middle peasant, the petty owner, the petty entrepreneur, who still prefers individual rather than collective enterprise. We adopted this policy, maintain it now, and shall do so in the future, so long as we have petty peasant enterprises. The decisions of the 14th Party Conference emphasised once again the extraordinary attention that the Party and the working class must devote to the petty individual enterprises in respect of raising their

productive forces. Those decisions were a result of the basic fact that agriculture, in its vast mass, developed, and still develops, as petty individual peasant agriculture.

The Party has done its utmost to raise and strengthen the development of the productive forces of the small enterprises, but the Party could not by any means accept the interpretation of this course given by groups hostile to it and to the working class, the interpretation given by the bourgeoisie both large and small, and also by our Opposition, which crawls behind the bourgeoisie.

Our evaluation of the New Economic Policy is, of course, entirely different. The New Economic Policy, as well as the policy of the 14th Party Conference, is a certain policy, permitted by and acceptable to the Soviet Government, as a concession in relation to the small peasant farms, small commodity producers, such as the masses of our peasantry are (without at the same time being capitalists). Therefore to interpret our concessions under certain limitations to the small peasant, although he is a petty property holder, to confuse this policy with the policy of rural development "with the help of capitalist methods" (*i.e.*, methods which, according to the brilliant words of Marx, "suck the blood from the heart and the brain from the head of the peasant") means to forget the A B C of Marxism and to make common cause with the bourgeois ideologists.

We took pains, and do so now, to raise agriculture and develop its productive forces. This is a most important task, and we must never leave it out of sight. We have already attained considerable results in that respect. But, compared with the level of agriculture in the advanced capitalist countries of Europe and America, we are on a very low plane.

Throughout the years of the New Economic policy the Party incessantly enacted a policy of limitation of the growth of capitalist elements. It established the progressive tax, it limited the right to lease land, it raised the demands of hired agricultural labour, supported the poor farms through credits and political prerogatives of the Soviet Government as a whole (including intensive support by State industry, etc.). But our task consists in completely

overcoming and liquidating the capitalist elements in the countryside as well as in the towns. In short, this task is nothing else but a task of building up Socialism. This concise formula means that, isolated from the basic task of overcoming the capitalist elements in the rural districts, and isolated from the tasks of Socialist construction as a whole, we cannot raise either the question of ending the shortage of equipment among peasants nor the question of combating the differentiation process. Our task is to develop our Party work so as to draw in the masses of peasants and go with them together along the path of overcoming and liquidating the capitalist elements in the villages. Only thus, in a Marxian, Leninist, Communist manner, can we approach our tasks in the villages.

#### **4. CO-OPERATION AND LARGE-SCALE COLLECTIVE FARMING.**

Our peasant economy develops as petty individual peasant economy, and such it is in the main.

Petty individual enterprise and the whole of national economy develop in our country on the basis of commodity relations between State industry and agriculture. Hence the importance of our price policy.

In this connection we must see in the coming period that the prices of agricultural produce remain stable, while prices of manufactured goods should be reduced in a systematic, gradual and continuous manner.

We must pay especial attention to the condition of our trade.

At the present time more than half of the manufactured goods delivered to the villages goes through the hands of our co-operatives, and almost two-thirds of the purchase of agricultural products is in our hands, in the hands of State and co-operative buyers. These two facts alone, showing the rôle of State and co-operative commodity supply in the villages, and the purchase of agricultural produce, show that, compared with the first stage of the New Economic Policy, we have now an entirely new situation in the development of rural economic life.

Now it depends to a large degree on us, the Soviet Government, to regulate the economic relations between

town and country. It largely depends on our ability to elaborate elastic and efficient plans, not too rigid (as has been usually the case hitherto).

The most important thing at the present time is to give the necessary support to the peasants, to help them raise their agricultural production. Given stable agricultural prices, farming as a profitable undertaking, and the interest of the peasantry, we can achieve a greater output of farm products, a greater agricultural production.

How can we raise our agriculture to a higher level? What means have we at our disposal to increase agricultural production?

The fundamental thing we must now remember is the fact that agriculture in our country is split up into a colossal number of small peasant enterprises, and that since the Revolution the splitting up of agriculture has even increased. We have approximately 24 million small peasant enterprises. If you examine the question as to the profitableness of this form of management you will find that 8 million of the weaker units find it does not pay even to have their own horses. According to the People's Commissariat for Agriculture, one-third of the small peasant units at the present time cannot afford to keep horses; they do not pay. This is the first fact. If we take the use of agricultural machinery we find the same thing. In some enterprises a good plough is unprofitable, apart from the fact that it is inaccessible to the weaker enterprises, and agricultural machines—reapers, sowers, and threshing machines of all sorts—are absolutely not worth while. They cannot be employed with profit in the dwarf peasant farms. That is why we still have in the U.S.S.R. more than 5 million wooden ploughs. We still have facts of such sorry "progress" as, for instance, the fact that the number of wooden ploughs in White Russia is this year comparatively greater than the number of up-to-date ploughs.

But the main question of economic development in the villages lies in the fact that on the side of the well-to-do kulak sections there is the advantage of the larger enterprise which beats economically the poor and middle peasant farms. Herein lies the basic economic contradiction of our



villages, where we must find a way out for the poor and middle peasants by hook or by crook.

If in our towns we have the basic advantage that the instruments of large-scale production (our State industry) are in the hands of the proletariat, and we can therefore easily beat the bourgeoisie, in the villages the economic situation is exactly the reverse. Here larger production has the advantage, and is actually on the side of the well-to-do peasant and the kulak. We help the poor and middle peasant, we help them to get on their feet, and limit the capitalist elements by taxation, by strict lease restrictions and conditions of employment; but the economic advantages of the larger enterprises as compared with the smaller ones we have not abolished, and only now are we approaching this cardinal economic contradiction in the villages with real earnestness.

That is why the struggle between the capitalist and Socialist elements in agriculture leaves the middle and poor peasant—the basic rural mass having at their basis their pitiful individual enterprises—almost in an impasse. They make slow progress, despite the ten years since the October Revolution, which, it would seem, should have given them a basis to move forward at a great rate. These economic advantages of the large well-to-do peasant enterprises over the small and dwarf enterprises must make us give deeper thought to our rural tasks. We must point this out to the peasantry, and explain to them that here lies the main evil in the countryside, here lies the main economic contradiction, and therefore here lies the centre of our tasks in relation to the rural districts.

#### Agreements.

An agreement was made to deliver a certain quantity of goods, for instance, between the sugar industry and the agricultural co-operative of the sugar-beet districts. The agricultural co-operative, which unites the small peasant enterprises of those districts, delivers, according to the agreement, the beets to the sugar factories on the appointed date (and also according to the stipulated price, quality, etc.) It should be borne in mind that the sugar industry is itself interested in seeing that the beets be delivered.

in due time, that they be of good quality, and that prices do not soar too high. The sugar industry is interested in the development of sugar beet, in the improvement of its quality, and consequently that there be improvement in the cultivation of the field and the supply of produce. Thus the sugar industry becomes directly interested in the general improvement of agriculture. Experience has shown that agreement campaigns between the sugar industry and the sugar beet co-operatives of the peasants of those districts have gone well. The sugar trust supplies the sugar beet co-operatives with picked seed, fertilisers, agricultural machines, etc. The rôle of the industrial organs in penetrating agriculture with complicated machinery is especially important. This is inevitably accompanied by a transition to collective cultivation, collective harvesting, and collective exploitation of agricultural machines, tractors, etc., in general.

At the present time agreements for the delivery of beets have been made almost with 900,000 peasant enterprises. Almost 100 per cent. of the peasants—*i. e.*, close to a million enterprises—producing beets belong not only to the co-operative, but, through the agreement of this co-operative, they deliver their produce to our sugar industry. This is not the first year of this development.

Let us take another example—the cotton industry.

Here we have approximately a similar situation. In this sphere also over 700,000 peasant enterprises already deliver their cotton to our cotton commission on contract.

This again is not a small figure—it constitutes almost three-quarters of a million of peasant enterprises. Actually, about 95 per cent. of all cotton growers deliver their cotton in an organised manner according to a definite contract between the peasant co-operative and industry.

Furthermore, we also see the development of contract conditions between the flax industry and the flax-growing districts. There a smaller number comes into consideration, but nevertheless also here we see almost 150,000 enterprises working according to contract. In respect to sunflower seeds, contracts also embrace about 150,000 enterprises.

Such, comrades, are the basic facts which show that systematic methods have already penetrated deeply the

sphere of agriculture; that in many cases industry is on a large front connected directly with agriculture and is helping to place it on a new track, supplying it with seed and fertilisers, guaranteeing certain conditions of ploughing and harvesting by supplying the peasantry with machines and tractors, in order to organise the business on a new basis and in order to bring about collective cultivation and ploughing of land, and prepare thereby the ground for mass collective agriculture.

That is what has been accomplished, affecting already about 2 million of our peasant enterprises. The question of contracts is extremely important from the point of view of determining the path of development of systematic influence on agriculture, the linking up of industry with agriculture, and the creation of elements for large-scale collective farming.

Then take the question of agricultural industry—*i.e.*, rural, primarily co-operative, industry, manufacturing agricultural raw material. According to the figures of the agricultural co-operative, the latter has about 16,000 small enterprises of all kinds, where, from an industrial point of view, all kinds of trash is dealt with. These enterprises have in very many cases no right to be called industrial, because very frequently they are miserably small.

However, in some branches of that industry there are certain elements which cannot be ignored. For instance, there are 6,000 small butter and cheese producing enterprises which deal with the produce of 960,000 co-operative peasant households. Again, we see about 1 million households already drawn into a co-operative organisation which (without directly uniting agricultural production) unites the working up of agricultural products, and, by putting forward higher demands to the producer, urge him on to Socialised cultivation of land through the employment of good agricultural machines. All this prepares the ground for the common harvesting of crops, for the organisation of communal livestock enterprises, etc.

What is especially important in respect to contracts and agricultural production is the fact that the peasants invest their savings in it, because they are directly interested in developing it to a maximum, since they increase

their income thereby and are enabled to raise their production.

We will recall what Lenin said concerning precisely such co-operative enterprises in his article on co-operation. He wrote :—

“Under our system the co-operative enterprises differ from private capitalist enterprises in the fact that they are collective enterprises; but they do not differ from Socialist enterprises if they are based on land while the means of production belong to the State—*i.e.*, to the working class.”

This statement made by Lenin has not yet been fully appreciated by us. At any rate, it has not been sufficiently reflected in our practical work. Such comrades are the basic points which prepare for us through co-operation the organisation of socialised large-scale production in the villages.

This, in short, means nothing but the preparation for a mass transformation of individual peasant enterprise into large-scale socialised production. It means that we have already not merely located the path of collectivisation of agriculture of the millions of peasants, but through gradual development of various elements of large-scale agricultural production, we are already marching in our millions towards the collectivisation of agriculture. We must only pay more attention to these elements of developing socialised large-scale farming which necessitates the greatest attention on our part, general support and general efforts on the part of the Party and the working class.

Now I shall deal separately with collective farms.

Usually, when we speak of the organisation of collective large-scale farming, we speak only of the methods of organisation according to which collective farms have been organised until now. This is wrong. We must not forget that the co-operative can become, and is already becoming, the main path of mass transformation of peasant farming from individual and small farms to large-scale collectivism. But at the same time we must not forget that the path of collective farming along which the formation of collective farms has proceeded until now, has been

of colossal importance for us. It will be of especially great significance henceforth for the mass collectivisation of the villages, which is already in progress.

How great the significance of the collective farms is at the present time may be seen from the vast quantity of figures, which I shall not mention now because of lack of time. I shall only mention one figure. No matter how we evaluate the rôle and significance of collective farming in our country, the fact remains that millions of people are already organised by our collective farms. If we take all communes, artels, and societies, we will find that about a million people (not householders, but people) already belong to collective farms, which is a fact of no negligible importance.

To what has already been said it should be added that we have another form of unity for the peasant enterprises, which is gaining in importance in the creation of a path for the transformation of contemporary agriculture into large-scale collective farms. Such are the so-called simple societies—*i.e.*, primarily societies for machinery and also for improvement, horse breeding and seed growing. These societies are also a genuine mass path to a gradual collectivisation of agriculture, uniting, so far, various elements of peasant enterprises (for instance, machinery, which is of especial importance in the matter of collectivisation). These societies also include about one million peasant households. This, comrades, clearly shows that they are becoming of great significance. There are over 100,000 households organised in machine societies, about 700,000 in the improvement societies. The horse-breeding and seed-selecting societies are still comparatively new, but have several tens of thousands of members each. It is important to note that they grow from year to year, and at breakneck speed. In two years (1924-26) their number has increased almost sevenfold, and the number of their members sixfold!

This goes to show how important these new elements of communal enterprise have already become in the various forms which are now developing in our agriculture.

From the examples given here you may judge as to what is new and socialistic in our agriculture. It is this

that guarantees the future of Socialist development of large-scale collective farming. Turn your attention, comrades, to the fact that all these things combined take place right under our eyes, but very frequently we are unable to give them proper attention. However, these are clear facts, and to a large extent important in principle, showing that a cardinal transformation in the entire social and economic development of our villages has commenced. In them we find the beginnings of a mass development of the elements of large-scale collective farming.

Finally, as to the electrification of agriculture. I have nothing better to say than what was said by Comrade Krzhizhanovsky on the rôle of electrification in agriculture. He pointed out in a brilliant manner that towards the end of ten years we shall surround the principal agricultural districts in the U.S.S.R. by a whole network of district electric stations, the building of which is part of our plan, and that, with the help of these stations, we shall supply every peasant enterprise with at least three to four horsepower. All this goes to show that we have a tremendous future for the development of large-scale farming before us.

##### **5. COLLECTIVISATION OF AGRICULTURE; OUR TACTIC AND THE CULTURAL PROBLEM.**

What tasks and what Party tactics arise from what has already been said?

The experiences of seven years of New Economic Policy have not been in vain. We amassed a good deal of experience thereby as regards building up Socialism. These seven years of N.E.P. mean (that is clear to us all) that we have found the right path of Socialist construction, that we, together with the working class, clearly know not only the aim of our struggle, but also the manner of achieving that aim.

The Party no longer has doubts about the path along which we are to go towards our Socialist goal. The tracks along which we are to travel are the New Economic Policy and the alliance of the peasantry. True, until recently we still had to fight against the Opposition prejudices relative to the New Economic Policy concerning the relations with the middle peasants. We remember that people spoke from

this very same platform during the 14th Party Congress, saying that the New Economic Policy is a policy of retreat and nothing more. But this obvious nonsense has been refuted, not only theoretically but also in practice, in our march towards Socialism both in town and country. We knew before, and now know, that by our New Economic Policy we made a concession to the petty peasant property holder; but the Party, headed by Lenin, said even at the 11th Congress that the retreat had ended. The retreat ended, and we began a broad offensive. Since then we have been advancing for about six years. We are advancing through the offensive of the Socialist elements against the relics of capitalism.

When we now speak of an aggressive offensive against the kulak, the rural capitalist elements, etc., it seems to me that there is nothing new in this formula. There can be no more determined, more aggressive offensive on the capitalist elements than the growing Socialist construction in town and country. It is exactly what we are doing. We are intensifying and developing Socialist elements as against the remnants of capitalism. An aggressive offensive on the kulak, an aggressive offensive on the rural capitalist elements, this is exactly what we call Socialist construction in our country. The development of co-operation, the development of collective farming, our cultural and economic work, etc., which has been going on not only this year, is exactly what we call an offensive on the rural capitalist elements. There is no question as to whether we need an aggressive offensive on the kulak, etc. It exists, and there is no need to speak about it. Now the question is: How to carry on the offensive and what to take now as the main lever in the offensive on the rural capitalist elements. That now is the most important question, and that is what we must primarily consider. In answer to this question the Party must now utter a new watchword.

To this very day we had to fight against the anti-middle peasant ideology of the Trotskyist Opposition, and we fought, and shall fight, against the disbelief that it is possible to build up Socialism together with the middle peasant under existing conditions. We could not regard anti-middle peasant ideology in any other way than as a

bourgeois prejudice. At the present time, by the 15th Party Congress, this phase of the struggle has already ended. If, nevertheless, it is necessary, we shall again fight anyone who tries to revive this anti-middle peasant tendency.

But this is not enough now. We must remember that the seven years of New Economic Policy gave us an adequate lesson about which Lenin even spoke in 1919. We must not be hasty. We must not lose our patience in relation to the middle peasant. We can say that this is the case now; this we have learned generally speaking. This has been splendidly proved by the complete defeat and absolute collapse of the Trotskyist Opposition.

It is now important to realise another thing—namely, that we are lagging behind, that we are not keeping pace with the new Socialist elements now developing in the village.

What we lack now is courage and perseverance in stimulating the collectivisation of the village, primarily because we do not know enough about it.

In order to emphasise how necessary it is for us to be more courageous in the matter, I will refer to what Lenin said concerning the importance of tractors for agriculture. See what Lenin said in his speech at the 8th Party Congress in 1919 concerning the middle peasant. He said:—

“We develop our tasks in the most consistent manner. We must go over from the task of subduing the bourgeoisie to the task of rearranging the life of the middle peasantry. We must live in peace with them. In a Communist society the middle peasantry will only be on our side if we facilitate and improve their living conditions. If we could deliver to-morrow a hundred thousand first-class tractors” (that is what Lenin dreamed about in 1919!—V. M.), “supply them with benzine, supply them with engineers (you know very well that this is still a fantasy), the middle peasant would say: ‘I am for the Commune’—*i.e.*, for Communism.”

Lenin dreamed of a hundred thousand tractors, benzine and chauffeurs in 1919, almost nine years ago. He saw in that a medium for winning over the middle peasants to the side of Communism.



Did not Lenin understand how difficult it will be to develop collective farming in the villages? Of course; he understood it better than we. He knew the village a hundred times better than we do, and felt the pulse of the peasant a thousand times better than we. But by his example of a hundred thousand tractors Lenin aroused our attention to the concrete methods of the realisation of Communism, which we must remember and from which we must deduce the necessary practical conclusions. What would Lenin say now when we do not devote sufficient attention to the beginnings of collective farming in the villages which appear every day? Of course, it is not so simple to deliver a hundred thousand tractors to the village and succeed in making the middle peasant say that he is "for the Commune"—*i.e.*, for Communism.

What are our methods? Obviously, first of all it is the method of conviction. But this is not enough, comrades. We must not only have conviction! Conviction plus encouragement by the proletarian State of the elements of growing large-scale socialised agriculture—such is our method of collectivisation in the village. This encouragement, plus conviction, of the peasantry—that they have no other means of getting out of their difficult economic conditions is the axis in the development of large-scale collective agriculture.

What do we lack at the present time in the village, particularly in respect to the new tasks?

Culture! Culture—and again culture!

Literally, everything in the village is now retarded by the lack of culture. No matter what branch you take, you will find that our lack of culture, our backwardness, and in some cases absolute barbarism, prevents us from developing the new elements which we now have in the village.

Lenin said that the cultural revolution is our foundation, now. He said: "This cultural revolution is now sufficient for us to become a complete Socialist country." Is this true? Absolutely so! This is now clearer than ever. Without really raising our cultural level we cannot make rapid progress, although we have serious economic foundations and really many of the pre-requisites for rapid pro-

gress along the lines which we have hitherto pursued comparatively slowly.

Sudden jumps from individual to large-scale farming are out of the question. There can be only a question of a gradual development of large collective farms. This only is the right path. No fantasy, no compulsion in relation to the peasantry in the matter of adaptation of large-scale farming can be allowed. But the social economic development of the village breaks the ground everywhere along the lines of socialisation.

The bureaucracy and lack of culture of our institutions interfere and retard to such an extent this development at every step, so that these new Socialist elements which now appear in our village very frequently do not receive sufficient support; we cannot strengthen and develop their progress still further.

Now, more than ever, it has become clear that the lack of culture among the masses, which is responsible for the shortcomings in our rural work, constitutes the main drawback for the better development of the village.

It would be foolish to say that we are uncultured and therefore we cannot think of large-scale collective farming. This is nonsense. It is Menshevism. It is a bourgeois idea hostile to the working class and the peasantry.

We have an agricultural tax of about 300,000,000 roubles. We exempt about 35 per cent. of the peasantry entirely from this tax. I think that we must maintain this percentage intact, *i.e.*, we must preserve this exemption of at least 35 per cent. of the peasantry also next year. We lose nothing by it, and gain in the eyes of the middle and poor peasants (*i.e.*, in the eyes of 95 per cent. of the peasantry) if we add to these 300,000,000 roubles, let us say another 100,000,000 by taxing the conspicuously well-to-do rural elements, allotting this money entirely for the development of schools and culture in the villages. (Applause.)

I think that we must also raise a more general question; is it not time to re-distribute to a certain extent our State funds in general, re-distribute them in favour of greater cultural development? (Applause. BUKHARIN: "You are right.") I fully support Comrade Rykov, who in his report on the five-year plan said that this

is necessary. It is necessary to do that in the first place through the medium of the funds coming from the reduced administrative expenditure. But these funds alone are insufficient. We must have a re-distribution of our State funds also, and cut down our economic expenditure so as to attain more intensive cultural work immediately. The rural school and teacher, all cultural work among the peasant masses are now such a burning and immediate task that we must grapple with it more firmly and unitedly than with anything else. We must not only speak a good deal about it and adopt good resolutions. We must immediately begin to re-distribute our funds in State and local institutions in order to improve our cultural work.

## 6. THE OPPOSITION.

Allow me now to say a few words about the question of the Opposition. I shall be brief.

Put the following question to yourself: What practical amendments did the Opposition make to the theses of the C.C.? If you compare the Opposition platform and counter-theses, you will find that any point indicating in the slightest manner an understanding of rural reality, the Opposition took from our thesis. Otherwise the Opposition indulges in demagogic criticism, the discrediting our different institutions, such as the Soviet, co-operative, agricultural credit, etc., institutions. Running panic-stricken from the tremendous difficulties of rural work—to Menshevism. Criticism of our practical work the Party itself has put forward, and will do so in the future in relation to all our institutions, without the assistance of Opposition demagogy and slander.

But I must analyse one new proposal of the Opposition made with the obvious aim of political speculation. I have in mind the hazy Opposition proposals to organise at some indefinite future date a "poor peasants' league."

Is this proposal acceptable? It seems to me that it is basically wrong and absolutely unacceptable. Why? Because the task of the Party at the present time is not to isolate the poor peasants, not to divorce them from the fundamental organisations—the Soviets, co-operatives, collective farms, and our general Socialist con-

struction—but to secure the decisive influence of the poor peasants within these basic organisations. That is our task. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") We do not need to defend the interests of the rural poor by advocating some secondary task, through some schematic organisations, but to draw in the poor peasants into the basic organisations—the Soviets and the Co-operatives—so that they who, so far, still lag behind the middle peasants in their activity, should become a more important factor in them, so that the poor peasants—the support of the Party and the working class in the villages—should become the leading element in the rural co-operatives and Soviets. Such is our main task in relation to the poor peasants. (Applause.)

The organisation of meetings and poor peasant groups is a different matter. The work of these groups must now become much extended. It is precisely in this respect that we must now have district and provincial conferences of poor peasants,

But what is the difference between poor peasant groups and what the Opposition proposes as a separate poor peasant league? There is a difference, a vital political difference.

The poor peasants' groups we are organising around our organisations; they are the direct auxiliary organisations of our Party. The district and provincial conferences of these groups will be held under the direct leadership of the Party. Besides—and this is very important—the entire organisation of "poor peasants' groups," as they are called in the village, have very elastic forms and help in every individual case (thanks to the changing of the composition of the personnel) to draw in the most active and really best poor peasant elements to the Soviets and the co-operatives. This would not be the case in connection with the organisation under the present conditions of a new separate organisation—a poor peasants' league. Considering the present economic revival in the villages, a separately established mass organisation of poor peasants would inevitably lead to a situation where in the poor peasants' league a certain percentage of poor peasants would in the near future become middle peasants, thereby the nature of the organisa-

tion would change entirely and it would lose its original form.

This goes to show that by organising the poor peasants into an organisation apart from the Soviets and the co-operatives we cannot improve the conditions of the poor peasants. Such an organisation could, under the present conditions (in so far as it would have its special historical roots as, for instance,, the Ukrainian poor peasant-committees) help to revive new petty bourgeois political tendencies.

The position is quite different as regards the meetings of poor peasants, poor peasant groups and the district and provincial conferences of these groups, held on the initiative and under the leadership of the Party. These will give us the necessary conditions for the development of the political activity of the poor peasants, for strengthening their rôle in the Soviets, co-operatives, etc. This will give us a powerful lever in our rural work along the lines of the tasks which we are now discussing.

The Opposition does not understand that, it does not see the real path towards improvement of the situation of the poor peasants, and arrives at a purely bureaucratic idea of setting up a special organisation, setting up new institutions and new central bodies. This bureaucratic scheme of establishing another organisation, with new organisational central bodies (of which, as it is, we have too many), this new bureaucratic Opposition scheme is politically harmful and must, therefore, be emphatically rejected. Our task is to organise the poor peasants around the Party through the Soviets and through the co-operatives.

## **7. WHENCE SHOULD WE TAKE OUR FORCES?**

**(Or the New Obligations of the Working Class.)**

We have gone through the most important phases of development of our rural work. We have had tremendous successes in this respect, and at the same time colossal shortcomings.

During this period our Party organisations have been growing, but this growth is far from being satisfactory in every respect. Suffice it to mention one figure : Out of the million two hundred thousand Communists in the Party (these figures undoubtedly under-estimate the actual

strength) only fourteen thousand are agricultural labourers, while there are over 3,000,000 agricultural labourers in the villages.

The Young Communist League grew tremendously during these years. But compare this Young Communist growth with its rôle in our village. Has the rôle of the Young Communist League in the rural districts grown in accordance with its numbers? Nothing of the sort. The Young Communist League is growing; but as regards its participation in the work of the Soviets, the co-operatives, the peasant mutual aid committees, etc., progress is very slow, it is not in a "hurry." But this is not at all a youthful and revolutionary quality, befitting the Y.C.L.

We have tremendous possibilities for developing our work amongst girls in rural districts; but even this is far from being done in a manner befitting our Party work. We have millions upon millions of girl farm-hands, poor and middle peasant girls, who should become a powerful element in the ranks of Socialist builders in the village precisely at the present time. But they are not drawn in to a sufficiently large degree. It is absolutely necessary for us to draw in the female part of the rural population into the co-operatives, Soviets, etc., to work along these lines on a mass scale, helping in every way to promote progress at a more rapid pace than hitherto.

The new tasks now advanced in respect to the rural population—the task of mass collectivisation—must become attractive to new cadres of Socialist builders in the village, especially and particularly to those coming from the ranks of the Young Communist League and the peasant women delegates. We must in every way help to expand these new cadres, which are so necessary in the matter of transformation of the small individual rural enterprises into large-scale collective farms.

#### **Agricultural Labourers**

As I already indicated, we have over three and a half million agricultural labourers, of whom only one-fourth are, according to official figures (which, of course, are not complete), organised in the union. We also know that the budget of the agricultural labourers' union is more than

half spent on the union machine and only a negligible part serves the needs of its members. Such is the situation in the agricultural labourers' organisation. In this sphere we are also far removed from what we must accomplish in the near future.

Where are our forces so necessary to help the village? And working class help to the village is now more necessary than ever before. Where should we find these forces?

Take our Party organisations.

They very often repeat the watchwords "Face to the village," but nevertheless very frequently they look at the village through bureaucratic eyes. They do not know well enough what is going on there. Are there many such Party institutions which can boast of having been able to organise a broad group of active non-Party poor and middle peasants, which may really take the lead now, in the growing mass initiative, in the development of the work of the rural co-operatives, and particularly in transforming agriculture into large-scale collective farming? Not many, indeed very few, such Party organisations can be found as yet. Thus the watchword "Face to the village" is correct, but it must be enacted in a Bolshevik manner and not (as is very frequently the case) in the manner I have just mentioned.

But this watchword is obviously inadequate, particularly now when we are entering a new phase of rural work, when the main task must become a mass transition to large-scale collective farming through co-operation. These new tasks place on the working class also tremendous new obligations in respect to the village. The working class can, and must now do, much more in this respect than hitherto.

Lenin energetically supported in his day such new forms of rural work as patronage of urban organisations over villages.

Patronage has since then developed, although very slowly. For instance, the Moscow and Leningrad patronage societies have made no progress during the last two years in their budget, and they work without any incentive. However, the workers have displayed initiative in this respect. The workers organised in the patronage

societies now number  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million. But this membership is insufficient and often is a mere formality. We must secure a maximum of incentive in the work of the patronage societies and the work of the organisations of workers coming from different localities, etc.

But even that is insufficient.

It is the duty of the working class at the present time not only to develop the patronage societies and the organisations of workers according to the localities they come from, but to bring the task of rural work before all trade union organisations. It is the duty of all trade union organisations, and especially of the agricultural labourers' union and others which are directly connected with the country—as, for instance, the building workers' union, the metal workers, textile workers, railway workers, chemists, and printing unions—in fact, it is the duty of all trade unions to give active support in the carrying out of the new tasks—the tasks of a cardinal socialist transformation of the rural districts. (Applause.)

In our trade unions the workers directly connected with the villages constitute a considerable percentage. Among these trade union members there are seasonal and casual workers, etc. There are many of them in the various unions. Apart from that most of the unions have from 20 to 30 per cent. of workers who, in one form or another, maintain permanent contact with the village through their families, and in many cases they even have their own plots of land.

This emphasises once more how sound the alliance between the workers and peasants is in our country. But this also emphasises the fact that the trade unions, all trade unions without exception, both local and central, headed by the A.R.T.U.C. have it as their task to develop immediately and on a broad scale organised proletarian support and assistance to the peasantry in initiating co-operative development, and in the transformation of co-operation into mass collective farming. Political, organisational, and cultural help, particularly rendered by the workers in the matter of organising large scale farming is the most thankful task for the organised proletariat, it is a matter of most vital importance for the proletarian revolution, it is the basis of



real Socialist construction, the foundation of the final victory of Communism.

We are now entering upon a period in which we really begin to feel with our own feet the path which leads us to the annihilation of the contradictions existing between town and country.

For the realisation of these great Communist tasks, the organised working class must undertake more energetically and persistently to support the backward toiling masses in the country. By understanding its new tasks and duties, the proletariat will succeed in realising that the workers' and peasants' alliance achieve its main task, namely, the establishment of a society in which there will be no proletarians, no peasants, and no classes in our country, and in which we will all be equal members of one Socialist society. (Stormy prolonged applause. The Congress rises.)

## THE OPPOSITION

### Opposition Statements to the 15th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

#### 1. TO THE PRESIDUM OF THE 15TH CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U.

Comrades, unity of the Communist Party is the main principle of the epoch of proletarian dictatorship. Without a Party unity on a Leninist base the dictatorship cannot be maintained, the construction of Socialism cannot be carried on, and assistance to the development of world revolution is impossible.

However, the recent development of inner Party strife definitely menaces the unity of our Party. Should the further development of our struggle lead to a split and later take the form of a struggle between two parties, it would be the greatest menace to Lenin's cause.

We do not by any means want to deny our share of responsibility for the acute inner Party situation: in the struggle for our views we have entered upon the path of factionalism which at times took extremely sharp forms and on several occasions we resorted to methods which go against Party discipline. We were urged on to this path only by our profound conviction of the correctness and the Leninist character of our views, by our desire to bring these views to the knowledge of the masses of Party members, by the obstacles we had to contend with on this path, and by the accusations, which are unbearable for Bolsheviks, made against us.

We have no difference of programme with the Party. Pointing out the presence and growth of Thermidorian dangers in the country and the inadequate measures against them, we never thought, and do not think, that our Party or its C.C. have become Thermidorian, or that our State has ceased to be a workers' State, and this is categorically

stated in our platform. We still maintain (and we shall defend this view) that our Party is, as it has been, an organisation of the proletarian vanguard, and that the Soviet Government is an organisation of the proletarian dictatorship. We brook no doubts and vacillations on the question of defence of the U.S.S.R., the first proletarian State in the world, the country of all toilers. We did not and do not intend to make non-Party people the judges as to our inner-Party controversies, being at the same time firmly convinced that the Party has nothing to conceal, in so far as fundamental political questions are concerned, from the non-Party working masses who constitute the class basis of the Party, and that the non-Party workers must be informed of the inner Party affairs in the form of an objective outline of the different points of view existing in the Party, as was the case when Lenin was with us.

However, the inner Party struggle has reached a degree of sharpness such as constitutes a definite menace to the unity of the Party, and consequently a menace to the fundamental interests of the proletarian dictatorship. This cannot and must not continue in the future. In this form the struggle must be liquidated. In the face of the international bourgeoisie, who speculate on a split in the Party, and who prepare war against the U.S.S.R. with increasing persistence, in face of the international proletariat who correctly see in the unity of the C.P.S.U. the most important guarantee that their revolutionary struggles will be successful—we consider it our duty to do everything necessary to strengthen the fighting unity of our Party.

We cannot renounce views, of the correctness of which we are convinced and which have been submitted by us to the Party in a platform and in our theses, but in order to preserve the unity of the Party and safeguard its full fighting capacity as the leader of a State and the world proletarian movement, we declare to the Congress that we will stop all our factional work, dissolve all factional organisations, and call upon our fellow-thinkers in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern to do likewise. We consider that it is an unconditional duty of a Party member to submit to the Congress, and that we shall live up to this condition. We have worked for our Party for dozens of years. We are not

bent on a split or in the organisation of a second party. We categorically reject the idea of a second party. Every attempt in that direction we consider to be an absolute violation of Lenin's teachings, and doomed to failure. We shall work for our Party also in the future, advocating our views within the strict limits of the Party Statutes and decisions, which is the right of every Bolshevik laid down in many basic Congress decisions under Lenin and after.

This statement expresses our firm determination.

We are convinced that we express the opinion of all our fellow thinkers expelled from the Party, and that the Party will consider it necessary, on the basis of this statement, to reinstate those who have been expelled, liberate those who have been arrested for Opposition activity, and give us all a chance to prove by our work in the Party the firmness of this, our decision, as a first step to the restoration of normal life in the Party.

We have no doubt that analogous measures on the part of the Comintern as regards our real fellow thinkers will, in connection with the ceasing of their factional activities, help to restore normal conditions also in the other Sections of the Comintern.

We fought for our views with firmness and determination before the Congress and during the pre-Congress discussion. Having decided to submit to the Congress we shall just as firmly and determinedly carry that decision into effect as true soldiers of the Bolshevik proletarian army.

(1) L. Avdeev, member of Party since 1901; (2) A. Alexandrov, member of Party since 1918; (3) G. Alexeev, member of Party since 1916; (4) Alsky, 1917; (5) N. Andreev, 1914; (6) Aussem, 1901; (7) A. Bielobrodov, 1907; (8) J. Belais, 1912; (9) S. Babakhan, 1917; (10) A. Batashev, 1918; (11) S. Baranov, 1913; (12) G. Belinky, 1901; (13) I. Bakayev, 1906; (14) Budzinskaya, 1914; (15) M. Boguslavsky; (16) V. Vorobiev, 1914; (17) J. Vardin, 1907; (18) I. Vratshchev, 1917; (19) V. Vuyovitch, 1912; (20) S. Gessen, 1915; (21) N. Greizna, 1917; (22) V. I. Gussiev, 1917; (23) N. Gordon, 1903; (24) A. Gertik, 1902; (25) L. Ginsburg, 1907; (26) A. Gural'sky, 1918; (27) V. Goratchiev, 1909; (28) Drobins; (29) T. Dmitriev, 1915; (30) J. Yelkovitch, 1917; (31) G. Yevdo-

kimov, 1903; (32) P. Yezhov, 1917; (33) E. Yefretov, 1917; (34) A. Zhuk, 1904; (35) G. Zinoviev; (36) S. Zorin, 1917; (37) N. Zalutsky, 1907; (38) D. Sveriev, 1917; (39) A. Istchenko, 1917; (40) A. Ivanov, 1913; (41) V. Ivanov, 1915; (42) Ilyin, 1917; (42) L. Kamenev; (44) S. Kavtaradze, 1903; (45) Kaspersky, 1913; (46) M. Krassovskaya, 1912; (47) Kovalevsky, 1905; (48) A. S. Kuklin, 1903; (49) V. Kasparova, 1904; (50) A. Koroliev, 1916; (51) Krissin, 1917; (52) Komandeer, 1912; (53) Kahalin, 1917; (54) Kostritzky, 1917; (55) A. Konkova, 1912; (56) I. N. Katalinov; (57) Korshunov, 1919; (58) M. Lashevitch, 1901; (59) V. Levin, 1917; (60) G. Liubin, 1917; (61) P. Lelozol, 1905; (62) Lizardin, 1892; (63) G. Lobanov, 1918; (64) N. Muralov, 1901; (65) V. Maliuta, 1916; (66) C. Milner, 1918; (67) A. Minitchev, 1911; (68) P. Makarov, 1917; (69) I. Naumov, 1913; (70) N. Nikolaev, 1914; (71) A. Nilolaev, 1913; (72) Nalivaiko, 1917; (73) N. J. Natanson; (74) E. Preobrazhensky, 1903; (75) U. Piatakov, 1910; (76) V. Popomarev, 1917; (77) Pitashko, 1918; (78) A. Peterson, 1917; (79) I. Paulson, 1918; (80) I. Reingold, 1917; (81) C. Ravitch, 1903; (82) K. Radek; (83) C. Rakovsky; (84) Rotzkan, 1915; (85) Rizhov, 1918; (86) R. Rafael, 1910; (87) M. Rem, 1918; (88) V. Ruminazev; (89) G. Sararev, 1908; (90) I. Smilga, 1907; (91) L. Serebriakov, 1905; (92) P. Safronov, 1917; (93) Sarkis, 1917; (94) Sokolov, 1914; (95) I. Semionov, 1917; (96) P. Semionov, 1917; (97) M. Soloviev, 1915; (98) L. Sosnovsky, 1903; (99) I. N. Smirnov, 1899; (100) S. G. Semionov, 1919; (101) Z. Senkov, 1919; (102) L. Trotsky; (103) Tuzhikov, 1919; (104) O. Tarkhanov, 1917; (105) I. I. Tarasov; (106) F. Tartakovskaya; (107) K. Utkin, 1918; (108) Ukonen, 1918; (109) G. Fiederov, 1907; (110) I. Furtichev, 1917; (111) I. Fortin, 1919; (112) I. Philipov, 1919; (113) N. Kharitonov, 1905; (114) D. Khatchkov, 1917; (115) Tchernov, 1918; (116) G. Sharov, 1904; (117) S. Sheshelova, 1918; (118) A. Shurigin, 1914; (119) E. Eshba, 1914; (120) M. Yakovlev, 1916; (121) Z. I. Ilyina, 1902.

On behalf of the above,

L. KAMENEV.

December 3, 1927.

## 2. TO COMRADE ORDJHONIKIDZE, CHAIRMAN OF THE 15TH CONGRESS COMMISSION.

Please bring the following statement before the Commission, and later before the Congress :

The resolution of the Congress on the report of the C.C. "declares membership of the Trotskyist opposition and the propagation of its views incompatible with membership of the Bolshevik Party."

In so doing the 15th Congress has not only rejected our opinions, but also prohibited their propagation. Defending our principles of the correctness of which we are convinced before the Congress, we at the same time emphasise in our statements to the Congress that we consider it obligatory for us to submit to the decisions of the Congress, no matter how hard they may be.

The situation has given rise to the question of a second party. We reject, on the basis of our principles, the path of a second party under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship.

In view of that, submitting to the decision of the Congress, we, participants in the Congress, declare, (1) That the Opposition faction must and will cease to exist, and (2) the decision of the Congress to be put into force prohibiting the propagation of our views is accepted by all of us. We call upon all our fellow thinkers to draw the same conclusions from the Congress decision. Everyone of us must accept the position pointed out by the Party and energetically carry out its decisions in his everyday practical work, helping the Party to go forward with the aims sponsored by Lenin.

Comrades, those who have been expelled from the Party for Opposition activities have already requested the Congress to reinstate them. We repeat and support their request, considering it a matter of course that the liberation of the arrested comrades in connection with Opposition activity to be an absolute necessity.

L. KAMENEV, I. BAKAYEV,

L. AVDEYEV, G. YEVDOKIMOV.

December 10, 1927.

### 3. TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMISSION OF THE 15TH CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U.

The decision of the 15th Congress of the Party on the incompatibility of adhering to the Opposition with membership in the Party induces us to make the following statement :

Submitting to the decision of the Congress, we cease all our factional work, dissolve all factional organisations, and call upon our fellow thinkers to do likewise.

We categorically reject the path of a second party, and consider every attempt in that direction to be absolutely counter to the existence of the proletarian dictatorship and therefore doomed to failure.

From this it clearly follows that in keeping with the decision of the Congress we take upon ourselves the obligation not to propagate our views by factional methods.

At the same time we think that our views laid down in the platform and thesis can be defended by everyone of us in the Party within the limits of its Statutes. To renounce the advocacy of our views in the Party is politically tantamount to a renunciation of the views themselves. Such renunciation would be our duty if we were convinced of their incorrectness, *i.e.*, that they are not in keeping with the programme of the C.P.S.U. or are of minor importance from the point of view of the fate of the Party and the proletarian dictatorship. Otherwise to renounce the defence of these views would really be renunciation of the right to fulfil the most elementary duty in relation to the Party and the working class.

We do not doubt that our fellow thinkers, including those who have been expelled from the Party, will prove their loyalty to Lenin's Party and will not hesitate in the matter of safeguarding its unity as a necessary condition for the proletarian dictatorship.

We firmly believe that the Party will find a way of readmitting to its ranks those who have been expelled and liberating from prison those under arrest for Opposition activity.

N. MURALOV, C. RAKOVSKY.

I add my signature to the statement of Comrades Muralov and Rakovsky. K. B. RADEK.

Received 10-12, 1927, 7.15 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*

## THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION IN CHARGE OF OPPOSITION AFFAIRS.

### Comrade Ordjhonikidze's Report.

The report on the work of the Congress Commission in charge of Opposition affairs is made by Comrade Ordjhonikidze, who is greeted with stormy and prolonged applause.

ORDJHONIKIDZE: Comrades, the Commission you elected made a thorough investigation of all documents concerning the activities of the Trotskyist Opposition and also the documents concerning people and groups who want to get into the breach made by the Opposition and take advantage of our inner Party differences with an obviously counter-revolutionary aim.

The Commission considers it has absolute proof that the Opposition had its local committees, regional committees, and its own central committee. This is confirmed both by documents which we have at our disposal and by the speeches of Comrades Kuzovnikov; Zoff, Pickle, and others. The Opposition had its own machinery, its own treasury, which thrived on membership dues and donations from non-Party elements sympathising with the Opposition. The Opposition established contact both at home and abroad, not only with people and groups expelled from the Party and the Comintern, but also with non-Party people who never belonged to our Party or the Comintern. The infamous Scherbakov case, unpleasant as it is for the Opposition, is nevertheless a fact. It is a fact that the Opposition was connected with such people. We said so before, and now repeat, that we do not accuse the Opposition of having been in contact with counter-revolutionaries, but we maintain, on the basis of documents in hand, that counter-revolutionary scoundrels gathered around the Opposition, and that the Opposition by its



actions against the Party fed these counter-revolutionary scoundrels. The Opposition, despite their pledges, did not break connections with the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group and other expelled elements from the Comintern; they continued, and still continue their organisational and ideological contact with them.

The Opposition openly appealed and is appealing to non-Party elements against the Party and against its C.C. Finally, there is the infamous incident of November 7th in the streets against the Party and against the Soviet Government. By its work, the Opposition inspired counter-revolution within our country, because the speeches delivered by Oppositionists directed against the Party were caught up by counter-revolutionary elements, saying that what they said before is now confirmed by the utterings of such authorities as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and others. By its work the Opposition did not only not help in organising the working masses abroad around the Soviet Government, but the contrary. Had its agitation been successful, the working class would regard the Soviet Government as a foreign government, a Thermidor Government.

All bourgeois and Social Democratic, as well as the Russian emigré papers abroad, published the speeches of Trotsky, Zinoviev, and other Oppositionists, showing that they have all the time been writing what is now confirmed in these speeches.

In the ideological sphere the Opposition has gone as far as the denial of the possibility of the victorious building up of Socialism in our country, denial of the Socialist character of our State industry, denial of the Socialist path of development of the rural districts under the proletarian dictatorship and the policy of an alliance between the proletariat and the masses of the peasantry on the basis of Socialist construction. It hurls against the Party the atrocious accusation of degeneration.

It is clear that here no mere trifles are involved. It is not here a question of individual mistakes of one Oppositionist or another, but, as the Congress has absolutely correctly pointed out, the Opposition has turned away from Leninism both in the ideological, tactical, and organisa-

tional spheres. In its decision on the report of the C.C., the Congress recognised the impossibility of the Opposition remaining within the Party, characterising their views as Menshevik Trotskyist views.

The Commission received three documents from the Opposition. The first one is an Opposition statement of December 3, 1927. It says :

“The unity of the Communist Party is the main principle of the epoch of proletarian dictatorship. Without Party unity on a Leninist basis, the dictatorship cannot be maintained, the construction of Socialism cannot be carried on, and assistance to the development of world revolution is impossible.”\*

But the Congress recognised that the views advocated by the Opposition are not Leninist but Menshevik. Therefore, if the Opposition sincerely stands for unity of our Party, if it does not intend to organise a second party, it must renounce its non-Leninist views.

Further, they say :

“In the struggle for our views we have entered upon the path of factionalism which at times took extremely sharp forms, and on several occasions we resorted to methods which go against Party discipline. We were urged on to this path only by our profound conviction of the correctness and the Leninist character of our views, by our desire to bring these views to the knowledge of the masses of Party membership, by the obstacles we had to contend with on this path, and by the accusations, which are unbearable for Bolsheviks, made against us.”\*\*

Here the Opposition points out that it stepped beyond the Party statutes, but that it was compelled to do so by the fact that the views which it advocates are really Leninist views, and those which the C.C. and our Party adheres to are non-Leninist. It further accuses the Central Committee of having compelled the Opposition to resort to this impermissible action, the violation of

\*From the statement of the 121.

\*\*From the same statement.

Party discipline and the Party statutes. It again follows that we are to blame and not they. The Congress recognised the views laid down in Zinoviev's and Trotsky's platform as Menshevik views. They regard them as Leninist views. The Congress declared the Opposition views to be Menshevik, they maintain that their views are correct and that they cannot renounce them.

This document we received before the Congress decision. After the Congress decision, we received two more documents, one signed by Kamenev, Bakayev, Avdeyev, and Yevdokimov on December 10th and the other signed by Muralov, Rakovsky and Radek on the same date. It seems that the bloc which Zinoviev said was to be "for good and for all" is cracking somewhere. If these documents are not merely hypocritical, if they do not constitute some military trick, if they are not a tactical move, then the Oppositionists should have honestly declared in them before the whole Party where they differ from the Party. I should say that we do not find any big difference between these two documents. In the first one, signed by Kamenev, Bakayev, and Avdeyev, we read:—

"Defending our principles of the correctness of which we are convinced, before the Congress, we at the same time emphasise in our statements to the Congress that we think it obligatory for us to submit to the decisions of the Congress no matter how hard they may be."

It is customary for us Bolsheviks that every Party and Congress decision is binding on all Party members without any statements. (Applause.) If Kamenev, Bakayev, Avdeyev, and Yevdokimov think they make some concession to the Congress by declaring that they will submit to its decisions, they are profoundly mistaken. There has never been a decision of our Congresses which was not binding for every member of our Party. - Those who will not submit to these decisions, we wish them a bon voyage. (Applause.)

In another document, signed by Muralov and Rakovsky, and later by Radek, we read:—

"We think that our views laid down in the plat-

form and these can be defended by every one of us in the Party within the limits of its Statutes. To renounce the advocacy of our views the Party is politically tantamount to a renunciation of the views themselves. Such renunciation would be our duty if we were convinced of their incorrectness, *i.e.*, that they are not in keeping with the programme of the C.P.S.U. or are of minor importance from the point of view of the fate of the Party and the proletarian dictatorship. Otherwise, to renounce the defence of these views would really be a renunciation of the right to fulfil the most elementary duty in relation to the Party and the working class."

This is said concerning the views which the 15th Congress unanimously declared to be Menshevik views. We are told that we cannot renounce the propagation of these views, but we will carry them on within the limits of the Statutes. Well, comrades, I do not know any Statutes in our Party which would permit the propagation of Menshevism within the Bolshevik Party. There is no such Statute in our Party and there never will be. (TOMSKY: "There will never be." Tumultuous applause.) It is clear that if these are Menshevik views they must be most emphatically rejected. That is what the Congress has done. If the Opposition, nevertheless, intends to propagate these views within the Party, it stands to reason that no one will permit it. The Oppositionists must decide for themselves: either they adhere to their Menshevik views, then they should withdraw from the Bolshevik Party, or down with the Menshevik views, in which case they remain in our Leninist Party. (Applause.)

Based on the decisions of the Party Congress, the Commission found these Opposition statements absolutely unsatisfactory. (Applause.)

From the other Opposition members we received no statement whatever. The Commission considered it necessary to recall Comrade Piatakov as lately he has not lived in Moscow, but abroad, to explain his attitude to the Opposition actions which recently took place (the printing establishment, illegal meetings, the November 7th demonstrations, etc.).

On instructions of the Commission I invited him. To my questions, Comrade Piatakov answered that he does not approve of the actions of the Opposition on November 7th and the organisation of illegal printing establishments, but that he thinks that this was caused by the Party Régime. He considers the Opposition platform correct. Moreover, he added that we ourselves will soon adopt this platform. (Hooting in the hall.) That is the answer he gave us.

Comrade Kamenev told some individual delegates here that he does not get any assistance from either side to find a way out of the impasse in which the Opposition finds itself and that he addressed himself to every one of us, but no one would come to his assistance. Comrade Kamenev said that he addressed himself to me and that I advised him to throw himself into the sea and swim, so that he will either get to the other side or drown. In so far as this was loudly proclaimed here, it is impossible for me to ignore it. It is true that Comrades Kamenev, Smirnov, and Smilga came to me two or three hours before the opening of the Congress suggesting a preliminary conference with the members of the Polit. Bureau. I told them that the Congress must open within about two or three hours and that the only way out is to take the Congress platform and say honestly and truly what they intend to do in the future. I considered any kind of negotiation behind the scenes absolutely inadmissible and advised them to appeal to the supreme organ of the Party—the Congress. What they said at the Congress we all heard. Their reply to the Congress decision we can see from the documents handed out to you. Is it the reply the Congress asked for? No. The Congress demanded ideological and organisational disarmament. We see neither the one nor the other in their replies.

If they tell us now that they are dissolving their faction it is rather difficult for us to believe them, because we have documents showing that they tell their fellow thinkers that the faction must be formally dissolved, but that actually it is necessary for them to rally to their platform, as it is the right platform. This cannot be otherwise. If you tell your fellow thinkers that your platform is a "Leninist" correct platform and all decisions of the Con-

gress verge on Menshevism, what fool would consent to cease the struggle?

That they do not disarm ideologically is clear from their documents. What was there for us to do? Could the commission make some foul compromise and bring it before the Congress? We thought that such a compromise would not merely be useless to the Party, but that it would do tremendous harm. We have tried many a time to come to terms with the Opposition. You remember the famous statement of October 16th, 1926; you know their statement and their pledge of the 8th of August this year. How did it end? It ended so that fierce attacks on the Party began the very next day. We thought, and still think, that if the Opposition honestly and sincerely wants to remain in the old Leninist Party it must come here and declare that it will fully and completely disarm both in an ideological and organisational respect—(applause)—that it fully and entirely recognises its mistakes and submits to the Party Congress. (Applause.) If, however, this does not happen, and so far it has not happened, then there is no use to start all over again the shilly-shallying which we have indulged in with the Opposition for two years. (Applause.)

This impels us to adopt the resolution which says that the Opposition must be expelled from the Party. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Prolonged applause.) At the same time, our proposal points out that the Party must exert all its efforts, take every measure towards freeing the rank and file workers who still belong to the Opposition—their ranks are already deteriorating, and we have seen in Leningrad alone 300 Bolshevik workers deserting the Opposition in the course of the last two weeks—from the ruinous influence of Trotsky's and Zinoviev's Menshevik ideas. (Applause.)

Submitting such a decision to you comrades, we know perfectly well how tremendous its significance is. We know perfectly well how hard it is to expel a section of ex-Bolsheviks from the Party, a section of ex-Bolsheviks who brought a good deal of benefit to our Party and fought many years in our ranks, but they compelled us to do it, I repeat, they compelled us. (Voice: "The Party demands it.") But there is nothing that can be done.

These comrades have done much work in our Party, but now when the Party is faced with difficulties, they, instead of combating these difficulties together with us and helping us to organise the defence of the country, attack our Party and the Soviet Government. This being so, we, no matter how hard it is for us, shall vote with a clear conscience that all those who hamper the Party should remain outside of it. (Tumultuous applause.) At the same time we shall do our utmost so that the Oppositionists should find themselves within the next few months ideologically and organisationally isolated as ex-generals without a single soldier, fully convinced that we shall be victorious. (Prolonged applause.)

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **Comrade Kalinin's Speech.**

Comrades, apparently the Opposition bloc has split in-two at the 15th Congress; at least we have heard a statement from only one part of that bloc. It should be said that, in addition to the grounds we had for expelling the Opposition from the Party, they have added many more reasons in their last statement. (Voices: "Hear! hear!" Applause.) It seems to me that this part of the Opposition we now have has ended both ideologically and organisationally. At the present time, even the most moderate Party member, with the best will to keep the Opposition in the Party, must say after this statement that this group of ex-Communists is dead and has definitely broken away from the Party.

We also have another statement submitted by another section of the Opposition bloc signed by Comrade Kame-nev and others. The authors of that statement say that they renounce the propagation of their views . . . they "renounce." They "promise" to submit to all Party decisions. But . . . they consider their views correct. (!!)

Comrades, what can be the opinion of the working class, from the moral and particularly the political point of view, of people who declare before the whole world that they renounce the propagation of views, which in their

opinion are correct? How can such a statement be understood? It is either a deliberate deception of the Party members, a deliberate, ill-intentioned deception, so that under its cover they may carry on their disruptive work again and again, or these Oppositionists have become philistines who hold their views for themselves, without advocating them.

They speak of solidarity. But this solidarity must find expression first of all in collective activity. The strength of the Party consists in its unity, in the unity of its action. And it seems to me that with all our good intention—and there is no doubt that many Communists have such intentions—to find some form which would make it possible for us to leave these people within the Party, we cannot do so. To do so would be dangerous for the Party. It would mean to retain merely apparent Party unity by trying to preserve by all means a certain number of obviously superfluous Party members. But such unity demoralises the Party, destroys the entity of the Bolshevik conceptions, and undermines the Bolshevik organisational structure. Such unity converts the true unity of the Party, where every member is obliged to submit unconditionally to the will of the Party, into a conglomeration of various groups, in other words, into a Menshevik Party.

Comrades, I think that some of us probably cherished the hope that perhaps on the last day, the last decisive day when the question of expelling this group of people from the Party was considered, we should hear from them words of repentance. But as you see, nothing of the sort from either of the groups of the former Opposition bloc. Evidently, the culprits themselves feel that they are already a foreign body within the Communist Party.

Comrades, it is unpleasant to have to expel members from the Party. All of us understand that there are a good many highly deserving comrades among them who have been fighting together with us for years and years. But the time has come when all personal sympathy and all personal services must be put aside, and be subordinated to the interests of the proletariat, the interests of the Communist Party. The supreme interests of the working



class, not only of our Union but of other countries and the endeavour to preserve the ideological purity and organisational solidity of the Communist Party, imperiously demand that we make this excision of degenerating elements in our Party. (Applause.) We know very well that many times in the past people were cut off from our Bolshevik Party when it was underground and weak. All these operations proved mere episodes, but the groups which were cut off in most cases became ordinary phillistines. It seems to me that the same fate also awaits those who will be expelled from the Party now. There is no other way out for them. But the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, after casting out useless elements from its midst, will march onward at the head of the working class to the successful attainment of its Socialist construction. (Applause.)

\* \* \* \* \*

#### **4. TO THE 15TH CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U. ON THE MOTION TO EXPEL THE OPPOSITION FROM THE PARTY.**

It was moved at the Congress that we be expelled from the C.P.S.U. We consider it our duty to make the following statement on this matter to the Congress:

1. Expulsion from the Party deprives us of our Party rights, but it cannot free us from the duties which everyone of us took on himself in joining the ranks of the Communist Party. Being expelled from its ranks, we remain as before true to the programme of our Party, its traditions, its banner. We shall work for the strengthening of the Communist Party and its influence on the working class.

2. We declared and declare now that we submit to the decisions of the 15th Congress on the dissolution of our faction. We have pledged ourselves to advocate our views within the limits of the Party Statutes. We pledged, and pledge ourselves now, to do our utmost for the preservation of unity of our Party which is at the head of a workers' State. We categorically reject the intention to organise a second Party, which is ascribed to us, as being incompatible

with the proletarian dictatorship and against Lenin's teachings. Expulsion from the Party will not change our opinions nor our attitude to the question of unity in the C.P.S.U

3. We reject just as emphatically the assertions concerning the anti-Soviet tendencies in our struggle. All of us, in one form or another, are partakers in the building up of the Soviet State, the first country of the toilers. Our aim is to strengthen the Soviet Government on the basis of an alliance of the workers and peasants. Our path is the path of inner Party reform. We will strive forward to the triumph of our views only on this path.

4. Our opinions have been branded as Menshevik opinions at the Congress. We can by no means accept this characterisation. Menshevism was and is opposed to the October Revolution and is the champion of bourgeois democracy, which is a form of capitalist domination.

We are participants in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship. The meaning of our inner Party struggle lies in the defence of the Socialist dictatorship from mistakes as a result of which may follow a return, after several political stages, of bourgeois democracy.

5. We repudiate the "Trotskyist" epithet of the Opposition, which is based on artificial and deliberate attempts to link up the greatest problems of our epoch with pre-revolutionary differences which have long since been liquidated and with which most of us have not been connected. We stand fully and completely on the basis of the historical foundations of Bolshevism.

6. We are being expelled for our views. They have been laid down in our platform and theses. We consider these views to be Bolshevik-Leninist views. We cannot renounce them because the march of events confirms their correctness.

7. Over one thousand Communists of the Opposition have already been expelled from the Party. The expulsion of the leaders of the Opposition by the Congress will signal the expulsion of additional thousands. These expulsions will signify—whether the Congress wants it or not—a turn of Party policy to the right, a strengthening of the classes

and groups within the country which are hostile to the proletariat and an incentive to the imperialist encroachments from without.

It is impossible successfully to limit the kulak, combat bureaucracy, and introduce the seven-hour day by cutting off at the same time those elements from the Party who have been endeavouring, during the last few years, to rebuff the growing strength of the kulak, persistently speaking against bureaucratic distortions and bringing the question of a more rapid improvement of the workers' conditions on the order of the day. It is impossible to carry on preparations for the defence of the October conquests against the onslaughts of imperialism and at the same time drive out from the Party those elements whom the world bourgeoisie regard as their most irreconcilable foes.

8. The Party régime resulting in our expulsion inevitably leads to new dismemberment in the Party and to new expulsions. Only a régime of inner Party democracy can guarantee the elaboration of a correct Party line and strengthen its ties with the working class.

9. The expulsion of Oppositionists as well as the other repressive measures against them aim at tearing out by their roots Opposition ideas from the Party. But in so far as these ideas correctly reflect the historical interests of the proletariat and the basic tasks of the Party, they, in spite of repressions, will live in the Party and secure new champions.

The worker-Bolsheviks are the heart of the Party. In time of growing danger their voice will be decisive for the fate of the Party and the revolution.

10. Being expelled from the Party we shall work for our return to its ranks. We are convinced that our expulsion will be temporary because the further development of the class struggle and our activities will convince every Party member of the injustice of the accusations which brought about our expulsion.

11. The struggle within the ranks of the C.P.S.U. could not leave the ranks of the Comintern unaffected. The Opposition has its followers and sympathisers, who are subjected to repression just as we are, almost in all fraternal Communist Parties. We doubt whether the Op-

positionists expelled from the other Parties will choose the path of setting up duplicate Parties, *i.e.*, the path of splitting the Comintern. The correction of mistakes and straightening out of the line of the leaders can and should be done within the limits of unity. A patient elucidation of our views on the basis of events, active participation in the struggle of the Communist Parties against the bourgeoisie and the Social Democrats, will restore unity in the Comintern on the firm basis laid down by Lenin at the new rise of the tide of the labour movement.

12. True to the teachings of Marx and Lenin, vitally connected with the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern, we reply to our expulsion from the C.P.S.U. by our firm decision to fight under the Bolshevik banner without restraint for the triumph of world revolution, for the unity of the Communist Parties as the vanguards of the proletariat, for the defence of the conquests of the October Revolution, for Communism, for the C.P.S.U., and the Comintern

I. SMILGA, N. MURALOV,  
C. RAKOVSKY, K. RADEK.

December 18th, 1927.

\* \* \* \*

#### **RESOLUTION OF THE 15TH CONGRESS OF THE C.P.S.U. ON THE OPPOSITION.**

**(Unanimously Adopted.)**

The 15th Congress having heard the report of the Commission which made a careful study of all material concerning the Opposition, records the following.

1. In the ideological sphere the Opposition went over from differences of a tactical character to differences of a programmatic character, revising Lenin's ideas and deteriorating to the positions of Menshevism. The denial of the possibility of the victorious building up of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the consequent denial of the Socialist character of our revolution; the denial of the Socialist character of our State industry; the denial of the Socialist path of rural development under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship, and the policy of alliance of the proletariat with

the basic masses of the proletariat on the basis of Socialist construction; and, finally, the actual denial of the proletarian dictatorship of the U.S.S.R. ("Thermidor") and the capitulation and defeatism connected with it—this whole ideological orientation transformed the Trotskyist Opposition into a tool of petty bourgeois democracy within the U.S.S.R. and an accessory detachment of international Social Democracy abroad.

2. In the tactical sphere, the Opposition, by intensifying and accentuating its work against the Party, passed the boundary not only of the Party Statutes, but also of Soviet law (illegal meetings, illegal printing establishments, illegal organs of the Press, violent seizure of premises, etc.). The transition to an open struggle against the régime of the proletarian dictatorship, the organisation of street demonstrations against the Party and the Soviet Government on November 7th, 1927, marked the climax of this anti-Soviet tactic. The anti-Soviet tactic of the Opposition, employed also abroad in connection with the propagation of slanderous attacks on the U.S.S.R., has actually placed the Opposition on a level with the avowed enemies of the country of proletarian dictatorship.

3. In the organisational sphere the Opposition, based on a revision of Lenin's views, passed over from factionalism to the setting up of its own Trotskyist Party. The commission established beyond a doubt that the Opposition has its own central, regional, provincial, town and district committees, a technical apparatus, membership dues, press, organs, etc., etc. Abroad, the Trotskyist Opposition established connections not only with factional groups of anti-Leninist tendencies existing within the Parties of the Comintern, but also with organisations, groups and individuals who never belonged to the Communist International, as well as enemies and traitors of the Communist movement (Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Korsch, Souvarine, Rosmer, Roland Holst, Liebers, etc., etc.) who were expelled from the Communist International. Such organisational practice of the Opposition resulted in the fact that within the U.S.S.R. it established connections with non-Party bourgeois intellectuals (Stcherbakov and Co.), who were in turn connected with avowed counter-

revolutionaries, and abroad it became the object of extensive support on the part of the bourgeoisie of all countries.

Based on the above, the 15th Congress holds that the C.C. and C.C.C. were right in expelling Trotsky and Zinoviev on November 14th, 1927, from the ranks of the C.P.S.U., and the other Opposition members of the C.C. and C.C.C. from these bodies, and in bringing the Opposition question as a whole for the consideration of the Congress.

In its resolution on the report of the C.C. the Congress declared that membership of the Trotskyist Opposition and the propagation of its views are incompatible with membership of the C.P.S.U. The Congress holds in this connection that the Opposition must disarm both ideologically and organisationally, emphatically condemning its above-outlined views as anti-Leninists and Menshevik, and take upon itself the obligation to defend the opinions and decisions of the Party, its Congresses, its conferences, and its C.C.

However, the Opposition rejected this demand of the Party. In the Opposition documents of December 3rd, 1927, signed by 121 active members of the Opposition, the latter not only do not renounce, but, on the contrary, insist on the propagation of their Menshevik views.

After the Congress adopted the resolution on the report of the C.C., the Commission received two new Opposition documents on December 10th, 1927, one of which (signed Rakovsky, Muralov, and Radek) insists not only on the necessity of preserving these Menshevik views, but also on the necessity of advocating them, and the other (signed Kamenev, Bakayev, Yevdokimov, and Avdeyev) insists on the preservation of the Menshevik views of the Opposition, but renouncing their propagation, which does not meet the demands of ideological capitulation and is tantamount to a refusal to defend the decisions of the Party.

Recording the obvious difference of opinion between the two Opposition groups, the Congress nevertheless holds that both Opposition statements are absolutely unsatisfactory.

Based on the foregoing, and taking into considera-

tion of the twofold violation by the Opposition of its solemn pledges renouncing factionalism, the Congress resolves:

1. To expel from the Party 75 active members of the Trotskyist Opposition.

2. To expel from the Party the Sapronov group of 23 people as an obviously anti-revolutionary group.

3. To authorise the C.C. and C.C.C. to take all measures for ideological persuasion of the rank and file members of the Trotskyist Opposition with the object of convincing them, simultaneously purging the Party from all obviously incorrigible elements of the Trotskyist Opposition.

\* \* \* \* \*

## 5. TO THE PRESIDUM OF THE CONGRESS.

**Comrade Ordjonikidze.**

We request that you bring the following address to the knowledge of the Congress:

The resolution of the Congress on the Opposition question brings before every participant of the former Opposition faction the question of his further work for the proletarian revolution. To serve the cause which we served under Lenin's leadership for years and years is impossible outside of the C.P.S.U. or along the path of organising a second party. It can be served only within the ranks of the C.P.S.U. However, the Congress expelled us from the C.P.S.U. Hence, no matter how severe the demands put forward by the Congress may be, no matter how convinced we were in defending our views prior to the Congress, we are obliged to submit our will and our opinions to the will and opinions of the Party, because it is the only leader of the proletarian revolution, and the only judge of what is useful and what is harmful for the victorious movement of the revolution.

The statement of December 10th, containing the renunciation of the propagation of our views, was found unsatisfactory and inadequate by the Congress. We therefore undertake to carry out the demands of the Congress for our ideological and organisational capitulation.

pledge ourselves to defend the views and decisions of the Party, its Congress, its conferences, and its C.U. In keeping with the resolution of the Congress, we consider wrong and condemn as anti-Leninist our opinions on the questions of the possibility of victorious construction of Socialism in the U.S.S.R., the Socialist character of our revolution, the Socialist character of our State industry, the Socialist path of rural development under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship, and the policy of an alliance of the proletariat with the basic masses of the peasantry on the basis of Socialist construction, and the denial of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. ("Thermidor").

We consider that our chief mistake was that in the struggle against the C.C. of the Party we entered upon a path of action which created the real menace of a second Party. We must recognise the mistake of the action of November 7th, the seizure of premises, the organisation of illegal printing establishments, etc.

Those who try to organise a separate party against the Communist Party inevitably stand up against the Comintern and the U.S.S.R., and inevitably defect to the camp of their enemies. This is true not only of the C.P.S.U., but also of all other sections of the Comintern.

We therefore consider it a mistake to maintain contact with the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group, and sever our connections with it. As far as Korsch, Souvarine, Rosmer, Roland Holst, and Liebers are concerned, we had and have nothing in common with them.

We appeal to the Congress to reinstate us into the Party and give us a chance to participate in the everyday practical work of the Party.

The above statement was signed by L. Kamenev, Yevdokimov, G. Zinoviev, I. Bakayev, Lashevitch, Zalutsky, J. Shirov, and 16 other prominent followers of the Zinoviev group.

(This is dated December 18th, 1927, and was submitted to the Congress on December 19th, after the latter adopted on the 18th a resolution to expel the Opposition from the Party.)



**COMRADE RYKOV'S SPEECH BEFORE THE MOTION ON  
THE OPPOSITION STATEMENT OF DECEMBER 19TH  
WAS PUT TO THE VOTE.**

Comrades, to-day, the 19th of December, a collective statement has been received from Kamenev, Yevokimov, and others, who have been expelled by a previous decision from the Party, addressing the Congress as follows:—

(Reads Statement V. See page 407.)

I received this statement about 12 o'clock to-day from Kamenev, but I refused to grant his request to come to the hall—(Voices: "Well done!")—to read personally the statement and speak for it at the Congress. I told him that I have no right to do so without a special decision of the Congress, in so far as by its decision of yesterday Kamenev and the others have been expelled from the Party. (Voices: "That's right.")

Before moving the motion I would like to have the approval of the Congress of my reply to Kamenev or—(Voices: "We approve!" "Hear! hear!" Prolonged applause.)

On behalf of the Presidium of the 15th Congress I read the following draft decision in reply to the statement of Kamenev and others.

(He reads the draft decision. The reading is interjected by shouts and stormy applause.)

This motion is made by the Presidium. In view of the clarity of this question, in view of the weightiness of the crimes against the Party committed by the Opposition prior to the 15th Congress, and in view of the tremendous differences which arose, the decisions of the 15th Congress must be taken seriously by everybody—(Voices: "Hear, hear.")—they must be regarded as absolutely firm decisions—(Voices: "Hear, hear.")—expressing the will of the whole Party—"Hear, hear."—the whole working class. Apart from that, the 15th Congress cannot allow, regardless of all statements, any violation of law or anything the Opposition did prior to the 15th Congress. It is necessary that no one should ever again take the idea into his head that he can repeat the experience of the Opposition. (Voices: "Hear, hear." Stormy applause.)

**RESOLUTION OF THE CONGRESS RE STATEMENT OF  
23 OPPOSITION MEMBERS, ADOPTED ON THE 19TH  
OF DECEMBER.**

1. Not to examine the statement of Kamenev, Zinoviev, and others who have been expelled from the Party, submitted on December 19th, 1927, as the 15th Congress has already exhausted the Opposition question in its resolution of December 18th.

2. To propose to the C.C. and C.C.C. to accept applications from active members of the former Opposition expelled from the Party only individually and decide on them only six months after filing the application, on conditions that: (a) The behaviour of the applicants is in keeping with the pledges made in their statements; (b) the statements of the former Oppositionists themselves are in full keeping with the demands of the 15th Congress (see resolution of the 15th Congress on the Opposition), and consequently proceed from a renunciation of the "Platform of the 83," the "Platform of the 3rd of September," and the "Platform of the 15."

## REPORT OF THE CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

### COMRADE MOSKVIN :

The Credentials Committee approved 898 mandates with full voting rights and 771 with consultative votes. In issuing mandates the information of the Party organisations announced at conferences and conventions, during the election of delegates to the Congress, was taken as a foundation. Thus the figures concerning the numerical strength of the organisations have been taken in most cases for November 15-20.

A total of 1,669 mandates has been approved. The total number of Communists represented at the Congress is 1,236,190; Party members numbering 887,233 and candidates 348,957. If we compare the net figure of members in the Party as a whole with the number of mandates with full voting powers we will find that 11 mandates have been given to approximately every ten thousand members. (At the 14th Congress the number was 22, and at the 13th 43 per ten thousand.) Every mandate with full voting rights represents 988 Party members.

How are these mandates distributed according to organisations? The delegates representing industrial districts form 46.6 per cent.; the delegates from the agricultural districts constitute 34 per cent., and those of the nationality districts 16.3 per cent. The Ukraine, Moscow, and Leningrad have the largest delegations at the Congress. Together these three delegations constitute 37.5 per cent. of all delegates.

As far as the mandates with consultative voice are concerned, they are distributed as follows: Local organisations received 346 mandates, central institutions received 425. If, however, we take into consideration the fact that 109 mandates of the central institutions were given to

workers actually working in the locals (in the Y.C.L., Women's Departments, propaganda groups and members of the C.C.C.), the distribution of mandates assumes the following picture: Local representatives constitute 59.4 per cent. of the total and those coming from the centre constitute 40.6 per cent.

I am now going to give an analysis of the Congress composition. I will announce the figures concerning the delegates with full voting power only.

The first thing I should mention concerning the composition of the Congress is as follows: Of the delegates present at the Congress 449, or 50 per cent. of the total, have not been at Party Congresses before. Besides, the group of delegates participating at the 14th Congress (with full voting powers) constitute only 25.8 per cent. of this Congress, and therefore compared with the 14th Congress, the present one consists of 75 per cent. new delegates. Among the delegates who participated at previous congresses, 57 per cent. were present only at two congresses, and consequently 43 per cent. were present at more than two. Thus, side by side with the old Party cadres, a large number of new delegates, who have grown up in the Party since the proletarian revolution, is present at this Congress.

Among the delegates to this Congress, the number of Party officials has declined and the group of rank and file workers considerably increased. Party officials constituted 70 per cent. of the delegates at the 14th Congress, but their percentage at this Congress has decreased by 16 per cent., since they constitute only 54 per cent. The number of factory workers has increased in absolute figures from 34 at the 14th Congress to 165 at this Congress, or from 5 per cent. to 18.4 per cent. The group of Soviet officials has also somewhat increased. The group of military officers has increased approximately 1 per cent. The group of factory administrators has remained stable. The groups representing trade union officials has somewhat decreased.

Of the Party officials, 100 are secretaries and members of factory, department, transport, university, and rural nuclei. Among the trade union officials, 49 are chairmen

or members of factory committees. The rank and file Party and trade union workers together with the workers from the bench constitute 30 per cent. of all delegates with full voting powers.

By its social composition, the 15th Party Congress is a workers' Congress. Seventy-one per cent. of the delegates at this Congress are workers, *i.e.*, 9 per cent. more than at the 14th Congress, and 8 per cent. more than at the 13th Congress.

In analysing the social composition of the various delegations, it should be pointed out that the Leningrad delegation ranks first in its percentage of workers, who constitute 79½ per cent. of the delegation; the provinces not directly connected with the Central Committee of the Party rank second, the workers constituting 77.9 per cent.

There are 165 workers from the bench at the Congress. They constitute 18.4 per cent. of all delegates; 87.8 per cent. of the workers are skilled workers, 47 per cent. of whom are metal workers. The metal workers comprise the basic group of the general Congress composition.

The peasant group has increased only in absolute numbers. Its relative strength has remained unchanged as compared with the 14th Congress, and constitute 5.7 per cent. The group of office workers constituted 31.4 per cent. of all delegates at the 13th Congress, 30.9 per cent. at the 14th Congress, and at the 15th Congress it dropped 7 per cent. as compared with the 14th, and constitutes only 23 per cent. of the total. Of that group, 53 per cent. were underground members, and 70 per cent. have a Party standing dating from before the October revolution; 11 per cent. of the office workers are professional revolutionaries.

In respect to the Party standing of the delegates, the following should be pointed out. The relative strength of delegates who had been members of underground organisations at the 12th Congress was 59 per cent., whereas at the 15th Congress it has declined to 38½ per cent. This is perfectly reasonable if we take into consideration the natural loss of all underground elements on the one hand, and the growth of new Party cadres on

the other. During the period 1922-1927 the Party lost about 1,500 old "underground" members, which could not but have influenced their relative strength at the congresses. Almost one-third of the Congress has a Party standing dating from the Civil War, *i.e.*, from 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920.

Besides, 76 per cent. of the delegates at this Congress served in the Army or in institutions in the military zone during the Civil War. These figures are the best denial of the slander circulated by the Opposition in their "platform" that there is a process of squeezing out from the Party the old Party members, who have gone through underground experience or who have at least participated in the Civil War. Our figures, showing that 38½ per cent. of the Congress delegates were underground members, while these constitute only 1.2 per cent. of the Party membership, that one-third of the delegates with decisive voice have a party standing dating from the Civil War, and 76 per cent. of all delegates took part in the Civil War, entirely refute this Opposition slander.

As far as the group from other Parties is concerned, it is continuously declining, and at the 15th Congress it constitutes 9 per cent. of all delegates; the former members of other parties were mostly Mensheviks—33 per cent., followed by Left S.R.'s—17 per cent., internationalists—13 per cent. The relative strength of the other groups is smaller, the smallest group being former Bundists (5 per cent.) and Anarchists (4 per cent.). It should be born in mind that 22 per cent. of them belonged to other parties during the underground period, and about 50 per cent. up to the October revolution.

The age composition of the 15th Congress is somewhat higher than that of the 14th Congress.

The number of women has increased from 2.4 per cent. to 4.6 per cent. as compared with the 14th Congress.

Finally, a few words concerning the national composition of the Congress. Compared with the 13th Congress, the Russian group has somewhat increased—from 60.8 per cent. to 62 per cent.; the relative strength of the Ukrainians has increased from 4.7 per cent. to 9.18 per cent., *i.e.*, almost double. There is also a relative increase in

the White-Russian delegates—from 1.2 per cent. to 2.9 per cent., and Turko-Tartars from 1 per cent. to 1.6 per cent. As far as the other nationalities are concerned, their strength has either remained stable or has somewhat decreased. There is a considerable decrease in representatives of nationalities which have no territories of their own, including the Jews—from 11.3 per cent. to 7.4 per cent.; and Letts from 7 per cent. to 4.7 per cent. Such are the main figures concerning the composition of the 15th Party Congress.

# The Workers' State

---

Foreign Delegation's Interview  
with J. Stalin, on November  
5th, 1927

[This pamphlet is a stenographic report of an interview given by the Secretary of the Russian Communist Party to a delegation of eighty foreign workers, and gives Stalin's reply on all the points raised by the delegation]

*From the Workers' Bookshop, Ltd.,  
16 King Street, London, W.C.2  
Price One Penny  
and Workers' Library Publishers,  
39 East 125th Street, New York*