

UNPUBLISHED MSS. OF KARL MARX.
STALIN: RESULTS OF 5-YEAR PLAN.

SPECIAL
DOUBLE
NUMBER

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE



February 15th, 1933

VOLUME X

COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL No. 3-4

TWENTY CENTS
CONTENTS
OVERLEAF

CONTENTS

Number 3 & 4

Published fortnightly in Russian, German,
French, Chinese, Spanish and English.

1. FOR MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY

(See page 91)

2. THE HISTORIC PLENUM OF THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE C.P.S.U. (b)

(See page 97)

3. THE RESULTS OF THE FIRST FIVE-YEAR PLAN

*(Report delivered at the Joint Plenum of the C.C. and the Central Control Com-
mission of the C.P.S.U. (b) January 7th, 1933)*

(See page 106)

J. STALIN

4. MR. CAMPBELL EXAGGERATES

(Reprinted from the "Bolshevik" No. 22)

(See page 124)

J. STALIN

5. WHICH WAY OUT?

S. GUSSEV

(See page 127)

6. LENIN, LUXEMBOURG, LIEBKNECHT

A. MARTYNOV

(See page 134)

50th ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF KARL MARX

7. EDITORIAL NOTE

(See page 143)

8. FROM MARX-ENGELS-LENIN INSTITUTE

(See page 143)

9. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WORKERS

KARL MARX

(See page 143)

10. THE "QUESTIONNAIRE FOR WORKERS" OF KARL MARX

A. C. BERNSTEIN

(See page 147)

FOR MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY

THE Communist International is strong because it stands completely on the ground of the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Almost one hundred years which have passed since the birth, formation and dissemination of revolutionary Marxism; nearly thirty years' struggle of the Bolshevik Party, originated under the leadership of Lenin on the solid basis of revolutionary Marxism, which was further developed by him, gaining the greatest victories under his banner, have demonstrated the tremendous importance of the theory of Marx as a guide to action in the struggle for the complete liberation of the proletariat.

"Marxist theory," wrote Lenin at the dawn of his activity, "for the first time converted socialism from an Utopia into a science, established the firm principles of this science, and indicated the path which must be followed by this science in future; in the elaboration of all of its aspects. It revealed the essence of the modern capitalist economy, explaining how wage-labour, the purchase of labour power, conceals the enslavement of the millions of propertyless people by a handful of capitalists, of owners of the land, factories, mines, etc. It revealed how the entire development of modern capitalism tends to replace small production by big industry, creates the conditions which make the socialist organisation of society possible and necessary. It taught us to see beneath the cover of time-honoured customs, political intrigues, cunning laws, hair-splitting sciences—the *class struggle*, the struggle between the varied types of propertied classes, and the propertyless masses, and the proletariat which stands at the head of the propertyless. It revealed the true task of a revolutionary socialist party, which consists, not in drafting plans for the reorganisation of society, not in preaching to the capitalists and their satellites on the improvement of the situation of the workers, not in the organisation of conspiracies, but in the *organisation of the class struggle of the proletariat and the leadership of this struggle, the ultimate goal of which consists in the capture of political power by the proletariat and the organisation of the socialist system.*"—(Lenin, Vol. II, 2nd Russian ed., p. 391.)

In the article entitled *The Teachings of Karl Marx*, Lenin wrote :—

"From the foregoing it is manifest that Marx deduces the inevitability of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society wholly and exclusively from the economic law of the movement of contemporary society. . . . The intellectual and moral driving force of this transformation is the proletariat, the physical carrier trained by capital-

ism itself. The contest of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, assuming various forms which grow continually richer in content, inevitably becomes a political struggle aiming at the conquest of political power by the proletariat" ("the Dictatorship of the Proletariat"). (Lenin, *Collected Works*, Russian ed., Vol. XVIII, p. 39, and *Little Lenin Library*, p. 29.)

This theory of Marx has been tested by the entire world historical experience of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It has vindicated itself against all the innumerable "theories" and "little theories" and wanderings of thought; against all attempts to revise it. The entire further development of human society splendidly confirms it—and it alone. It emerged victorious because it is correct; because it is the only revolutionary theory of the proletariat.

The Communist International is strong because it stands completely on the scientific base of Marxism, on the base of this only definitely scientific revolutionary theory; which all adherents of capitalism, all defenders of wage slavery, all agents of the exploiting classes, have fought for nine decades. Lenin, the best disciple of Marx and Engels, has not altered or rejected a single proposition of the teachings of Marx and Engels. He adopted Marxism wholly and completely. On the basis of the theory of Marxism, which is not a dogma, but which "develops finally only in close connection with the practice of the truly mass and truly revolutionary movement" (Lenin), he, at the head of the Bolshevik Party, further developed the policy and strategy of Marx for the victory of the proletariat, and advanced the *fundamental principle of Marxism, the dictatorship of the proletariat* to the forefront, which was forgotten, or deliberately ignored by Kautsky, Plekhanov, Guesde, and the other leaders of the Second International. He continued and developed Marxism further, in conformity with the ensuing new epoch, the epoch of imperialism and the developing proletarian revolution, contributing to the common treasure house of Marxism the new element generalised and elaborated during definite stages of history, during definite stages of the class struggle throughout the world.

The only authentic Marxism in the period of imperialism and proletarian revolutions—is Leninism, the "theory and tactic of the proletarian revolution in general, and the theory and tactic of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular."—(Stalin, "Leninism.")

On the firm foundation of Marxism-Leninism, and the basis of the entire historical experience of the world revolutionary movement in general, and the

experience of the Bolsheviks, gained in the three Russian revolutions particularly, the tactics and strategy of the Communist International have been worked out as a direct continuation of the tactics and strategy of Marx, as a continuation of the cause of the First International.

The development of the general crisis of capitalism, and the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. once again revealed the power of the scientific foresight of Marxism-Leninism with exceptional force. On the firm basis of the doctrine of Marx and Engels, Lenin defined imperialism as decaying and dying capitalism developing, on the whole, along a declining line. On the same basis, Lenin defines the character of the imperialist war, and the beginning of the general crisis of capitalism, the beginning of the epoch of proletarian revolutions of which the October Revolution was the first link. Proceeding from the doctrine of Marx and Engels, Lenin developed the doctrine of the unevenness of the development of capitalism in its imperialist phase, of the possibility of breaking through the imperialist chain first at its weakest link, and of the possibility of building a complete socialist society, first in a single country taken in itself. Proceeding from the doctrine of Marx and Engels, Lenin worked out the revolutionary tactics of the proletariat in the revolution. At the same time, Lenin, on the basis of Marxist statements concerning the labour aristocracy, declared that it constituted the social base of the modern social-democracy, defined the rôle of the modern social-democracy as the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie, as a party which has departed from Marxism and betrayed the working-class, and without the destruction of whose mass influence, it will be impossible to win over the majority of the working-class on the side of the revolution.

On the firm basis of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Stalin, at the very beginning of the stabilisation of capitalism, resolutely rebuffed all those who wanted to see the crushing of the revolution, and the erroneousness of Lenin's assertion on the new epoch, the epoch of the world proletarian revolution, in the temporary lull of the revolutionary movement, all those who claimed that the growth of production, technique and trade overthrows the theory of the decay of capitalism, advanced by Lenin in *Imperialism, etc.*, that the growth of production, technique and trade signified that capitalism has emerged from its general crisis. Developing Lenin's teachings further, Comrade Stalin, under conditions of the partial stabilisation of capitalism and restoration of the economy in the U.S.S.R., developed the Leninist thesis of the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. with the aid of its own internal resources and thus creating a powerful lever of the world proletarian revolution. Having deeply imbued the

Party's consciousness with the idea of the possibility of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. by its internal forces, Stalin developed further the Leninist doctrine of agricultural collectivisation to the point of realising complete collectivisation and liquidating the kulaks as a class by means of a socialist offensive all along the entire front.

The Marxist-Leninist theory has enabled the Communist International, from the very outset of the period of relative stabilisation of capitalism to foreshadow the inevitability and proximity of a new crisis of over-production and its transformation into a world economic crisis; to prove the inevitability of the collapse of the capitalist stabilisation and the advent of a new series of revolutions and wars.

Did not all opportunists and renegades of Marxism in every country attack the view of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International four years ago concerning the ensuing of the third period of post-war capitalism; the view that the stabilisation of capitalism had become even more shaky and unstable, that a new revolutionary upheaval was rapidly developing? Did they not, three years ago, ridicule the Communists' prediction of the inevitability of the transformation of the economic crisis of over-production which began then, into a world economic crisis? Did they not, after most countries were already in the grip of this crisis, prophesy its rapid end a thousand times, and were not the Communists the only ones to give a correct perspective of the development of the crisis? Has not the Communist International proved to be right, on all these questions, against all the "world savants," against all social-democratic "theoreticians," and against all the opportunists in its own ranks?

Never before has history so strikingly repudiated the "theories" of all the bourgeois and social-democratic thinkers as to-day. Never before has it so strikingly confirmed the correctness and scientific nature of the theory, policy and strategy of Marxism-Leninism, and the Communist International, fighting under its banner.

The Social-Democrats dub themselves Marxists. But in their "theories" they preserved only the least essential and characteristic of Marxism.

"The theoretical victory of Marxism forces its enemies to disguise themselves as Marxists. The internally decayed liberalism attempts to revive itself in the form of socialist opportunism."—(Lenin, Vol. XVI, p. 351.)

So said Lenin at the time when very few among the Social-Democrats dared to appear openly against Marxism. But after fifteen years of betrayal of the revolution and coalition with the bourgeoisie; after nineteen years of open desertion of Marxism; social-democracy still attempts to utilise the Marxian traditions of the pre-revolutionary labour movement,

to restrain the masses from joining the camp of the revolutionary class struggle.

The social-democracy professes to be a Marxian party, on the plea that it recognises the class struggle. But the class struggle was not *discovered* by Marx, it is not only recognised by the Marxists, but also by bourgeois economists and politicians. The Social-Democrats profess to be a Marxian party on the plea that they stand for socialism, for the abolition of private property in the means of production. But this was supported by many bourgeois reformists beginning with representatives of reactionary "socialism" of the type of Roabertus, and ending with such "socialists" as Struve and Sombart. The mere recognition of the class struggle, and the inevitability of socialism does not suffice to make one a Marxist. Only he who acknowledges the fundamentals of Marxism, who carries the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a Marxist.

Therein lies the root distinction between Marxists and pseudo-Marxists, between Bolshevism and "Democratic socialism."

But social-democracy only *recognises* the class struggle, in action it is by no means *for* the class struggle, but, on the contrary, *against* the class struggle of the proletariat. The well-known Austro-"Marxist," Karl Renner, said three years ago :

"The interests of the toiling masses, at the present level of our economic and political development, are almost invariably identical with the highest common interests. For this reason they (the toiling classes) do well to become the carriers and promoters of the common interests leaving the defence of the special class interests to the bourgeoisie. The too-loud slogans of the class struggle strengthen our enemies rather than ourselves, by welding them together."—(*Die Gesellschaft*, No. 2, 1930.)†

The attitude of Social-Democracy to the class struggle was expressed even more clearly by Emile Vandervelde :

"When the labour-socialist International was re-established in Hamburg, the conditions which those desiring to be members of the International had to meet were fixed. Here the Frenchmen, the Germans, the Belgians, returned to the old formulae, *i.e.*, to the formulae of the capture of the large forms of production and exchange as the aim of the International, and to the class struggle, as its means. However, when the English translation was made, the Englishmen declared : ' Why ! the class struggle does not suit us, the class struggle does not exist in England. There is talk of class war, but only the Communists are for class war. We cannot agree with this formulation. We

cannot accept it.' In the end an agreement was reached in favour of a free translation : In the German and French texts, the formulation ' the class struggle,' was left, while the English formulation read : ' independent action of the working-class' which actually represents a free, but essentially true translation of the words ' class struggle.' "

—(*L'Europe Nouvelle*, Dec. 24, 1932, p. 1500.)

Vandervelde recalls this episode to vex the English, but does not notice that he himself proves that the English expressed the view of the entire congress, that they were merely more outspoken than the Germans, French and the Belgians ; for they did not need to recall the Marxian traditions, which the British Labour Movement has never known.

Social-Democracy recognises the inevitability of the development of human society to socialism in words only. It does not consider the organisation of a struggle for socialism at all necessary. After lengthy ruminations German social democracy admitted that the world has matured for economic reorganisation (Wels). But what does it mean by this economic reorganisation ? Certainly not the confiscation of the means of production. Not even the nationalisation of the means of production. Economic reorganisation is to mean, as Alfred Braunthal says, the intervention of the State in economic life with a view to finding the means for its maintenance and capitalisation, and introducing the planning principle. Another "Left" theoretician of social-democracy, Otto Leichter, adds that the socialist reorganisation of economy is such an economic necessity that even bourgeois governments now in power cannot evade it. For this reason, Otto Leichter opposes the taking of power by social-democracy, and even its entry into a coalition, since socialism must ensue, regardless of who is in power.

This is what the social-democratic theories on two of the most elementary questions, in which social-democracy claims to still adhere to Marxian positions, look like. In reality, there are no questions in which the social-democracy adheres to the positions of Marxism. It has departed from Marx on every question. As far back as 1879 Marx and Engels in a letter to Bernstein, wrote :

"For nearly forty years, we have been stressing the class struggle as the direct driving force of history and particularly the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as a powerful lever of the modern social revolution, and we cannot, therefore, possibly co-operate with people who seek to erase this class struggle from the movement. Should the new Party organ assume the tendency which corresponds to the views of these gentlemen, should it be bourgeois rather than proletarian, we will, unfortunately, have nothing

†Quotations re-translated.—Ed.

left to do but speak against it publicly and put an end to the solidarity with you, which we have displayed in the past in representing the German Party abroad.”—(*Marx and Engels Archive*, Vol. VI., p. 155.)

This was fifty-four years ago. Since then the Labour Movement has traversed a long road of historical development and became transformed into a mighty force. But the social-democracy has not only become a variation of the bourgeois parties, but also a social-fascist party. Social-democracy already has absolutely nothing in common with socialism. This is best demonstrated by Emile Vandervelde's statement regarding the leaders of the British Labour Party, Thomas, Snowden, MacDonald, who recently left the Party. Vandervelde considers it possible to expose them now—they have already left; but when these people were still leaders of the Second International they were his friends, and they do not differ in the slightest from the Welshes, Bauers, Hilferdings, Blums, and Vanderveldes who are still in the Second International.

“Thomas will not object if I say that he never liked to be a socialist; he is essentially a trade unionist. Snowden is an intimate friend of Lloyd George, a radical, it was said that when he was Finance Minister of the Labour Government, he posted a card with the following inscription on the door of his office: ‘Socialists entering here, abandon hope.’ Finally, Ramsay MacDonald, my old fighting comrade, whose friend I have been, who has been a comrade of mine in many battles and travels. . . . I recall also that during the great general strike which took place a few years ago in England, he wrote to me a letter which I still keep, and in which he bitterly complains about the aggressiveness displayed by the British working-class in the strike. To those who knew him, what took place in 1931 was nothing specially surprising.”—(*L'Europe Nouvelle*, Dec. 24, 1932.)

By exposing his friends with whom he “fought and travelled” for decades, Emile Vandervelde wants to win the sympathies of the French and Belgian workers; to divert their attention from his treacherous tactics, which actually support his former party comrades, and former and present friends, the Prime Ministers, Ramsay MacDonald and Paul Boncour, against the revolutionary wave. Emile Vandervelde has begun to style himself “an old Marxist,” though he has departed no less from Marxism than MacDonald and Thomas. Even the French socialists, not to speak of Hilferding and Bauer, have also begun to talk of Marxism. They are anxious to create the impression that social-democracy is turning back to Marx. In reality, social-democracy needs the fig-leaf of Marxism to conceal the greatly accelerated process of its fascisation.

At the forthcoming Frankfurt Party Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party, Hilferding will deliver an address on “Marx and Modernity,” in which he will attempt to create some semblance of a return to Marx to retain influence over the working masses.

We Communists declare that only we, only the Communist International, are Marxists; that only in Leninism has Marxism found its further development.

Thirty years have passed since the group of Bolsheviks took shape; it is nearly thirty years since Bebel, after the Dresden Party Congress, began to develop into a Centrist—which marked the decisive victory of reformism in the German social-democracy. Thirty years of two roads—the “Russian,” that is the road of Marx and Lenin; and the “Prussian,” that is the road of revision of Marxism and betrayal of the working-class in the interests of co-operation with the bourgeoisie.

And what has been the outcome? It is obvious to all.

Bolshevism has won a decisive historical victory in the U.S.S.R. Fifteen years ago, the Bolsheviks, by means of an armed uprising, captured the power in a backward, uncultured, country, wrecked by the war, and the capitalist system. And now the first Five-Year Plan of socialist construction has been fulfilled in four years and three months. The country which was the most backward in Europe before the revolution, has, thanks to the dictatorship of the proletariat, been transformed from an agrarian into an industrial nation and advanced to the front of the most advanced countries in technical economic respects.

A technical base for the socialist reconstruction of the entire national economy on modern lines has been created. The biggest agriculture in the world has been created. Economic equality has been gained for the most backward colonies of tsarism. Unemployment has been abolished, the sense of insecurity among the workers has disappeared, the material and cultural standards of the masses have been raised. The capitalist elements of city and village have been crushed, the foundation of the Socialist system has been laid. Socialism which Marx transformed from a Utopia into a science, is being realised by Communists in a land of 160 million souls, its victory is assured.

The “democratic socialism,” the social-democracy (social-fascism in reality) has at the same time suffered a crushing defeat. Capitalism is experiencing a general crisis. The productive forces have commenced to rebel against the existing production relations. Capitalism can no longer provide even an elementary subsistence to its slaves. Millions of unemployed are dying of starvation while the warehouses are glutted with food. Destitution among

the masses has reached unprecedented proportions. What is the medieval plague in comparison with modern unemployment?

Social-democracy had just completed working out its theory of the possibility of crisis-less development, in connection with the fact that, according to Hilferding's views, capitalism has become organised—when suddenly the world economic crisis burst out. The theory of organised capitalism and crisisless development; the theory of a super-class state expressing the common interests of all classes; that it is the bourgeoisie which conducts the class struggle while the proletariat must defend the common interest—all this was to have proved that the Marxian law of absolute impoverishment has been invalidated, that the modern state is the basis upon which the welfare of the working-class will smoothly develop. For this reason social-democracy was to cease being an anti-capitalist party, was to abandon the struggle for the "violent overthrow of the modern social system" (Marx).

The crisis has led to this—that in the United States—which the Social-Democrats called an economic miracle, as proof of the possibility of material well-being of the working-class under capitalism (Tarnow)—85 per cent. of the productive forces of heavy industry are idle, 16 million workers are jobless, millions of children are homeless, millions are starving. And this in a country which, the whole of the Second International maintained, had refuted the Marxian theory of impoverishment. In Germany, which, according to the teachings of the "democratic socialists," the Noskes and Bauers, the Hilferdings and Severings, was to be developing directly, by the growth of democracy and rise of the standards of the masses, to socialism, there is fearsome destitution and famine, fascist bandit terrorism, a fascist dictatorship. Only three years have passed since Dittman said: if there is a dictatorship, let it be ours; and—on July 20, 1932, social-democracy relinquished the Prussian Government, yielding to the "force" of one lieutenant and three Reichswehr soldiers. Only four years have passed since Hilferding proclaimed the theory of organised capitalism. Now they have been forced to shelve this theory. Only a couple of years ago the social-democracy started a vigorous propaganda in favour of state capitalism. Now this theory is no longer pushed to the forefront, but the reorganisation of economy.

The extreme intensification of all the international and internal contradictions of capitalism completely undermines the social-democratic theories of super-imperialism, and the League of Nations, as its organiser. It undermines the theories of the international co-operation of the bourgeoisie without wars, as well as the theory of class co-operation within the

country. The social-democratic theories of peaceful evolution into socialism are completely bankrupt, this is crystal-clear to all. Social-democracy, having experienced the collapse of all of its reformist theories, is becoming increasingly fascist—in face of the rise of the revolutionary wave, and declaring now that the counter-revolution is winning in Europe, that the working-class is being thrown back, that capitalism has demonstrated its vitality for many years to come, that a counter-revolutionary situation exists. Social-democracy wants thus to deprive the working masses of revolutionary perspective; to snap their energy in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.

The utter bankruptcy of social-democracy is a fact.

The desertion from Marxism revenged itself by dooming the social-democratic theories to the same fate which has befallen those of the bourgeois savants.

The Communists must energetically destroy every possibility of the Social-Democrats labelling themselves Marxists.

The Communist International prevails because its policy is based upon the firm, unshakeable foundation of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism, embodied in action, represents an enormous revolutionary force, organising the mass for the rebuilding of human society, which points the way to their victory over the exploiting classes, to the triumph of socialism. Therefore, the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism represents the most important political task of the revolutionary proletariat.

The Communist International is the only successor of the International Working Men's Association, the only body actually carrying the doctrine of Marx and Engels into effect. There cannot be, and there are not, two Marxian parties. The only Marxian party to-day is the sections of the Comintern, which develops Marxism forward and realises it in action.

This is the only kind of Marxism, which Lenin taught us.

Nine years have now elapsed since the death of *Lenin*. Fourteen years have gone by since the murder of *Rosa Luxemburg*, and *Karl Liebknecht*, who, despite all their serious political and theoretical mistakes, belonged to those few people who fought for Marxism in the Second International; for the revolution. *Rosa Luxemburg* and *Karl Liebknecht* have proved to be wrong in everything in which they differed from *Lenin*, and there is no other Marxism except that of *Lenin*. But on the fundamental issues of the world policy of the proletariat during the war and after, *Luxemburg* and *Liebknecht* fought in the first ranks of the world proletariat. They belong entirely to the Comintern, which reveals their mistakes, but regards and will regard them as its own and will not surrender them to anyone. It is precisely the life and work of *Liebknecht* and *Luxemburg*, the comparison

of the fate of the Russian and German revolutions which shows that only on the basis of Leninism can the proletariat be victorious.

We must utilise the anniversary of the death of Lenin, Luxembourg and Liebknecht to raise our Marxian-Leninist theory to a new height, and strengthen the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

The U.S.S.R. represents a vast base for our theoretical work in the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism. But in the capitalist countries too, we have important successes. Still these successes are as yet insufficient. In no language, except the Russian, is there a complete edition of Lenin's works. This impedes the assimilation of Leninism by the workers of other countries. We are duty bound to see to it that, by the tenth anniversary of the death of Lenin his theory, policy and strategy, his life work should be accessible to the world proletariat, that his complete works should be published at least in one language apart from the Russian. It is also our duty to strengthen the publication of the works of Marx and Engels in every language, for they constitute the scientific foundation of our movement.

In a number of countries, serious theoretical work is being conducted. The Communists of Germany, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, France and Norway are carrying out serious work in studying the history of the Communist Parties of these countries. We value this work highly, for without a truly serious study of the history of the Communist movement, it is impossible to reveal its mistakes and the defects of the current work, it is impossible to demonstrate the scientific and consistent character of the entire line of the Comintern. The Communist Party of Poland has won a most important victory on the front of

Marxian theory by having drafted a party programme, recently approved by the Sixth Congress of the C.P. of Poland. The Chinese Communist Party also has important successes in the production of the Party programme. The C.P. of Germany is also working for the creation of its programme. Nor should we under-estimate the theoretical importance of the Programmes of Action adopted by a number of Parties (the programmes of action of the C.P. of India and Indo-China, the agrarian programmes of the Communist Parties of France, Holland and many others) and the series of political documents issued by all the parties, especially by that of Germany.

But this is still far from sufficient.

It is necessary to saturate our entire work with the Leninist theory, in an even greater measure.

Four important tasks face us in this field :

First, the strengthening of the publication, dissemination and study of the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism and extensive propaganda of these works among the working masses ; second, the strengthening of the theoretical organs of the Parties, raising the Marxian-Leninist level of the entire work of the Communists ; third, the strengthening of the study of the history of the Communist movement, continuing the work begun by the Polish, French and Czech comrades ; fourth, the strengthening of the work of creation of programmes by the different sections of the Communist International on the firm basis of the programme of the Comintern.

This means :

Strengthening the propaganda of Marxism-Leninism.

Strengthening the theoretical offensive on social-democracy.

THE HISTORIC PLENUM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE C.P.S.U.

I. A WORLD HISTORIC VICTORY.

AT the January Plenum of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. (b), Comrade Stalin reported to the Plenum of the Party, the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., and the whole world, on the results of the first Five-Year Plan.

The Five-Year Plan is of universal world historic significance. Comrade Stalin declared in his report that "History has shown, however, that the international significance of the Five-Year Plan is immeasurable. History has shown that the Five-Year Plan is not the private affair of the Soviet Union, but the affair of the whole world international proletariat."

The Five-Year Plan, which the bourgeoisie and its social-fascist agents at first regarded with such contemptuous mockery ("Utopia!"), and subsequently with ever-increasing alarm and fear, the Five-Year Plan in connection with which the proletariat of the whole world maintained such hopes, was completed 93.7 per cent. in four years and three months. It would have been finished 100 per cent. if the Soviet Government, in view of the complications in the Far East, had not been forced to hurriedly turn several factories on to the production of modern weapons of defence for a few months. The results of the Five-Year Plan have shown the proletariat of the entire globe the colossal advantages enjoyed by the Soviet above the capitalist system.

While all the capitalist countries of the world were in the throes of the most unprecedented economic crisis, surrounded by hostile capitalist neighbours, engaged in a struggle with the capitalist elements inside the country, the proletariat of the U.S.S.R., holding the reins of power, have been able in four years, only four years, to change out of all recognition the face of a mighty country, occupying one-sixth part of the globe! In the course of four years, only four years, "from the backward, small peasant country that was old Russia, the U.S.S.R. has forged ahead into the first ranks of the most highly developed countries, in the technical and economic sense."* In the course of four years, only four years, "the U.S.S.R. has been converted from an agrarian, into an industrial country."

The "Vorwaerts," organ of the social-fascist agents of the bourgeoisie, in an article on January 11, waxes quite ironical concerning this mighty historic feat. Industrialisation for the purpose of creating autarchy†, of itself, has nothing whatever in common

with socialism, obviously. "This is the aim of modern Kemalist Turkey, and this was also the aim of Russia in the time of Count Witte before the war." This was their aim! But these lackeys of the bourgeoisie pretend they do not know that not a single capitalist country throughout the annals of history was ever capable of making such a colossal industrial revolution *in such a short period of time* (four years). The whole point is that a colossal industrial revolution of this kind could be realised in such a short space of time only thanks to the heroic enthusiasm of the proletariat, conscious that it had thrown off the chains of capitalist slavery. The whole point is that this transformation could be completed, in such a short space of time, only by the proletariat, led by the Leninist party headed by the best pupil of Lenin, Comrade Stalin.

In four years, only four years, giants have arisen in the U.S.S.R.—in the metallurgical industry, ferrous and non-ferrous; a new chemical industry has grown, giants of energetics, giants of machine construction have grown up; tractor construction, the production of complicated agricultural machines, the automobile industry, the production of powerful locomotives and waggons, production of large turbines and generators, of equipment for ferrous metallurgy, equipment for the fuel industry, aero- and automobile-construction, complicated machine tools and small precision tools.

"As a result, the whole of machine construction increased by four-and-a-half times as compared with 1927-28 (the last year of the Plan showing an increase of 54 per cent. over the planned figure); and is now ten times larger than pre-war machine construction."

At the Plenum, Comrade Ordjonikidze was able to declare with pride: "During the course of 1932 it was demonstrated more than once that there is no machine we cannot build . . . to-day there is no enterprise, no works, no factory that we are unable to project and build with our own engineering and technical resources." During these four years, the new coal and metallurgical base, Ural-Kuzbas, has been built. It would be difficult to enumerate the enormous number of *new natural riches* discovered by our geological research work during the last four years. And, as a result: (a) the proportional relationship between industrial and agricultural production has been radically changed in favour of the former, for the relative proportion of industry has increased from 48 per cent. in 1927/28 to 70 per cent. in 1932, with a steady growth in agriculture; further in industrial production, the production of

* All quotations, unless otherwise stated, from the Resolution of the Plenum C.C. of C.P.S.U. (b).—Ed.

†Economic Independence. Ed.

means of production is now predominant, for the percentage of heavy industry has increased from 44.5 per cent. in 1927/28 to 53 per cent. in 1932; an increase of 10 per cent. above the task set by the Plan; (b) the volume of industrial production in 1932 was 334 per cent. above the pre-war figure, and 219 per cent. above the 1928 figure . . . which meant that in the fourth year of the Five-Year Plan, 1932, the programme for the Five-Year Plan was completed by 93.7 per cent.; and as regards heavy industry it was completed by 108 per cent." *Already in 1931 the U.S.S.R. had taken the second place in the world, following the United States, in level of industrial production.* Even the Berlin Konjunktur Institut* was compelled to admit this.

As regards agriculture, "the rapid growth of industry, on the one hand, and the successful efforts to liquidate the kulaks as a class on the other hand, made it possible to supply agriculture with tractors and the latest agricultural machinery; to unite the small, individual farms into big collective farms, and organise a broad network of grain and cattle-breeding Soviet farms." During the four years of the Five-Year Plan, agriculture has received over 120,000 new tractors, agricultural machinery to the amount of 1,600,000,000 roubles; over 200,000 collective farms have been organised, embracing 60 per cent. of the peasant farms, and about 75 per cent. of the entire peasant sown area. During the same period 5,000 Soviet farms have been organised (grain, cattle-breeding and technical cultures); and the collective farms together with the Soviet farms cover about 80 per cent. of the total sown area.

In consequence, the *capitalist elements in town and village have been smashed, although not completely routed; the foundation of socialist economics has been built; the victory of socialism in the U.S.S.R. is assured.*

The organ of the social-fascist bourgeois lackeys "Vorwaerts" writes that the revolution in the Soviet village completed during the last three or four years has, in fact, led to the degradation of agriculture: "Never before," writes "Vorwaerts", "has the State received so little grain, as this year." "Vorwaerts" is lying; it is consciously deceiving the workers. In comparison with 1927-28 the sown area in 1932 increased by 21 million hectares. Simultaneously, instead of the 700 million poods of grain given to the State in 1927-28, only 10 per cent. of which was from collective and Soviet farms, the Government received 1,400 million poods in 1931-32 (*twice as much as at the commencement of the Five-Year Plan!*), 76 per cent. of which was market grain from the collective and Soviet farms.

The industrialisation of the land and collectivisation of agriculture, with the liquidation of the kulaks

as a class, created the pre-conditions for radical improvements in the position of the toiling mass. The possibilities before us in this respect, thanks to the building of the foundation of socialist economics, are enormous, inexhaustible. But already during the first Five-Year Plan the position of the working-class, and the bulk of the peasantry systematically improved from year to year, despite the calumny of the bourgeoisie, and its social-fascist lackeys.

Only three years ago there were about one-and-a-half million unemployed in the U.S.S.R. *Unemployment is now liquidated* in the U.S.S.R.; whereas in capitalist countries there are now no less than 40 to 50 million unemployed.

Only three or four years ago there were no less than 30 per cent. poor peasants among the agricultural population, and even earlier, before the October revolution, the poor peasants amounted to no less than 60 per cent. of the agricultural population. Now, thanks to collectivisation, the differentiation in the villages and the agrarian over-population has been liquidated and, *consequently, poverty and pauperisation in the villages have also been abolished.*

Since 1928 the number of workers and office staff in large-scale industry has doubled, which has given an increase over the Five-Year Plan estimate of 57 per cent. *The seven-hour working day has been introduced.* The average working day for the entire people's economy amounts to 7.09 hours, all main branches of industry work seven hours, dangerous industries only six. The national income, which means the income of the workers and peasants, has increased by 85 per cent. The average annual wage of the workers and employees in large-scale industry has increased by 67 per cent., a figure which is 18 per cent. over and above the Five-Year Plan estimate.

The social-democrats point out that this growth, in view of the increased cost of living, does not correspond to a real rise in wages. But they purposely remain silent on the fact that, in the U.S.S.R. *social wages exist in addition to personal wages*; they remain silent on the fact that the social insurance fund has increased since 1928 by 292 per cent. (an increase above the Five-Year Plan figure of 111 per cent.), that the development of communal catering means *that over 70 per cent. of the workers in the main branches of industry are embraced by the network of communal restaurants*—an increase of six times the Five-Year Plan estimate. They remain silent on the fact that the number of members of workers' families engaged in industry has increased and that, to a corresponding extent, the budget of the workers' family has increased. They remain silent on the colossal increase in the number of workers' and peasants' children who not only get free education, but receive monetary grants during their studies (factory workshop schools), or stipendiums (students

* German Economic Research Institute.—Ed.

in the Universities.) They remain silent on the fact that the number of scholars (mostly workers' children) in the elementary schools has increased from 10 million in 1928 to 19 million in 1932; that the country from being 67 per cent. literate in 1930 was already 90 per cent. literate in 1932, that the number of scholars in general educational middle schools has increased from 1,600,000 in 1928 to 4,350,000 in 1932, that the number of scholars in technical schools and workers' faculties increased from 264,000 in 1928 to 1,437,000 in 1932, that the number of students in higher educational institutions increased from 166,000 in 1928 to 500,000 in 1932, *that middle and higher education is not now merely formally, but actually available to the entire rising generation of the working-class, which is still not the case anywhere else in the world!*

"Vorwaerts," in the article quoted above, slanders in saying that "dwelling quarters instead of increasing, decreased in floor space" during the years of the Five-Year Plan. Actually the amount of dwelling space in towns and villages of the country increased during the last four years by 26,700,000 cubic metres (almost three-and-a-half times more than for the previous five years—1924-28).

During the last four years, in Moscow alone, dwelling space has been built to the extent of 2,116,000 cubic metres, that is, 68 per cent. more was built than the Vienna social-democratic municipality (the pride of Austrian social-democracy) was able to build in the twelve years from 1918-1930.*

The social-democratic Press spitefully shouts about the serious lack of industrial goods in the U.S.S.R. Yes, it is true, that while in capitalist countries the shops are full to overflowing with goods that the impoverished workers and millions of unemployed are not in a position to buy, in the U.S.S.R. on the contrary, there are still insufficient industrial goods to meet the demand, especially *the colossal growing demand of the villages*. But social-democracy, in speculating upon this fact, remains silent on the fact that the Soviet Government, which during the last four years especially urged forward the development of heavy industry, nevertheless at the same time occupied itself with *broad reconstruction work of light industry*, first, of mastering new processes, and creating new branches of industry; secondly, of creating its own machine construction base for light industry; and, thirdly, by way of creating its own raw materials base for it. During these four years a new branch has grown up and developed—the hosiery industry, which from a handicraft industry, has become a workshop sewing industry; similar concentration has taken place in the leather and boot industry; a new industry has been mastered in

cotton, paper, wool, silk, linen and jute, the working up of fats and bones and, finally, in the film industry. During these four years a machine construction base for the light industry has been created. *For the textile industry alone 125 new types of machines have been installed and mastered*. During these four years the production of cotton in the U.S.S.R. has doubled, and *the U.S.S.R. has become completely independent of imported Western European cotton*; an analogous process has taken place also in the linen industry. Finally, according to the control figures for 1933, there is to be an increase of 48 per cent. in capital construction in light industry.

Social-democracy speculates upon the fact that the workers in the U.S.S.R. are still insufficiently supplied with meat and fats. True it is that in the U.S.S.R. the number of head of cattle has been curtailed thanks to kulak agitation which incited a section of the peasants to kill their cattle during the transition from individual to collective farming economy, and thanks to the work of wreckers, whose fate has caused so much concern to the social-democrats. But the social-democrats remain silent that *thanks to the energetic interference of the Soviet Government this process of cutting down the number of cattle was brought to a stop* and the number of head of cattle is already increasing. Already the year 1931 showed signs of the beginnings of a considerable change in pig-breeding. Thus, in the Central Black Earth Region, there was an increase of 40 per cent. of full-grown pigs in 1932, as compared with 1931; in the North Caucasus an increase of 30 per cent.; in the Mid-Volga Region 40 per cent., and so on. The second half of 1932 shows the beginning of a change in the increased number of all other kinds of cattle (Report of Comrade Kuibyshev to the Plenum). "A comparatively short time ago, the Soviet farms held up the supply of meat and the industrial centres were not assured their supply. Now, thanks to the introduction of a tax in kind on meat, Moscow, Leningrad, the Donetz Basin and several other industrial centres are guaranteed their regular ration of meat." (Comrade Kaganovich's speech to the Moscow Party officials.)

The main task of the Five-Year Plan has in the main been completed, and the most important link in this Plan—heavy industry including its kernel—machine construction—has already been forged. If, however, in the quantitative sense the Five-Year Plan was completed in four years and three months, and in several of the most important branches even over-fulfilled, nevertheless in the *qualitative* sense the plan is not yet fulfilled: the *productivity of labour* has not yet increased, and the *cost of production* has not yet been reduced, to the extent required by the Five-Year Plan. And here again social-democrats try to speculate. The "Wiener Arbeiterzei-

* Report of Com. Kaganovich to Moscow Party Conference.

tung," speaking in pathetic tones about the enormous achievements of the Five-Year Plan, in its leading article of January 15, right on the heels of these curtseyings, only made to win the hearts of the workers, tries in the second half of the article to sweep right away all signs of the successes of the Soviet Government: "Russian industry now owns an industrial apparatus which is mighty in the technical sense and highly perfected." "But the people who are to master this apparatus have yet to be educated gradually." Further on there follows a lamentation on the low productivity of labour in the U.S.S.R. True, the productivity of labour in the U.S.S.R. has not yet sufficiently increased, as compared with her enormous capital investments; this is because two-and-a-half million new workers from the villages have been drawn into industry, because the new young engineers and technicians have not yet gained sufficient experience, because we have to master an enormous amount of completely new industrial processes. But the defenders of capitalism should not raise this question, for, however insufficient the growth of the productivity of labour in the U.S.S.R. may be, as compared with the possibilities and requirements of our economy, *the rate of this growth has already completely overtaken the rate of growth in the productivity of labour in capitalist countries in their best years*: "The American Stuart Chase considered it a special achievement during the period of 'prosperity' in the United States, when the productivity of labour increased by 25 per cent. in the course of five years. In England during the five years before the crisis (1924-29) the productivity of labour increased by 11 per cent. During the entire period from 1917 to 1931, Germany was able to obtain an increase of only 27 per cent. in the productivity of labour (according to the German economist Kuczinsky) . . . *In the U.S.S.R. the productivity of labour for industry increased during the course of the Five-Year Plan by 40 per cent.*" (Comrade Molotov's Report.)

The position is especially unsatisfactory in the U.S.S.R. as regards the lowering of the cost of production. The percentage of waste in industry is still very high; the percentage of utilisation of machinery is also extremely low, etc. But here also we find great achievements in several branches of industry. The workers are learning in the process of industry itself, during their work, just as the Red Army learned, and learned to conquer, during the years of civil war. We have already given many examples, even examples of world records in this respect, in the article "On the Border-line between the First and Second 'Piatiletkas' of the Soviet Union" in the "Communist International," No. 15, 1932. Comrade Ordjonikidze gave several new illustrations of this at the January Plenum of the

Central Committee of the C.P.S.U.: In 1930, a tractor from the Stalingrad works cost 7,179 roubles; in 1931 the cost was 4,076 roubles and in 1932 3,314 roubles. A drop of 53.8 per cent. in the cost of production. The motor-car "Amo 3" from the Stalin works cost 11,078 roubles in 1931 and 5,665 roubles in 1932; a drop of 48.9 per cent. The combine "Kommunar" (without motor) cost 11,305 roubles in 1929-30; in 1931 4,578 roubles, and in 1932 3,800 roubles; a drop of 66.4 per cent., etc.

2. PROBLEMS OF GROWTH.

In his report, Comrade Stalin raised the question as to why the Party, during the last four years, introduced *the most rapid rate* of development of industry, "whipped up the country, as it were, and spurred it onward." He gave an absolutely clear, exhaustive answer to this question:

"We could refrain from whipping up a country which was a hundred years behind, and which, owing to its backwardness, was faced with mortal danger. Only in this way was it possible to enable the country to quickly re-equip itself, on the basis of modern technique, and finally emerge on the high road.

"Furthermore, we could not know on what day the imperialists would attack the U.S.S.R. and interrupt our work of construction, but that they could attack us at any moment, taking advantage of the technical and economic backwardness of our country—of that there could not be any doubt. . . .

"The conditions prevailing at the moment, the growth of armaments in capitalist countries, the collapse of disarmament, the hatred of the international bourgeoisie towards the U.S.S.R.—all this impelled the Party to accelerate the strengthening of the defences of the country, which are the foundation of its independence."

Should we "whip up" the country in future also and introduce "the most rapid rate of development of industry"? Comrade Stalin gives an answer to this question also in his report, as did also the resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee: no, we should not. "First of all, thanks to the successful fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan, we have in the main, *already* fulfilled its principal task—the transfer of industry, transport and agriculture, to a new modern technical base, Secondly, thanks to the successful fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan, *we have already succeeded* in raising the defences of the country to the proper level" (Stalin). Thirdly, such a rapid rate of development would be impossible, for during the first Five-Year Plan "the construction of new enterprises in the sphere of industry, as well as in agriculture went forward, in the main, in connection with the use of already existing, old or renovated industrial enterprises, the technique of which was already known and the use of which did not present

any special difficulties. . . ." (Plenum resolution). "The position will be different in the second Five-Year Plan, if we consider that 62 per cent. of the basic capital of heavy industry in exploitation at the beginning of the second Five-Year Plan is newly created during the last four years" (Ordjonikidze). Hence the Plenum draws the conclusion: "The first Five-Year Plan was five years of *construction* of new workshops. . . . Unlike the first five years, the second five years will be primarily a period during which the new industrial enterprises will be *mastered*, when the agricultural enterprises will be *consolidated organisationally*, both collective farms and soviet farms, which does not, of course, exclude but presupposes the further development of new construction." . . . In this connection the joint plenum of the Central Committee and Central Control Committee considers that: "(a) The average annual increase of industrial production during the second five years should not be aimed at 21 to 22 per cent., as was the case during the first five years but a little less, approximately 12 to 14 per cent.; (b) the main pressure must be brought to bear, not upon the quantitative increase in production, but on improving the quality of production and raising the productivity of labour in industry; not in extending the sown area, but in increasing the yield in agriculture and improving the quality of work in agriculture" (Plenum resolution).

Thus, one of the central tasks of the second Five-Year Plan is to raise the productivity of labour. What does this require? First, *the material basis* for raising the productivity of labour; this has already been created, during the first five years. Secondly, two further conditions, which Lenin indicated:

" . . . in approaching the question of raising the productivity of labour, bear in mind the peculiarities of the transition period from capitalism to socialism which demands, on the one hand, that the basis for *socialist organisation of competition* should be laid down and, on the other hand, requires *the adoption of compulsion*, that the slogan of proletarian dictatorship be not defamed by the practice of a jelly-like state of proletarian power." (Lenin: "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government," 1918.)

"The socialist organisation of competition" has also managed to be widely developed in connection with the building of the foundation of socialist economics. To a lesser degree the second condition—"the adoption of compulsion"—has been carried out for the purpose of enforcing labour discipline. The Party and the Soviet Government are now concentrating upon this. It was for this purpose that the decree concerning absenteeism was published on the eve of the Plenum. For the same purpose the passport system is now being introduced, which will relieve the industrial centres of parasitical elements, who are a burden upon the working-class

population of the towns, and react adversely upon the workers.

How have the Trotskyists and right opportunists reacted to the decisions of the Plenum to slacken the rate of development of our new building work somewhat? Just as soon as they "sensed" that the Soviet Government intended to take the course of a slower rate of development, they began to gloat, to talk about "retreat," while Mr. Trotsky, the one-time "super-industrialist" issued his special slogan for 1933: this year, it seems, should be the "year of capital repairs." The exultation of these gentlemen is "premature." They, first of all, overlook the fact that 13 to 14 per cent. of the larger sum of production of the second Five-Year Plan produces a greater increase in production in absolute figures than 21 to 22 per cent. from a smaller sum of production in the first five years. In particular, an increase in production of 16.5 per cent. has been fixed for 1933, and capital works in connection with industry, during the first year of the second Five-Year Plan, amount to 10,109 million roubles, as compared with 9,164 million in the fourth year of the first Five-Year Plan; which means an increase of capital construction in industry of 10 per cent. as compared with 1932. Secondly, they overlook the fact that to master the new works constructed is a more complicated and difficult task than the work of building, and that the effect achieved when these new works are mastered will be colossal, and consequently, that the decision of the Plenum of the Central Committee is *not a retreat, but a still more determined socialist advance*.

The social-democratic Press reacted to the decision of the Plenum in just the same way as the Trotskyists and Right opportunists. The "Wiener Arbeiterzeitung," in the above-mentioned article, writes:

"What Stalin announces to be the task of the coming years corresponds to the demands that the Rights in the Bolshevik Party, people like Rykov, Tomsky, Smirnov . . . have been putting forward up to now. . . . It should be remembered that Stalin destroyed Trotsky both personally and politically at the very moment when he decided to retreat from the new economic policy and take up *a more severe course against the peasantry* (our italics.—*Ed.*), which is what Trotsky demanded; fulfilling in his Five-Year Plan and his "general line" a very essential part of Trotsky's demands. It is in just the same way that Stalin is behaving, apparently, now. Stalin, in his plan for the second Five-Year Plan, is fulfilling the essential demands of the Rykovs, Tomskys and Smirnovs. And just for this reason he is smashing them politically. This is already a characteristic of the mechanism of dictatorship, that the heads fly off at the very moment when the ideas created by those heads are victorious."

Mr. Otto Bauer has concluded a united front with

the Trotskyists and Right opportunists and like them spreads unconscionable lies. It is a lie that Stalin, like Trotsky in his time, took up "a more severe course against the peasants." Trotsky indeed, not believing in the possibility of building socialism in one country, of rebuilding the villages on socialist lines, of collectivising agriculture, considering the development of capitalism in the Soviet village to be inevitable, completed his plan of "super-industrialisation" by adding his plan of "a more severe struggle against the peasants." Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, convinced of the possibility of building socialism in one country, and reorganising the villages on socialist lines, insisted against the Trotskyists in *maintaining the alliance with the middle peasantry* to the end, by waging war upon the *kulaks* and arriving at the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, when the necessary factors for this were created. It is equally a lie and slander to assert that the present decision of the Central Committee in any way resembles the platform put forward at one time by the Right opportunists. The Right opportunists proposed that the rate of development of industrialisation should be slackened, that the light industry should be developed *at the expense* of heavy industries. Simultaneously they opposed collectivisation, counting upon the kulak, who, apparently, should give the Soviet Government grain and "peacefully grow into socialism." This was the platform of the kulak agents, which would have led to the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. Stalin and the Bolshevik Party, in opposition to this, took up the stern course of industrialisation and collectivisation, and the fight against the kulaks, even to their liquidation as a class. Now *that these main tasks have been fulfilled*, Stalin and the Leninist Central Committee, *on the basis of the fact of their fulfilment*, have decided to remove the centre of gravity during the next two to three years from the new construction work, to the task of mastering what has already been built, in the process of a further sharpening of the class struggle, in the fight against those kulaks who have been beaten, but are not yet finally beaten once and for all. It is absolutely obvious, that this road, diametrically opposite to the road of the Right opportunists, leads not to the restoration of capitalism, but to its final eradication and the building up of the non-class society.

3. ORGANISATIONAL CONSOLIDATION OF COLLECTIVE AND SOVIET FARMS.

In connection with the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, on the basis of universal collectivisation, the kulaks in the U.S.S.R. are beaten economically and cast out of the main stream of economic life ; but the remains of the dying classes, though beaten, are not beaten once and for all, and have cropped up all over

the face of the U.S.S.R. ; and just for the reason that they have nothing to lose, they are carrying on undermining work with considerable exasperation, under the guise of "workers" and "peasants." They have especially concentrated their undermining work upon the villages, reckoning that this is the weakest section at the moment, since the new organisations—collective and Soviet farms—are not yet strong, and are still passing through a period like that which the Soviet workshops and factories underwent in 1920-21.

By penetrating into the collective farms in the capacity of bookkeepers, managers, warehousemen, brigadiers, etc., and not infrequently even as leading workers on the management of the collective farms, these anti-Soviet elements try to "organise wrecking activities, despoil machines, upset the sowing, steal the property of the collective farms, break up labour discipline, organise the stealing of grain put by for the sowing, create secret warehouses, sabotage the grain collection—and sometimes are able to completely disintegrate the whole collective farms" (Plenum resolution).

The weak party organisations in the villages, including even cells in the Soviet farms and machine-tractor stations, and not infrequently even the directors of Soviet farms have, in several places, lost their revolutionary judgment and not only fail to react against this anti-Soviet work, but sometimes themselves fall victims to the influence of wrecking elements, and link themselves up with the enemies of the collective and Soviet farms. And some of the regional organisations, whose heads have been turned by the successes of collectivisation, did not examine the new situation which had arisen in the villages carefully, and the new manoeuvres of the class enemy who, as Comrade Stalin expressed it, "had changed from the direct attack against the collective farms to the work of quiet permeation." As a result, we find that the grain collection this year has gone forward with comparatively more difficulties than during last year, in spite of the fact that the harvest this year was not lower, but higher than that of last year. In connection with these facts, Comrade Stalin spoke at the Plenum on the report of Comrade Kaganovich and gave a programme of the work in the village ; his speech was of enormous importance and a brilliant example of courageous Bolshevik self-criticism ; it was at the same time a brilliant example of profound Marxist-Leninist dialectics, delivered in the simplest, most universally comprehensible form.

The social-fascist "Vorwaerts," immediately upon the publication of Comrade Stalin's report, insinuated in the above-mentioned article that Stalin had avoided, had remained silent, on all the difficult questions. The publication of Comrade Stalin's programme-speech is a real box on the ears for these

insinuator. Not a single bourgeois, not a single social-fascist party in the capitalist countries where "freedom of the press" flourishes (for the exploiting classes) would ever dare so openly and sharply to engage in self-criticism as did Comrade Stalin at the Plenum of the Central Committee. And this is absolutely comprehensible. Comrade Stalin was able, before all, with absolute calm and confidence to open up criticism with his keen knife, and reveal the weak spot in the work of the Party in the village, because he knows full well that the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. led by him and the Leninist party, which has overcome immeasurably heavy tasks on its road, will rapidly overcome these difficulties also, just as soon as they are conscious of them. We do not intend to expound Comrade Stalin's speech here, for we are convinced that every Communist, every class-conscious worker will read this speech. We will mention only that Comrade Stalin's speech, and the corresponding resolution of the Plenum on Comrade Kaganovich's report, have already mobilised the whole party around the work of consolidating this weak point, of transferring the political leadership in the collective and Soviet farms into the hands of firm, trustworthy Communists, strengthening the active workers in the collective and Soviet farms of casting out of the collective and Soviet farms all anti-Soviet elements, giving organisational and economic assistance to collective and Soviet farms, of waging a relentless struggle against wreckers who have found their way into them, of bringing the actual work of the collective and Soviet farms into line with their socialist form, giving political education to collective and Soviet farmers, of ensuring that they fulfil their obligations to the proletarian State, and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat in the village. The most important step in this direction is the institution of political departments in the machine-tractor stations and Soviet farms, as laid down by the decision of the Plenum. The same purpose is aimed at in the regulation published immediately after the Plenum of the Central Committee, by the Soviet of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. concerning the supply of grain to the State by collective farms and individual farms. This regulation, which abolishes the supply of grain by contract and introduces the supply of grain in the form of a tax in kind in exchange for payment at fixed prices, on the basis of a previously arranged, fixed amount of grain to be supplied from each hectare in each district within a certain date, will enable the peasants to plan their economy, and create a stimulus to the better working of the land. This measure has already been introduced with considerable success in connection with the meat supply, and will certainly be as effective with the grain collection.

A splendid example of concrete instructions on how it is necessary, at the moment, to act in the sowing, to rapidly destroy kulak sabotage and conduct the work, is given in the decision of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and the C.C. of the C.P.S.U. on measures to be adopted in organising the autumn sowing campaign in Northern Caucasus, published on Jan. 24th.

We do not yet know how the bourgeois and social-fascist Press will react to Comrade Stalin's programme speech, but it is hardly difficult to guess. Social-fascist "Vorwaerts," the vanguard in the struggle against the Soviet Government, on the basis of gossip about the difficulties with which the grain collection has been going forward in certain regions, has written in the article mentioned already that "now the Bolshevik dictatorship is faced with not 24 million peasant farms, as an unorganised mass, but 200,000 organisations, which radically changes the relation of forces." "Vorwaerts" writes that "without any plot, without any agitation on the part of the kulaks who were liquidated long ago, the peasantry in 1932 are moving towards an agricultural strike, as they did in 1920." And this alleged fact "Vorwaerts" explains as being because "the State has done its utmost to drive the peasants into compulsory associations." "The violent rate of development of industry," writes the "Vorwaerts" further on, "brought about an accumulation of capital to such an extent as the world has not yet seen. The main source was and is the Russian village. According to the comparison made by Preobrazhensky, which is now famous, primary socialist accumulation is of necessity made at the expense of the peasantry."

It would be as well to dwell a little on these fables and this argument, borrowed by the social-fascist "Vorwaerts" from the theoretical arsenal of Preobrazhensky, the Trotskyist. First of all, it is a fable that the collectivised peasants regard the collective farms as compulsory organisations. If this were so, we should be witnessing an endeavour on the part of the peasants to leave the collective farms. Whereas at the Plenum of the Central Committee it was unanimously recorded that cases of exit from the collective farms are not to be observed at all at the present time. On the contrary, if two or three years ago the peasants, upon entering the collective farms, did so hesitatingly, trying as it were to justify themselves before the mass of individual peasants, now, on the contrary, the individual farmers find themselves compelled to justify themselves for not having entered the collective farms. On the unanimous testimony of comrades from the provinces at the Plenum of the Central Committee, the collective farms have become invincible fortresses in the Soviet village, and the kulaks now do not dare to act openly against the collective farms.

How is this to be explained? By the fact that in spite of the calumnious utterances of "Vorwaerts" and the Trotskyists, the peasants are not only not victims of State "primitive Socialist accumulation," but, on the contrary, have gained very considerably from entering the collective farms, and are already realising it. There was a time when the peasantry supported the Soviet Government in so far as the October revolution expropriated the landlords, and gave the land to the peasants, and continued to support it by credit. This is not the position now. Now the Soviet Government is no longer the debtor of the peasants. Commencing recently, *the Soviet Government has given the bulk of the peasantry what no other Government in the world is in a position to give.* Quite apart from the fact that collectivisation destroyed the differentiation of the village, did away with pauperisation of the village; quite apart from the fact that the bulk of the peasantry, in connection with the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, were rid of the cruellest exploiters, the Soviet Government, during the last four years, has given to the peasants, the mightiest means of production. The Soviet Government, during the first Five-Year Plan, gave the peasants over 120,000 new tractors. "At the beginning of the first Five Year Plan 27 per cent. of the peasant farms had no working cattle or agricultural implements, and 74 per cent. ploughing implements only. This means that 74 per cent. of the peasantry either had no implements, or only one plough, and 27 per cent. of them even had no working cattle. By the end of the first Five-Year Plan 25 per cent. of all the peasant farms inside the collective farms were linked up with machine tractor stations, were already armed with a system of mechanical machine power. Here you have machines for ploughing, sowing, weeding, harvesting, threshing, etc. *Already 25 per cent. of the entire peasant farms have a whole system of complicated machinery.* Over 30 per cent. of those inside the remaining collective farms make use of a collection of agricultural machines with horse-power. Again, not just one single implement for ploughing, but *a whole collection of machines* with horse-power. In 1928, one-tenth of the spring sowing was done with the old primitive Russian plough, made of wood. Three-quarters of the spring sowing area was done by hand. Over one-third of the area was harvested with sickles and scythes, and 40 per cent. of the gross yield was threshed by hand. This was in 1928.

The considerable amount of agricultural machinery produced during the last four years makes it possible in the coming year, 1933, with the most rational utilisation of agricultural machinery already in hand, and that which will be produced, to till almost one-third of the spring area by means of tractors, to sow almost entirely with machinery, to reap three-

quarters of the area with machines and horses, and about one-sixth with tractors and combines; to thresh the grain entirely with the use of horse, and mechanised threshers. In 1928 40 per cent. was threshed by hand, in 1933 we shall be able to thresh the grain absolutely and entirely with the help of threshers" (Comrade Kuibyshev's Report).

Have the results of this technical re-equipment of the village been felt, and does it prove in actual practice that the collective farm supersedes the individual? Most certainly. Comrade Molotov in his report, said: "Let us take the results of the sowing campaign in 1932 and compare the productivity of labour in the collective farms, served by the machine tractor stations, in collective farms not served by them, and in the individual farms. What do we see? The following:

(a) Seven million collective farmers, served by machine tractor stations, sowed 35 million hectares or, in other words, five hectares per farm;

(b) Eight million collective farmers, not served by machine tractor stations, sowed 31 million hectares or, approximately four hectares per farm;

(c) Ten million individual farmers sowed 19 million hectares, which was less than two hectares per individual farmer.

Thus we already have facts to prove the advantage of collective labour, more especially collective labour which is linked up with tractors and agricultural machinery from the machine tractor stations."

How is it that nevertheless this year there are such difficulties in the grain collection, more than for last year? Comrade Stalin answered this question with extreme clarity in his programme speech: "Not the peasants are responsible for this, but we, Communists." First, our comrades in the provinces forgot that consciousness always lags behind surroundings; they did not understand that "the collective farmers are in their surroundings no longer individual farmers, but collectivists; but their thoughts, their consciousness, are still the old ones, private-property-owning thoughts." Secondly, our village workers, satisfied with the rapid growth of collectivisation and leaving things at that, did not guess that the "transfer of the peasant to the collective farm does not lessen, but increases the care of the Communists and their responsibility," for before, when he was an individual peasant, the collective farmer used to care for his own farm himself; and now that he is in the collective farm, he shifts the trouble about it on to the shoulders of others; now the collective farm management has to see to it, and the collective farm management, without our help, is not in a position to organise a large farm. Thirdly, our comrades in the provinces, satisfied with the fact that the kulaks as a class are liquidated, quite forgot that the kulak, forced to his knees, has decked

himself out in new attire, has assumed a new outer form, has entered into the collective farm and, wherever our comrades were removed from the leadership in the collective farms, these class enemies themselves seized upon the vacancies.

Is it possible for the party to liquidate this oversight now that the position has become quite clear to all? Now that Comrade Stalin has revealed all the processes now going on in the village with astonishing clarity, which many workers did not understand, and so clearly indicated the way to liquidate defects, this is possible, of this there can be no doubt whatever. It is enough to remember what hopes our enemies held in connection with the villages at the end of 1929 and the beginning of 1930, when many workers in the districts, their heads turned by their successes, made several "left" mistakes, and to remember how quickly the peasants' flight from the collective farms was stopped, after Comrade Stalin's article on "Giddy from Success." Now it will be far more simple to correct the mistakes of the comrades in the provinces, for now the C.P.S.U. has a mighty lever with which to influence the village: 2,446 machine tractor stations, which the party did not have in 1929-30.

4. THE C.P.S.U. ON THE ROAD TO NEW VICTORIES.

The task of mastering our new enterprises and of strengthening organisationally the collective farms and Soviet farms demands, first of all, that the ranks of the party itself should be consolidated. The capitalist elements which have been liquidated, but not smashed once and for all, not only bring pressure to bear on the weakest link in the party chain, in their violent struggle against us, but in several cases, especially in the village, they have been able to find their way into the party itself, having first altered their outward appearance and masked their true colours. And the sharpening of the class struggle, as before, has brought about a certain revival among the "left" and Right opportunists who have been crushed, but not yet smashed once and for all. The C.P.S.U., which laid down the line of an enforced attack upon capitalist elements at the XV Party

Congress, began by opening fire upon the opportunists inside the ranks of the party, and routed the Right opposition, after the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists had already been thrown out of the party. And now in this new stage of socialist advance, the leadership of the C.P.S.U. is aiming a crushing blow against all counter-revolutionary groups as that of Riutin, and Eismont, and seriously warns the late leaders of the Right opposition, who took no active part in the struggle against anti-party elements, and even maintained connections with Smirnov and Eismont. At the same time, and the same purpose, the joint Plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee approved the decision of the Political Bureau to undertake a cleansing of the party during 1933, and to stop the admittance of new party members until the party cleansing be finished, to ensure iron, proletarian discipline to the party and cleanse the party ranks of all untrustworthy, unstable, clinging elements.

The Leninist party, the C.P.S.U., led by Comrade Stalin, has won a mighty victory of universal historical importance, and, through its fight against the class enemies and opportunists in its own ranks, is going forward to new victories. This mighty work, which is now being accomplished by the C.P.S.U., should not only engage the attention of the entire Communist International, but the entire world proletariat. The proletariat of the whole world, with the example of the C.P.S.U., is becoming convinced of the fact that Lenin's road is the only road to socialism, the road that leads to victory; but this road is not smooth or easy; it is not a bed of roses, but a difficult road that demands sacrifices. The road is hard, but there is no other. Either the workers will take this road, and they will then surely conquer, or they will waver, will look behind, will listen to the social-fascist traitors and lay down their arms at the slightest demagogic concessions, at every trifling promise—and then the noose of capitalist slavery will be drawn ever tighter around their necks. We cannot doubt that the majority of the working-class of the capitalist countries will choose—and that in the near future—the first road, the road to October.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIRST FIVE-YEAR PLAN

(Report delivered at the Joint Plenum of the C.C. and the Central Commission of the C.P.S.U. (b) Jan. 7, 1933)

I.

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN.

COMRADES,

WHEN the Five-Year Plan appeared people hardly expected that it could have enormous international significance. On the contrary, many thought that the Five-Year Plan was the private affair of the Soviet Union, an important and serious affair, but the private, national affair of the Soviet Union nevertheless.

History has shown, however, that the international significance of the Five-Year Plan is immeasurable. History has shown that the Five-Year Plan is not the private affair of the Soviet Union, but the affair of the whole international proletariat.

Long before the Five-Year Plan appeared, in the period when we were finishing the struggle against the interventionists and proceeded along the path of economic construction—even in that period Lenin said that our economic construction was of profound economic significance, that every step forward taken by the Soviet Government along the path of economic construction would call forth a deep echo among the most varied strata in capitalist countries and would split people into two camps—the camp of the adherents of the proletarian revolution and the camp of its opponents.

Lenin said at that time :

“At the present time we are exercising our main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy. All eyes are turned on the Soviet Russian Republic, all the toilers in all countries of the world without exception and without any exaggeration. That has been achieved. The struggle on this field is now being waged on a world scale. If we fulfil this task—then we shall have won on an international scale for certain and finally. That is why questions of economic construction assume absolutely exceptional significance for us. On this front we must win victory, by slow, gradual—it cannot be fast—but steadily increasing progress.”—Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXVI., pp. 410-411. Russian Ed.)

This was said at the time when we were finishing the war against the interventionists, when we were passing from the military struggle against capitalism to the struggle on the economic front, to the period of economic construction.

Many years have passed since then, and every step forward the Soviet Government took in the sphere of economic construction each year, each quarter, brilliantly confirmed the correctness of Comrade Lenin's words.

But the most brilliant confirmation of Comrade

Lenin's words is provided by our Five-Year Plan of construction, the rise of this plan, its development and its fulfilment. Indeed, it seems that no step taken along the path of economic construction in our country has called forth such an echo among the most varied strata in the capitalist countries of Europe, America and Asia as has the question of the Five-Year Plan, its development and its fulfilment.

In the first period the bourgeoisie and its Press greeted the Five-Year Plan with ridicule. “Fantastic,” “delirium,” “utopia,” that is how they dubbed the Five-Year Plan then. Later on, when it began to be revealed that the fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan was producing real results, they began to beat the alarm and declare that the Five-Year Plan threatened the existence of the capitalist countries, that its fulfilment will lead to the flooding of European markets with goods, to intensive dumping and the worsening of unemployment. Still later, when even this trick against the Soviet Union failed to produce the expected results, a series of voyages to the U.S.S.R. was undertaken by the representatives of all sorts of firms, organs of the Press, various kinds of societies, etc., for the purpose of seeing with their own eyes what is actually going on in the Soviet Union. This is quite apart from the workers' delegations who, right from the first appearance of the Five-Year Plan, expressed their admiration of the enterprise and successes of the Soviet Government and manifested their readiness to support the working-class of the U.S.S.R.

From that time a cleavage began in so-called public opinion, in the bourgeois Press, in various kinds of bourgeois societies, etc. Some declared that the Five-Year Plan had utterly failed and that the Bolsheviks were on the verge of collapse. Others, on the contrary, declared that although the Bolsheviks were bad men—nevertheless, their Five-Year Plan was working out, and in all probability they would achieve their aim.

Perhaps it will not be superfluous for me to quote the opinions of various organs of the bourgeois Press.

Take, for example, the American newspaper, the *New York Times*. At the end of November, 1932, this paper wrote :

“A Five-Year Industrial Plan which sets out to defy the sense of proportion, which drives toward an objective ‘regardless of cost,’ as Moscow has often proudly boasted, is really not a plan. It is a gamble.”

And here is the opinion of the English bourgeois newspaper, the *Daily Telegraph*, expressed at the end of the year :

“As a practical test of ‘planned economics’ the scheme has quite clearly failed.”

The opinion of the *New York Times* in November, 1932 :

“ . . . collectivisation campaign is of course a ghastly failure. It has brought Russia to the edge of famine.”

The opinion of a bourgeois newspaper in Poland, *Gazetta Polska*, expressed in the summer of 1932 :

“The situation seems to show that the Government of the Soviets has reached a *cul de sac* with its policy of collectivising the rural districts.”

The opinion of an English bourgeois newspaper, *The Financial Times*, expressed in November, 1932 :

“Stalin and his Party, as the outcome of their policy, find themselves faced with the breakdown of the Five-Year Plan system and frustration of the aims it was expected to achieve.”

The opinion of the Italian magazine, *Politica* :

“It would be absurd to think that nothing has been done in the four years’ work of a nation consisting of a hundred and sixty million, four years of superhuman economic and political effort on the part of a régime of such strength as the Bolshevik régime represents. On the contrary, a great deal has been done. . . . Nevertheless, the catastrophe is here, it is an obvious fact to all. Of this friends and enemies, Bolsheviks and anti-Bolsheviks, opportunists on the Right and the Left are convinced.”

Finally, the opinion of an American bourgeois magazine, *Current History* :

“A survey of the existing posture of affairs in Russia, therefore, leads to the conclusion that the Five-Year programme has failed both in terms of its announced statistical objectives and more fundamentally in terms of certain of its underlying social principles.”

Such are the opinions of one section of the bourgeois Press.

It is hardly worth while criticising those who gave utterance to these opinions. I do not think it is worth while, because these “diehards” belong to the species of medieval fossils for whom facts have no significance, and who, no matter how we carry out the Five-Year Plan, will persist in their opinion just the same.

We will now quote the opinion of other organs of the Press in this same bourgeois camp.

Here is the opinion of the well-known bourgeois newspaper in France, *Les Temps*, expressed in January, 1932 :

“The U.S.S.R. has won the first round, having industrialised herself without the aid of foreign capital.”

The opinion of *Les Temps* again, expressed in the summer of 1932 :

“Communism accomplished at one leap the stage of construction which the capitalist régime had to pass through in slow paces. . . . Practically the Bolsheviks have won the game against us. . . . We are hampered, especially in France, where the land is infinitely divided up, by the impossibility of mechanising agriculture on American lines. . . . The Soviets, by industrialising agriculture, have solved the problem, at least theoretically.”

The opinion of a British bourgeois magazine, *The Round Table* :

“ . . . The development achieved under the Five-Year Plan is astounding. The tractor plants of Kharkov and Stalingrad, the Amo automobile factory in Moscow, the Ford plant at Nizhni-Novgorod, the Dnieprostroy hydro-electric project, the mammoth steel plants at Magnitogorsk and Kuznetsk in Siberia, the network of machine shops and chemical plants in the Urals—which bid fair to become Russia’s Ruhr—these and other industrial achievements all over the country show that, whatever the shortcomings and difficulties, Russian industry, like a well-watered plant, keeps on gaining colour, size and strength. . . . She has laid the foundations for future development, and what is infinitely more important from her point of view, she has strengthened prodigiously her fighting capacity.”

The opinion of the English bourgeois newspaper, *The Financial News* :

“The progress made in machine construction cannot be doubted, and the celebrations of it in the Press and on the platform, glowing as they are, are not unwarranted. It must be remembered that . . . Russia, of course, produced machines and tools, but only of the simplest kind. . . .

“True, the importation of machines and tools is actually increasing in absolute figures ; but the proportion of imported machines to those of native production is steadily diminishing. . . . Russia is producing to-day all the machinery essential to her metallurgical and electrical industries, has succeeded in creating her own automobile industry ; has established her own tool-making industry from small precision instruments to the heaviest presses ; and in the matter of agricultural machinery is independent of foreign imports. . . .

“Nor do they agree that the retardation of production in the output of such basic industries as iron and coal is so serious as to endanger the fulfilment of the Plan in four years. . . . The one thing certain is that the enormous plant now being established guarantees a very considerable increase in the output of the heavy industries.”

The opinion of an Austrian bourgeois newspaper,

Die Neue Freie Press, expressed in the beginning of 1932 :

"We can curse Bolshevism, but we must understand it. . . . The second Five-Year Plan is a new quantity which must be taken into account in every economic calculation."

The opinion of an English capitalist, Gibson Jarvie, the president of the United Dominion Trust, expressed in October, 1932 :

"Now I want it clearly understood that I am neither Communist nor Bolshevik. I am definitely a capitalist and an individualist. . . . Russia is forging ahead while all too many of our factories and shipyards lie idle, when farm land lies fallow and approximately 3,000,000 of our people despairingly seek work. . . . Russia has accomplished her first Five-Year Plan. Jokes have been made about that Plan ; it has been scoffed at ; it has been ridiculed and its failure has been predicted. You can take it beyond question, and you will be wise to accept it, that under the Five-Year Plan much more has been accomplished than was ever anticipated. . . . In all these industrial towns which I visited, a new city is growing up, a city on a definite plan with wide streets in the process of being beautified by trees and grass plots, houses of the most modern type with plenty of air space between them, schools, hospitals, workers' clubs and the inevitable crèche or nursery, where the children of working mothers are cared for. . . . Don't under-rate the Russians or their plans, and don't make the mistake of believing that the Soviet Government must crash. . . . Russia to-day is a country with a soul and an ideal. . . . Russia is a country of amazing activity. . . . I believe that the Russian objective is sound. . . . And perhaps, most important of all, all these youngsters and these workers in Russia have one thing which is too sadly lacking in the capitalist countries to-day, and that is—hope !"

The opinion of the American bourgeois journal, *The Nation*, expressed in November, 1932 :

" . . . The four years of the Five-Year Plan have witnessed truly remarkable developments. . . . Russia is working with war-time intensity on the positive task of building the physical and social moulds of a new life. The face of the country is being changed literally beyond recognition. This is true of Moscow, with hundreds of streets and squares paved . . . with new suburbs, new buildings, and a cordon of new factories on its outskirts, and it is true of smaller and less important cities. New towns have sprung out of the steppe, the wilderness, and the desert—not just a few towns, but at least fifty of them with populations of from 50,000 to 250,000—all in the last four

years, each constructed around an enterprise for the development of some natural resource. Hundreds of new district power stations and a handful of 'giants' like Dnieperstroï are gradually putting reality into Lenin's formula : 'Electricity plus Soviets equals socialism. . . .' The Soviet Union now engages in the large-scale manufacture of an endless variety of articles which Russia never before produced—tractors, combines, high-grade steels, synthetic rubber, ball-bearings, high-power Diesel motors, 50,000 kilowatt turbines, telephone-exchange equipment, electrical mining machinery, aeroplanes, automobiles, lorries, bicycles, electric-welding equipment, and several hundreds of types of new machines. . . . For the first time Russia is mining aluminium, magnesium, apatite, iodine, potash, and many other valuable minerals. . . . The guiding landmark on the Soviet countryside is no longer the dome of a rich church towering over the ugly mud-thatched peasant huts clustered in its shadow, but the grain elevator and the silo. Collectives are building piggeries, barns, and houses. Electricity is penetrating the illiterate village, and radio and newspaper have conquered it. Workers are learning to operate the world's most modern machines ; peasant boys make and use agricultural machinery bigger and more complicated than ever America has seen. . . . Russia is becoming 'machine-minded. Russia is passing quickly from the age of wood into an age of iron, steel, concrete, and motors.

The opinion of the "Left"-reformist journal in Glasgow, Scotland, the *Forward*, expressed in September, 1932 :

"Nobody can fail to notice the enormous amount of building work that is going on.

"New factories, new picture-houses, new schools, new restaurants, new clubs, new big blocks of tenements, everywhere new buildings, many completed, others with scaffolding. . . .

"It is difficult to convey to the mind of the British reader exactly what has been done, and what is being done.

"It has to be seen to be believed. Our own war-time efforts, like Gretna Green, are flea-bites to what has been done in Russia. Americans admit that even in the greatest rush days in the West there could have been nothing like the feverish building activity that is going on in Russia to-day.

"One sees so many changes in the Russian scene after two years that one gives up trying to imagine what Russia will be like in another ten years.

"So dismiss from your heads the fantastic scare stories of the British Press that lies so per-

sistently, so blatantly, so contemptibly about Russia, and all the half truths and misconceptions that are circulated by the dilettante literary academic intelligentsia that look at Russia patronisingly through superior middle class spectacles, without having the slightest understanding of what is going on. . . .

"Russia is building up a new society on what are, generally speaking, fundamentally sound lines. To do this it is taking risks, it is working enthusiastically with an energy that has never been seen in the world before, it has tremendous difficulties inseparable from this attempt to build up Socialism in a vast, undeveloped, isolated country from the rest of the world. But the impression I have, after seeing it again after two years, is that of a nation making solid progress, planning, creating, constructing in a way that is a striking challenge to the hostile capitalist world."

Such are the discordant voices and the cleavages in the camp of bourgeois circles, of whom some stand for the destruction of the U.S.S.R. and its alleged bankrupt Five-Year Plan, while others, apparently, stand for commercial co-operation with the U.S.S.R., obviously calculating that they can obtain some advantage for themselves out of the success of the Five-Year Plan.

The question of the attitude of the working-class in capitalist countries to the question of the Five-Year Plan, to the question of the successes of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. stands in a special category. It would be sufficient to confine oneself here to quoting the opinion of one of numerous workers' delegations which annually come to the U.S.S.R., say, for example, the Belgian workers' delegation. The opinion of this delegation is typical of that of all workers' delegations without exception, irrespective of whether we speak of the English delegation, the French delegation, the German or American delegations or the delegations of other countries. This is the opinion:

"We are struck with admiration at the enormous construction that we have observed during our travels. In Moscow as well as in Makeyevka, Gorlovka, Kharkov, and Leningrad, we were able to satisfy ourselves on the enthusiasm with which the work is being carried on here. All the machines are of modern construction. The factories are clean, well ventilated and well lit. We saw how medical assistance and hygienic conditions are provided for the workers in the U.S.S.R.

"The workers' houses are built near the factories. In the workers' towns, schools and crèches are organised; the children are surrounded with every care. We were able to see the difference between the old and the newly-constructed factories, between the old and the new houses. All

that we have seen has given us a clear idea of the enormous strength of the toilers who are building a new society under the leadership of the Communist Party. In the U.S.S.R. we have observed a great cultural revival, while in other countries there is decadence in all spheres, and unemployment reigns. We were able to see the frightful difficulties the Soviet toilers have to encounter on their path. We can therefore appreciate all the more the pride with which they pointed to their victories.

"We are convinced that they will overcome all obstacles."

Here you have then, the international significance of the Five-Year Plan. It was enough for us to carry on construction work for a matter of two or three years, it was enough for us to show the first successes of the Five-Year Plan, for the whole world to split up into two camps—the camp of those who untiringly bark at us, and the camp of those who are astonished at the successes of the Five-Year Plan; and this is quite apart from the fact that we have our own camp all over the world, which is becoming stronger—the camp of the working-class in the capitalist countries, which rejoices at the successes of the working-class in the U.S.S.R. and is prepared to support it to the terror of the bourgeoisie of the whole world.

What does this mean?

It means that there can be no doubt about the international significance of the Five-Year Plan, about the international significance of its successes and gains.

It means that the capitalist countries are pregnant with the proletarian revolution, and precisely because they are pregnant with the proletarian revolution the bourgeoisie would have liked to find in the failure of the Five-Year Plan a fresh argument against revolution, whereas, on the other hand, the proletariat is striving to find, and indeed does find in the successes of the Five-Year Plan a fresh argument in favour of revolution, against the bourgeoisie of the whole world.

THE SUCCESSES OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN MOBILISE THE REVOLUTIONARY FORCES OF ALL COUNTRIES AGAINST CAPITALISM—such is the indisputable fact.

There cannot be any doubt that the international revolutionary significance of the Five-Year Plan is really immeasurable.

All the greater, therefore, must be the attention that we devote to the question of the Five-Year Plan, the content of the Five-Year Plan and of the fundamental tasks of the Five-Year Plan.

All the more carefully, therefore, must we analyse the results of the Five-Year Plan, the results of the execution and fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan.

II.

THE FUNDAMENTAL TASK OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN AND THE PATH OF ITS FULFILMENT.

We now come to the question of the Five-Year Plan as such.

What is the Five-Year Plan?

What was the fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan?

The fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan was to transfer our country, with its backward, and in part, medieval technique, to the path of new, modern technique.

The fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan was to transform the U.S.S.R. from an agrarian and weak country, dependent upon the caprices of the capitalist countries, into an industrial and powerful country quite independent of the caprices of world capitalism.

The fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan was, in transferring the U.S.S.R. into an industrial country, to utterly squeeze out the capitalist elements, to widen the front of socialist forms of economy and create the economic base for the abolition of classes in the U.S.S.R. and for the construction of socialist society.

The fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan was to create such an industry in our country as would be able to re-equip and re-organise, not only industry as a whole, but also transport, and also agriculture—on the basis of socialism.

The fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan was to transfer small and scattered agriculture to the road of large-scale collective farming and thereby secure the economic base for socialism in the rural districts and thus remove the possibility of the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R.

Finally, the task of the Five-Year Plan was to create in the country all the necessary technical and economic pre-requisites for increasing the power of defence of the country to the utmost, which will enable it to organise determined resistance against each and every attempt at military intervention from outside, against each and every attempt at military attack from without.

What dictated this fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan; what were the grounds for it?

The necessity to abolish the technical backwardness of the Soviet Union which doomed it to an unenviable existence; the necessity to create in the country such pre-requisites as would enable it not only to overtake, but in time to surpass economically and technically, the advanced capitalist countries.

Consideration of the fact that the Soviet Government could not maintain itself for long on the basis of a backward industry, that only modern large-scale industry, not only equal to, but which, in time, would excel the industries of capitalist countries, can serve

as a real and reliable foundation for the Soviet Government.

Consideration of the fact that the Soviet Government could not for long rest upon two opposite foundations, on the basis of large-scale socialist industry which DESTROYS the capitalist elements, and on small individual peasant farming, which GENERATES capitalist elements.

Consideration of the fact that until small peasant farming is put on the basis of large-scale production until the small peasant farms are united into large collective farms—the danger of the restoration of capitalism in the U.S.S.R. would be the most real of all possible dangers.

Lenin said:

“Due to the revolution, Russia, in its political structure, has caught up with the advanced countries in the course of a few months.

“But this is not enough. War is implacable; it puts the question with merciless sharpness; either overtake the advanced countries and surpass them ALSO ECONOMICALLY . . . either full steam ahead or perish. This is how history has put the question.”—(Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXI., Book I, p. 216, Russian Ed.)

Lenin said:

“As long as we live in a small peasant country there is a firmer economic basis for capitalism in Russia than for Communism. This must be remembered. Everyone who has carefully observed the life of the countryside and compares it with the life of the town knows that we have not torn up the roots of capitalism, and that we have not undermined the foundation, the basis of the internal enemy. The latter rests upon petty farming and there is only one way to undermine him, and that is, to transfer the economy of the country, including agriculture, to a new technical base, to the technical base of modern large-scale production. . . . Only when the country will be electrified, only when industry, agriculture and transport will be placed on the basis of modern large-scale industry, only then will we be finally victorious.”—(Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXVI., p. 46, Russian Ed.)

These were the propositions that lay at the basis of the Party's considerations which led to the drawing up of the Five-Year Plan, which led to the determination of the fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan.

That is the position in regard to the fundamental task of the Five-Year Plan.

But it is impossible to commence the fulfilment of such a grand plan haphazard, just anywhere. In order to carry out such a plan, it is necessary first of all to find the main link of the plan, because only after having found and grasped this main link was it possible to pull all the other links of the Plan.

What was the main link in the Five-Year Plan?

The main link of the Five-Year Plan was heavy industry, and its core, machine-construction. Because only heavy industry was capable of reconstructing industry, as a whole, and transport, and agriculture, and of putting them on their feet. Hence, it was necessary to start from heavy industry in fulfilling the Five-Year Plan. Hence, the restoration of heavy industry had to be put at the base of the fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan.

We have Lenin's guidance also on this point.

"The salvation of Russia lies not only in a good harvest obtained by peasant farming—that is not enough—and not only in the good state of the light industry which provides the peasantry with articles of consumption—that, too, is not enough—we must have also HEAVY industry. . . Unless we save heavy industry, unless we restore it, we cannot build up any industry, and without it we shall perish as an independent country. . . Heavy industries need State subsidies. If we are not able to find them, then we, as a civilised State let alone as a socialist State—will perish."—(Lenin, *Collected Works*. Vol. XXVII., p. 349, Russian Edition.)

But the restoration and the development of heavy industry, particularly in such a backward and poor country as our country was at the beginning of the Five-Year Plan, is a very difficult task, because, as is well known, heavy industry calls for enormous financial expenditure, and the availability of a certain minimum of experienced technical forces, without which, speaking generally, the restoration of heavy industry is impossible. Did the Party know this, and did it take it into account? Yes, it did know it. It not only knew it, but it announced it, in the hearing of all. The Party knew how heavy industry was built up in England, Germany and America. It knew that in those countries heavy industry was built up either with the aid of big loans, or by plundering other countries, or by both methods simultaneously. The Party knew that these paths were closed to our country. What did it calculate on? It calculated on the forces of our country itself. It calculated on the fact that, possessing a Soviet Government and basing itself on the nationalisation of the land, of industry, of transport, the banks and commerce, we could pursue a strict régime of economy in order to accumulate sufficient resources for the restoration and development of heavy industry. The Party frankly said that this will call for serious sacrifices, and that we must openly and consciously make these sacrifices, if we want to achieve our goal. The Party calculated on rousing the internal forces of our country for this task without usurious credits and loans from outside. This is what Lenin said on this score:

"We must try to build up a State in which the workers shall maintain their leadership of the

peasantry and the confidence of the peasantry, and with the greatest possible economy, expel from their social relationships all traces of superfluity.

"We must reduce our State apparatus to the utmost possible economy, we must expel from it all traces of superfluity, of which so much has been left it by tsarist Russia, by its bureaucratic-capitalist apparatus.

"Will not this be the reign of peasant narrow-mindedness?"

"No. If the working-class will maintain its leadership of the peasantry we will be able, at the price of extremely great economy in the administration of our State, to preserve all our savings, even the smallest, for the development of our large-scale machine industry, for the development of electrification, hydro-peat, for the completion of Volkhovstroy,† etc.*

"In this and this alone can we place our hope. Only then will we be able to change horses, to put it figuratively, to change from the impoverished peasant, muzhik horse, from the horse of economy calculated for a ruined peasant country—to the horse which the proletariat is seeking and cannot but seek, to the horse of large-scale machine industry, electrification, Volkhovstroy, etc."—(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXVII., p. 417, Russian Ed.)

To change from the impoverished muzhik horse to the horse of large-scale machine industry—that was the aim the Party pursued, when drawing up the Five-Year Plan, and in striving to fulfil it.

To exercise the strictest régime of economy and accumulate the resources necessary for financing the industrialisation of the country—that was the road that had to be taken to secure the restoration of heavy industry, and carry out the Five-Year Plan.

A bold task? A difficult road? But our Party is called a Leninist Party precisely because it has no right to fear difficulties.

More than that. The Party's confidence in the possibility of fulfilling the Five-Year Plan, and its confidence in the strength of the working-class was so strong, that it found it possible to undertake to fulfil this difficult task not in five years, as was provided for in the Five-Year Plan, but in four years, strictly speaking, in four years and three months, if the special quarter be added.‡

* Electric power station run by water power or by peat fuel.

† The power station near Leningrad. The first big power station to be built by the Soviet Government.—*Ed.*

‡ Until 1930 the business year was calculated from October to September. In 1930 it was decided to make the business year coincide with the calendar year. This made the last quarter of 1930 a sort of "leap" quarter and is referred to as the "special quarter."—*Ed.*

This is what gave birth to the famous slogan :
 "The Five-Year Plan in Four."

Well, what happened ?

Subsequent facts prove that the Party was right.

The facts prove that without this audacity, and confidence in the strength of the working-class, the Party could not have achieved the victory of which we are now so justly proud.

III.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN IN FOUR YEARS IN THE SPHERE OF INDUSTRY.

We now come to the question of the results of the fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan. What are the results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of INDUSTRY ?

Have we achieved victory in this sphere ?

Yes, we have. And not only have we done that, but we have done more than we expected, more than the hottest heads in our Party could expect. Even our enemies can not deny this—now ; our friends certainly do not do so.

Formerly, we did not have an iron and steel industry, the basis of the industrialisation of the country. Now we have such an industry.

We did not have a tractor industry. Now we have one.

We did not have an automobile industry. Now we have one.

We did not have an engineering industry. Now we have one.

We did not have a big and modern chemical industry. Now we have one.

We did not have a real, big industry for the production of modern agricultural machinery. Now we have one.

We did not have an aviation industry. Now we have one.

In production of electric power we were last on the list. Now we are among the first on the list.

In the production of all products, and coal, we were last on the list. Now we are among the first on the list.

We had only one, single, coal and metallurgical base, the Ukraine, which we could barely manage. We have not only succeeded in improving this base, but we have created a new coal and metallurgical base—in the East, which is the pride of our country.

We had only one single textile industry base—in the north of our country. In the very near future we shall have two new bases of the textile industry—in Central Asia and Eastern Siberia.

And we have not only created these new enormous branches of industry, but we have created them on such a scale and on such dimensions that the scale and dimensions of European industry pale into insignificance.

And all this has resulted in the complete and irrevocable expulsion of the capitalist elements from industry, and socialist industry has become the sole form of industry in the U.S.S.R.

And all this has resulted in our country being transformed from an agrarian country into an industrial country, for the relative proportion of industrial output to agricultural output has increased from 48 per cent. in the beginning of the Five-Year Plan (1928) to 70 per cent. at the end of the fourth year of the Five-Year Plan (1932).

And all this has resulted in our being able to fulfil the programme of general industrial output, which was calculated to take five years, to the extent of 93.7 per cent. at the end of four years ; in our having increased the volume of industrial output more than THREE-FOLD compared with the pre-war output, and more than TWO-FOLD compared with the output of 1928. We have fulfilled the Five-Year Plan programme of output for heavy industry to the extent of 108 per cent. It is true that we are short of fulfilling the general programme of the Five-Year Plan by 6 per cent. But this is to be explained by the fact that in view of the refusal of neighbouring countries to sign Pacts of Non-Aggression with us, and in view of the complications that arose in the Far East, we were obliged, in order to improve the defences of the country, to hastily transfer a number of factories to the production of modern weapons of defence. Well, in view of the necessity of a certain preparatory period, the transfer resulted in these factories ceasing to turn out goods for a period of four months, and this could not but affect the fulfilment of the general programme of output of the Five-Year Plan during 1932. This operation resulted in our completely closing the breach in the defences of the country. But it could not but affect the fulfilment of the programme of output of the Five-Year Plan. There cannot be any doubt that, but for this circumstance, we would not only have fulfilled, but over-fulfilled, the figures of the Five-Year Plan.

Finally, all this resulted in the fact that from a weak country, unprepared for defence, the Soviet Union has been transformed into a country mighty in defence, a country prepared for every contingency, a country capable of producing all modern weapons of defence on a mass scale and of equipping its own army with them in the event of an attack from without.

Such, in general, are the results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of industry.

Now judge for yourselves. After this, what is all the talk in the bourgeois Press about the "failure" of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of industry, worth ?

What is the position in the CAPITALIST countries, which are now passing through a severe crisis, in so far as the growth of their industrial output is concerned ?

Here are the generally known official figures.

While the index number of the volume of industrial production in the U.S.S.R., at the end of 1932, ROSE to 334 taking the pre-war output at 100, the index number of the volume of industrial output in the U.S.A. DROPPED in the same period to 84, that of England to 75, that of Germany to 62. While the index number of the volume of industrial output in the U.S.S.R. at the end of 1932 rose to 219, taking 1928 as 100, the index number of the volume of industrial output in the U.S.A. during the same period dropped to 56, that in England to 80, Germany to 55, Poland to 54.

What do these figures show if not that the capitalist system of industry has not stood the test in contest with the Soviet system, that the Soviet system of industry has all the advantages over the capitalist system.

We are told, this is all very well, many new factories have been built, the foundations of industrialisation have been laid. But it would have been far better to have abandoned the policy of industrialisation, the policy of expanding the production of means of production, or at least, to put that business in the background in order to produce more calico, boots, clothes and other articles of general use. Fewer articles of general use have been produced than is required, and this creates certain difficulties.

But then, those who say this should know and take into account what a policy of pushing the task of industrialisation into the background would have brought us to. Of course, of the one-and-a-half billion roubles in foreign currency which we spent on purchasing equipment for our heavy industry we could have set apart one-half for the purpose of importing raw cotton, hides, wool, rubber, etc. Had we done that we should have had more calico, boots and clothes. But then, we would not have had a tractor and an automobile industry, we would not have had anything like a big iron and steel industry, we would not have had metal for the production of machinery—and we would have been unarmed, in the midst of a capitalist environment, which is armed with modern technique. We would then have deprived ourselves of the possibility of supplying tractors and agricultural machinery to our agriculture—which means that we would have been left without bread. We would have deprived ourselves of the possibility of achieving victory over the capitalist elements in the country—which means that we would have immeasurably increased the chances of the restoration of capitalism. We would have deprived ourselves of all the modern means of defence without which the political independence of the country is impossible, without which a country is transformed into a field of military operations of foreign enemies. Our position would then have been more or less analogous

to the present position of China, which has no heavy industry, has no war industry of its own, and whom everybody who cares now has a peck at.

In a word, in that case we would have had military intervention, not Pacts of Non-Aggression, but war, dangerous and fatal war, sanguinary and unequal war; for in that war we would have been almost unarmed in the face of the enemy, who has all the modern means of attack at his disposal.

That is how things would turn out to be, comrades.

Clearly, a self-respecting Government, a self-respecting Party, could not adopt such a fatal point of view.

And it is precisely because the Party rejected this anti-revolutionary line—it is precisely for that reason that it achieved decisive victory in the fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of industry.

In carrying out the Five-Year Plan and organising victory in the sphere of industrial construction, the Party pursued the policy of securing the greatest possible rates of development of industry. The Party, as it were, whipped up the country and spurred it onward.

Was the Party right in pursuing the policy of securing the speediest possible rates of development?

Yes, it was absolutely right.

We could not refrain from whipping up a country which was a hundred years behind, and which, owing to its backwardness, was faced with mortal danger. Only in this way was it possible to enable the country to quickly re-equip itself, on the basis of modern technique, and finally emerge on the high road.

Furthermore, we could not know on what day the imperialists would attack the U.S.S.R. and interrupt our work of construction; but that they could attack us at any moment, taking advantage of the technical and economic backwardness of our country, of that there could not be any doubt. That is why the Party was obliged to whip up the country, in order not to lose time, in order to make the utmost use of the respite, and to manage to create in the U.S.S.R. the bases of industrialisation which represent the foundations of her power. The Party was not able to wait and manoeuvre, and it had to pursue the policy of securing the speediest possible rates of development.

Finally, the Party had to put an end, in the speediest possible time, to the weakness of the country in the sphere of defence. The conditions prevailing at the moment, the growth of armaments in capitalist countries, the collapse of disarmament, the hatred of the international bourgeoisie towards the Soviet Union—all this impelled the Party to accelerate the strengthening of the defences of the country, which are the foundations of its independence.

But did the Party have real possibilities of pursuing the policy of the speediest possible rates of development? Yes, it had. It had these possi-

bilities, not only because it managed in time to rouse the country to make rapid progress, but first of all, because in the work of extensive new construction, it was able to rely upon the old, or renovated, factories and works with which the workers and the engineering technical personnel were already familiar, and which in view of this, made it possible to achieve the speediest possible rates of development.

This is the basis upon which the rapid upsurge of new construction, the *pathos* of unfolding construction, the heroes and shock brigade workers on new constructions, and the practice of surging rates of development sprang up in our country in the first period of the Five-Year Plan.

Can it be said that exactly the same policy of securing the speediest possible rates of development will have to be pursued in the period of the second Five-Year Plan?

No. It cannot.

First of all, thanks to the successful fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan we have, in the main, ALREADY FULFILLED its principal task—the transfer of industry, transport and agriculture to a new, modern, technical base. After that, will it be worth while to whip up, to spur on the country? Clearly, this is no longer necessary.

Secondly, thanks to the successful fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan, we HAVE ALREADY SUCCEEDED in raising the defences of the country to the proper level. Is it worth while, after this, to whip up and spur on the country? Clearly this is no longer necessary.

Finally, thanks to the successful fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan, we have managed to build scores and hundreds of new large factories and combinations of factories, equipped with a new complicated technique. This means that in the second Five-Year Plan, the principal role in the volume of industrial output will not be played by the old factories, the technique of which has already been mastered, as was the case during the period of the first Five-Year Plan, but by the new factories, the technique of which has not yet been mastered, and which has to be mastered. But the mastery of the new enterprises, and the new technique present much greater difficulties than the utilisation of old, or renovated, factories and works, the technique of which has been mastered. That requires more time, in order to improve the skill of the workers and the engineering and technical personnel, and to acquire the new skill that is necessary in order to completely utilise the new technique. Is it not clear, after this, that even if we desired, we could not, in the period of the second Five-Year Plan, particularly in the first two or three years of the second Five-Year Plan, carry out a policy of securing the speediest possible rates of development?

That is why I think that in the second Five-Year

Plan we will have to adopt less speedy rates of growth of industrial output. In the period of the first Five-Year Plan the average annual increase of industrial output was 22 per cent. I think that in the second Five-Year Plan we will have to take an average of 13-14 per cent. annual increase of industrial output. For capitalist countries such a rate of increase of industrial output is an unattainable ideal. Not only such a rate of increase of industrial output—even an average of 5 per cent. annual increase of industrial output is an unattainable ideal for them. But then, they are capitalist countries. A Soviet country, with a Soviet system of economy is altogether different. Our system of economy enables us to obtain, and we must obtain, an annual increase of production of 13-14 per cent. as a MINIMUM.

In the first period of the first Five-Year Plan we succeeded in organising enthusiasm, *pathos*, FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION, and achieved decisive successes. This is very good. But now this is not enough. Now we must supplement this with enthusiasm and *pathos* for MASTERING the new factories and the new technique, for seriously increasing the productivity of labour, for seriously reducing cost of production.

THAT IS THE MAIN THING NOW. Because, only on this basis will we be able, towards the middle of the second Five-Year Plan, say, to make a fresh, powerful spurt forward in the sphere of construction as well as in the sphere of increasing industrial output.

Finally, a few words about rates and percentages of annual increase of production. Our industrialists pay little attention to this question. And yet, it is a very interesting one. What do we mean by per cent. of increase of production, and what does every one per cent. of increase imply? Take 1925 for example, the period of restoration. In that year, the increase of output was 66 per cent., the volume of industrial output amounted to 7,700,000,000 roubles. An increase of 66 per cent. at that time represented, in absolute figures, something over 3,000,000,000 roubles. Hence, every per cent. of increase was then equal to 43,000,000 roubles. Now let us take the year 1928. In that year, the increase was 26 per cent. *i.e.*, almost half that of 1925. The volume of industrial output in 1928 amounted to 15,500,000,000 roubles. The total increase for the year amounted, in absolute figures, to 3,280,000,000 roubles. Thus, every per cent. of increase was then equal to 120,000,000 roubles, *i.e.*, almost three times as much as in 1925, when the total increase amounted to 66 per cent. Finally, let us take 1931. In that year, the increase was 22 per cent., *i.e.*, one-third of that of 1925. The volume of industrial output in 1931 amounted to 30,800,000,000 roubles. The total increase, in absolute figures, amounted to a little over 5,600,000,000 roubles. Hence, every per cent. of increase represented more than 250,000,000 roubles,

i.e., six times more than in 1925, when we had 66 per cent. of increase, and twice as much as in 1928, when we had a little over 26 per cent. of increase.

What does all this show? It shows that in studying the rate of increase of production we must not limit ourselves to the examination of only the total percentage of increase—we must also strive to discover what lies behind each per cent. of increase and what the total sum of the annual increase of production is. For 1933, for example, we are allowing for 16 per cent. of increase, *i.e.*, one-fourth of that of 1925. But this does not mean that the increase of production in 1933 will also be one-fourth of 1925. In 1925, the absolute figure of the increase of production was a little over 3,000,000,000 roubles, and each per cent. was equal to 43,000,000 roubles. There are no reasons to doubt that with a 16 per cent. increase, the increase of production in 1933 will amount to not less than 5,000,000,000 roubles, *i.e.*, almost twice as much as in 1925, and each per cent. of increase will be equal to at least 320-340,000,000 roubles, *i.e.*, will represent at least seven times as much as each per cent. of increase represented in 1925.

That is how things turn out to be, comrades, if we examine the question of rates of growth and percentages of increase concretely.

That is the position in regard to the results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of industry.

IV.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN IN FOUR YEARS IN THE SPHERE OF AGRICULTURE.

We will pass now to the question of the results of Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of agriculture.

The Five-Year Plan in the sphere of agriculture is the Five-Year Plan of collectivisation. What did the Party take as its starting point in carrying out collectivisation?

The Party's starting point was that, in order to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in order to build up socialist society, it was necessary, in addition to industrialisation, also to pass from small individual peasant farming to large-scale collective agriculture equipped with tractors and modern agricultural machinery, as the only durable basis for the Soviet power in the countryside.

The Party's starting point was that, without collectivisation, it would be impossible to lead our country on to the high road of construction of the economic foundations of socialism, that it would be impossible to liberate the vast masses of the toiling peasantry from poverty and ignorance.

Lenin said:

"Small farming cannot extricate itself from poverty."—(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV., p. 540, Russian Ed.)

Lenin said:

"If we continue, as of old, in small households, even as free citizens on free land, we are still threatened with unavoidable ruin."—(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XX., Book 2, p. 127.)

Lenin said that:

"Only with the aid of common, artel, co-operative labour, is it possible to emerge from the cul de sac into which the imperialist war drove us."*—(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV., p. 537, Russian Ed.)

Lenin said that:

"... it is necessary to undertake common tillage on the large model farm, outside of this, there is no way out of economic ruin, out of the truly desperate situation in which Russia finds itself."—(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XX., Book 2, pp. 127-128.) Starting out from this, Lenin arrived at the following fundamental conclusion:

"Only if we really succeed in proving to the peasantry the advantages of social, collective, co-operative, artel cultivation of the land, only if we succeed in assisting the peasantry, with the aid of co-operative, artel farming, will the working-class, which holds political power, really prove to the peasantry that it is right, and really and firmly win over to its side, the vast masses of the peasantry."—(Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XXIV., pp. 579-580, Russian Ed.)

It was from these propositions of Lenin that the Party started out in carrying out its programme of the collectivisation of agriculture, the programme of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of agriculture.

In this connection, the task of the Five-Year Plan in agriculture was to unite the scattered and small individual peasant farms, which lacked the opportunity of utilising tractors and modern agricultural machinery, into large collective farms, equipped with all the modern implements of highly developed agriculture, and to cover all the free land with model Soviet farms, so-called Sovhoz.†

The task of the Five-Year Plan in agriculture was to transform the U.S.S.R. from a small peasant and backward country into a land of large-scale agriculture organised on the basis of collective labour and producing a maximum of marketable produce.

What has the Party achieved by carrying out the programme of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of agriculture? Has it fulfilled its programme or has it failed?

The Party succeeded, in a matter of three years, in organising more than 200,000 collective farms and about 5,000 grain and stock-breeding state farms; and, at the same time, it succeeded in four years, in

* The Russian for co-operative workshop, or enterprise.—Ed.

† *i.e.*, farms run directly by the State.—Ed.

enlarging the sown area by 21,000,000 hectares. The Party succeeded in uniting more than 60 per cent. of the peasant farms, which cover more than 70 per cent. of the land cultivated by peasants, into collective farms, which means that we have FULFILLED THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN THREEFOLD.

The Party has succeeded in creating a position in which, instead of the 500-600,000,000 poods* of marketable grain (which was the amount collected in the period when individual peasant farming predominated) it is now able to obtain 1,200-1,400 million poods of grain annually.

The Party has succeeded in smashing up the kulaks as a class, although they are not finally exterminated; the working peasants have been emancipated from kulak bondage and exploitation, and a firm economic basis, the basis of collective farming, has been established for the Soviet Government in the countryside.

The Party has succeeded in transforming the U.S.S.R. from a land of small peasant farming into a land where farming is conducted on a scale larger than anywhere else in the world.

Such are the general results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of agriculture.

Judge for yourselves: what worth, after all this, is there in the talk of the bourgeois Press about the "collapse" of collectivisation, about the "failure" of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of agriculture?

What is the position of agriculture in the CAPITALIST countries, which are now experiencing a severe agricultural crisis? Here are the official figures, known to all.

In the principal grain producing countries, the sown area has been reduced by 8-10 per cent. The cotton area has been reduced in the United States by 15 per cent.; the sugar beet area in Germany and Czecho-Slovakia has been reduced by 22-30 per cent.; flax in Lithuania and Latvia by 25-30 per cent.

According to the returns of the United States Department of Agriculture, the value of the gross output of agriculture in the United States DROPPED from 11,000,000,000 dollars in 1929 to 5,000,000,000 dollars in 1932, *i.e.*, by more than 50 per cent. The value of the gross output of grain in that country DROPPED from 1,288,000,000 dollars in 1929 to 391,000,000 dollars in 1932, *i.e.*, by more than 68 per cent. The value of the cotton crop in that country DROPPED from 1,389,000,000 dollars in 1929 to 397,000,000 dollars in 1932, *i.e.*, a drop of more than 70 per cent.

Do not all these facts go to show the advantages of the Soviet system of agriculture over the capitalist system? Do not these facts go to show that the collective farms are a more virile form of farming than individual and capitalist farming?

It is said that collective farms and Soviet farms do not pay, that they absorb an enormous quantity of funds, that there is no sense in maintaining such enterprises, that it would be more expedient to dissolve them and leave only those which pay. But only those who do not understand anything about questions of national economy, about questions of economics, can talk like this. A few years ago more than half of our textile enterprises did not pay. A section of our comrades suggested to us that we should close these enterprises. What would have happened had we followed their advice? We would have committed an enormous crime against the country, against the working-class; because, by doing that we would have ruined our rising industry. What did we do at that time? We held out for a year or so and finally succeeded in making the whole of our textile industry pay. And what about our automobile works in the town of Gorky?* Why, that does not pay yet! Would you like us to close that down? Or our iron and steel industry, which does not pay yet? Shall we close that down, too, comrades? If we are going to look at whether a thing pays or not from that point of view, then we ought to develop to the full only a few branches of industry, those which are the most profitable; for example, the confectionery industry, flour milling, perfumery industry, knitted goods industry, toy-making industry, etc. Of course, I am not opposed to developing these branches of industry. On the contrary, they must be developed, for they, too, are needed by the population. But, in the first place, they cannot be developed without equipment and fuel, which are produced by the heavy industry. In the second place, we cannot base industrialisation upon them. That is the position, comrades.

We cannot look upon whether a thing pays or not from the huckster's point of view, from the point of view of the immediate present. We must look upon whether a thing pays or not from the point of view of national economy as a whole, over a period of several years. Only such a point of view can be described as genuinely Leninist, as genuinely Marxist. And this point of view is obligatory, not only in regard to industry, but also, and to an even greater extent in regard to the collective farms and Soviet farms. Just think: in a matter of three years we created more than 200,000 collective farms and more than 5,000 Soviet farms, *i.e.*, we created entirely new large enterprises, which bear the same significance for agriculture as our works and factories bear in industry. Name another country which has managed, in the course of three years, to create not 205,000 new large enterprises, but even 25,000. You will not be able to name such a country, because

* 60 poods equal 1 ton.—*Ed.*

* The new name recently given to the town of Nizhni-Novgorod.—*Ed.*

there is no such country. But we have created 205,000 new enterprises in agriculture. It appears, however, that there are people who demand that these enterprises should pay immediately, and if they cannot pay immediately, then they should be destroyed and dissolved. Is it not clear that these very queer people envy the laurels of Herostratus and cannot sleep at night worrying over them.

In saying that the collective farms and Soviet farms do not pay, I do not want to suggest that they all do not pay. Nothing of the kind. Everyone knows that already we have a large number of collective farms and Soviet farms that pay very well. We have thousands of collective farms, and scores of Soviet farms, which fully pay their way already. These collective farms and Soviet farms are the pride of our Party, the pride of the Soviet Government. Of course not all collective farms and Soviet farms are alike. Some collective farms and Soviet farms are old, some are new, and some are quite young. The latter are still weak economic organisms, which have not yet taken definite shape. They are passing through approximately the same organisational and constructive period that our factories and works passed through in 1920-21. Naturally, the majority of these cannot pay yet; but there cannot be the slightest doubt that they will become profitable in the course of the next two or three years in the same way as our factories and works began to pay after 1921. To refuse to render them assistance and support on the grounds that they are not all profitable as yet, at the present time, would be committing a great crime against the working class and the peasantry. Only the enemies of the people, and counter-revolutionaries, can raise the question of the collective farms and Soviet farms being unnecessary.

In carrying out the Five-Year Plan in agriculture, the Party carried out collectivisation at accelerated speed. Was the Party right in pursuing the policy of securing an accelerated rate of collectivisation? Yes, it was absolutely right, although, certain excesses were committed. In the first place, in pursuing the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class, and in destroying the nests of the kulaks, the Party could not stop half way. It had to carry out this task to the end. Secondly, possessing tractors and agricultural machinery, on the one hand, and taking advantage of the absence of private property in land (the nationalisation of the land!) on the other hand, the Party had every opportunity of accelerating the collectivisation of agriculture. And, indeed, it achieved enormous successes in this field; for it fulfilled the programme of the Five-Year Plan of collectivisation threefold.

Does this mean that we must pursue the policy of securing accelerated rates of collectivisation in the second Five-Year Plan? No, it does not mean that. The point is that, in the main, we have COMPLETED

the collectivisation of the principal regions of the U.S.S.R. Hence, we have done more in this sphere than could have been expected, and we have not only, in the main, completed collectivisation. We have succeeded in convincing the overwhelming majority of the peasantry that collective farming is the most advantageous form of farming. This is a tremendous gain, comrades. Is it worth while, after this, hurrying about getting rapid rates of collectivisation? Clearly, it is not.

Now, it is no longer a question of accelerated rates of collectivisation, still less a question as to whether the collective farms should exist or not; that question has already been answered in the affirmative. The collective farms have come to stay, and the road back to the old, individual farming is closed for ever. The task now is to strengthen the collective farms ORGANISATIONALLY, to expel the sabotaging elements from them, to recruit real, tried, Bolshevik cadres for the collective farms, and to make them really Bolshevik collective farms.

That is the principal thing to-day.

That is the position in regard to the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of agriculture.

V.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN IN FOUR YEARS IN THE SPHERE OF IMPROVING THE MATERIAL CONDITIONS OF THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS.

I have spoken about the successes in the sphere of industry and agriculture, about the revival of industry and agriculture in the U.S.S.R. What are the results of these successes from the point of view of the improvement of the material conditions of the workers and peasants? What are the main results of our successes in the sphere of industry and agriculture from the point of view of the radical improvement of the material conditions of the toilers?

They are, firstly, THE ABOLITION OF UNEMPLOYMENT, and the removal of uncertainty for the morrow among the workers.

Secondly, almost the whole of the peasant poor have been brought into the work of collective farm construction and, on this basis, the process of differentiation among the peasantry into kulaks and poor peasants has been stopped, and AS A RESULT THE IMPOVERISHMENT AND PAUPERISATION OF THE RURAL DISTRICTS HAVE BEEN STOPPED.

These are enormous gains, comrades, gains of which not a single bourgeois State, even the most "democratic" State, could dream.

In the U.S.S.R., the workers have long forgotten what unemployment is. About three years ago we had about one-and-a-half million unemployed. It is already two years now that unemployment has been completely abolished. And the workers have managed to forget the burden and horror of unemployment.

Look at the capitalist countries and see what horrors are taking place there as a result of unemployment. In those countries there are now not less than 30-40,000,000 unemployed. Who are these people? Usually it is said of them that they are "down and out."

Every day they try to get work, seek work, are prepared to accept almost any conditions of labour, but they are not given work, because they are "superfluous." And this is taking place at a time when vast quantities of goods and products are wasted for the sake of the caprices of the sons of capitalists and landlords whom the fates have petted. The unemployed are refused food because they have no money to pay for the food, they are refused shelter because they have no money to pay for rooms. How and where do they live? They live on the miserable crumbs from the rich man's table, by raking refuse bins, where they find decayed remnants of food, they live in the slums of big cities and more often in hovels outside of the towns hastily put up by the unemployed themselves, out of packing cases and the bark of trees. But this is not all; it is not only the unemployed who suffer as a result of unemployment. The employed workers also suffer as a result of it. They suffer because the presence of a large number of unemployed makes their position in industry insecure, and makes them uncertain of the morrow. To-day they are employed, but they are not sure that when they wake up to-morrow they may not find that they have been discharged.

One of the principal gains of the Five-Year Plan in four years is that we have abolished unemployment and have relieved the workers of the U.S.S.R. from its horrors.

The same thing must be said in regard to the peasantry. They, too, have forgotten about the differentiation of the peasantry as between kulaks and poor peasantry; they have forgotten about the exploitation of the peasants by the kulaks; about the ruin which, every year, caused hundreds of thousands and millions, of the poor peasants to go begging on the road. Three or four years ago, the poor stratum of our peasantry represented not less than 30 per cent. of the total peasant population. These numbered more than 10,000,000. Before that time, before the October Revolution, the poor stratum represented not less than 60 per cent. of the peasant population. Who are the poor peasants? They are those who usually lacked either seeds, or horses, or implements, or all of these, for the purpose of carrying on their husbandry. The poor peasants are those who lived in a state of semi-starvation and, as a rule, were in bondage to the kulaks, and in the old days, both to the kulaks and the landlords. Not so long ago, about one-and-a-half million, and sometimes two million poor peasants used to go seeking work every year in the South—in the North Caucasus and the

Ukraine, to hire themselves to the kulaks, and still earlier—to the kulaks, and landlords. Still larger numbers used to come every year to the factory gates and fill the ranks of the unemployed. And it was not only the poor peasants who found themselves in this unenviable position. A good half of the middle peasants found themselves in the same state of poverty and privation as the poor peasants. The peasants have managed to forget about all this now.

What has the Five-Year Plan in four years given to the poor peasants and to the lower stratum of the middle peasants? It has undermined and smashed the kulaks as a class, and has liberated the poor peasants, and a good half of the middle peasants, from bondage to the kulaks. It has brought them into the collective farms and put them in a firm position. By this it has destroyed the possibility of the differentiation of the peasantry into exploiter-kulaks and exploited poor peasants. It has put the poor and the lower stratum of the middle peasants who are in the collective farms in a position of security and by that, has put a stop to the process of ruin and impoverishment of the peasantry. Now there are no longer cases in our country of millions of peasants leaving their homes annually to seek work in remote districts. In order to get the peasant to go to work outside of his own collective farm it is now necessary to sign a contract with the collective farm and in addition to pay the collective farmer his railway expenses. Now there are no more cases of hundreds of thousands, and millions, of peasants being ruined and forced to hang about the factory gates. That is what used to happen long ago. Now the peasant is in a state of security, he is a member of a collective farm, which owns tractors, agricultural machinery, a seed fund, a reserve fund, etc., etc.

That is what the Five-Year Plan has given to the poor peasants and to the lower stratum of the middle peasants.

That is the substance of the principal gains of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of the improvement of the material conditions of the workers and peasants.

As a result of these principal gains in the sphere of the improvement of the material conditions of the workers and peasants we have achieved during the first Five-Year Plan the following:

(a) A TWO-FOLD increase in the number of workers and office workers employed in large-scale industry compared with 1928, which represents an increase of 57 per cent. in excess of the Five-Year Plan.

(b) An increase in the national income—hence, an increase in the incomes of the workers and peasants—which in 1932 amounted to 45,100,000,000 roubles, an increase of 85 per cent. compared with 1928.

(c) An increase in the average annual wages of workers and office workers employed in large-scale industry by 67 per cent. compared with 1928, which

is an increase of 18 per cent. in excess of the Five-Year Plan.

(d) An increase in the social insurance fund of 292 per cent. compared with 1928 (4,120,000,000 roubles in 1932 compared with 1,050,000,000 roubles in 1928), which is 111 per cent. increase in excess of the Five-Year Plan.

(e) An increase in public catering, which now caters for more than 70 per cent. of the workers employed in the decisive branches of industry, which is an increase six times in excess of the Five-Year Plan.

Of course we have not yet reached the position to completely satisfy the material requirements of the workers and peasants, and it is hardly likely that we shall reach this position within the next year or two; but we have undoubtedly succeeded, year by year, in improving the material conditions of the workers and peasants. The only ones who may have any doubts about this are the most bitter enemies of the Soviet Government, or perhaps certain representatives of the bourgeois Press, including several of the Moscow correspondents of this Press, who probably know no more about the economics of nations and the conditions of the toilers than, say, the Abyssinian king knows about higher mathematics.

What is the position in regard to the conditions of the workers and peasants in capitalist countries?

Here are the official figures.

The number of unemployed in capitalist countries has increased catastrophically. In the United States, in the manufacturing industry alone, according to official figures, the number of employed workers has dropped from 8,500,000 in 1928 to 5,500,000 in 1932; but, according to the figures of the American Federation of Labour, the number of unemployed in the United States, in all industries, at the end of 1932, was 11,000,000. In England, according to official statistics, the number of unemployed has increased from 1,290,000 in 1928 to 2,800,000 in 1932. In Germany, according to official figures, the number of unemployed rose from 1,376,000 in 1928 to 5,500,000 in 1932. This is the picture that is observed in all capitalist countries. Moreover, as a rule, official statistics minimise the number of unemployed, the total number of which in capitalist countries ranges from 35-40,000,000.

The wages of the workers are being systematically reduced. According to official returns, average monthly wages in the United States have been reduced by 35 per cent. compared with the level of 1928. In England, wages have been reduced 15 per cent. in the same period, and in Germany, even 50 per cent. According to the calculations of the American Federation of Labour, the American workers, in 1930-31, lost more than 35,000,000,000 dollars as a result of wage reductions.

The workers' insurance funds, small as they were, have been considerably reduced in England and Ger-

many. In the United States and in France, unemployment insurance does not exist, or hardly exists at all, and as a consequence, the number of homeless workers and vagrant children is growing to a colossal extent, particularly in the United States.

The position is no better in regard to the conditions of the masses of the peasantry in capitalist countries, where the agricultural crisis is fundamentally undermining peasant farming and is forcing millions of ruined peasants and farmers on the road to beg.

Such are the results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of the improvement of the material conditions of the U.S.S.R.

VI.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN IN FOUR YEARS IN THE SPHERE OF THE CIRCULATION OF COMMODITIES BETWEEN TOWN AND COUNTRY.

We will now pass to the question of the results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of growth of the circulation of commodities between town and country.

The enormous growth in the output of industry and agriculture, the increase in the marketable surplus in industry as well as in agriculture, and finally, the growth of the requirements of the workers and peasants—all this could not but lead, and really has led to a revival and the expansion of the circulation of commodities between town and country.

The production "smytchka" (alliance) between town and country is the fundamental form of the "smytchka." But the production "smytchka" alone is not enough. It must be supplemented by the commodity "smytchka" in order that the ties between town and country may be durable and inseverable. This can only be achieved by developing Soviet trade. It would be wrong to think that Soviet trade can be developed only along one channel; for example, the co-operative societies. In order to develop Soviet trade, all channels must be used: the co-operative societies, the State trading system, and collective farm trading.

Certain comrades think that the development of Soviet trade, and particularly the development of collective farm trade, is a reversion to the first stage of the New Economic Policy. This is absolutely wrong.

There is a fundamental difference between Soviet trade, including collective farm trade, and the trade that was carried on in the first stage of NEP.

In the first stage of NEP we permitted a revival of capitalism, permitted private commodity circulation, permitted the "activities" of private traders, capitalists, speculators.

That was more or less free trade merely restricted by the regulating rôle of the State. At that time,

the private capitalist sector occupied a fairly important place in the commodity circulation of the country. This is quite apart from the fact that at that time we did not have a developed industry as we have now, nor did we have collective farms, nor Soviet farms, which are working according to plan, and which are placing enormous reserves of agricultural produce and urban goods at the disposal of the State.

Can we say that this is the position now? Of course not.

In the first place, Soviet trade cannot be placed on a par with trade in the first stage of NEP, even though the latter was regulated by the State. Trade in the first stage of NEP permitted the revival of capitalism and the functioning of the private capitalist sector in the circulation of commodities; Soviet trade, however, starts out from the negation of both the one and the other. What is Soviet trade? Soviet trade is trade without capitalists—great or small, trade without speculators—great or small. It is a special form of trade, which has never existed in history before, and which we alone, the Bolsheviks, practise in the conditions of Soviet development.

Secondly, we now have a fairly widely developed State industry and a whole system of collective farms and Soviet farms, which provide the State with enormous reserves of agricultural and manufactured goods with which to develop Soviet trade. This was not the case, nor could it be the case, in the conditions of the first stage of NEP.

Thirdly, till lately, we completely squeezed the private traders, merchants and middlemen of all kinds out of the sphere of commodity circulation. Of course this does not mean that private traders and speculators will not, in accordance with the law of atavism, reappear in the sphere of commodity circulation and take advantage of the most favourable field for them in this respect, namely, collective farm trading. More than that, the collective farmers themselves sometimes are not averse to dropping into speculation, which does not do them honour, of course. But to combat these unhealthy symptoms we have the law that was passed recently by the Soviet Government which provides for measures for the prevention and punishment of speculation.

You know, of course, that this law does not err on the side of leniency. You will understand, of course, that such a law was not, and could not have been passed in the conditions of the first stage of NEP.

Thus you see that anyone who speaks about a reversion to the trade of the first stage of NEP after this, shows that he understands nothing, absolutely nothing, about our Soviet economics.

We are told that it is impossible to develop trade, even if it is Soviet trade, without a sound money system and a sound currency, that it is first of all

necessary to restore our money system and our Soviet currency, which, it is alleged, does not represent any value. That is what the economists in capitalist countries tell us. I think that these worthy economists understand no more about political economy than, say, the Archbishop of Canterbury understands about anti-religious propaganda. How can it be asserted that our Soviet currency does not represent any value? Is it not a fact that with this currency we built Magnitostroy, Dnieprostroy, Kusnetskstroy, the Stalingrad and Kharkov Tractor Works, the Gorky and Moscow Automobile Works, hundreds of thousands of collective farms, and thousands of Soviet farms? Do these gentlemen think that all these enterprises have been built with straw, or clay and not with real materials, having definite value? What secures the stability of Soviet currency? If we have in mind, of course, the organised market, which is of decisive significance in the commodity circulation of the country, and not the unorganised market, which has only a subordinate significance. Of course, it is not the gold reserve alone. The stability of Soviet currency is secured, first of all, by the enormous quantity of goods in the hands of the State and put into circulation at stable prices. Who among the economists can deny that this security, which is used only in the U.S.S.R., is more real security for the stability of the currency than any gold reserve? Will the economists in capitalist countries even understand that they have got themselves hopelessly mixed over the theory of the gold reserve being the only security for the stability of the currency?

That is how the position stands in regard to the questions connected with the expansion of Soviet trade.

What have we achieved as a result of carrying out the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of development of Soviet trade?

As a result of the Five-Year Plan we have:

(a) An increase in the output of the light industry amounting to 187 per cent. compared with 1928.

(b) An increase in the retail, co-operative and State commodity circulation, which now, calculated in prices of 1932, amounts to 39,600,000,000 roubles, *i.e.*, an increase in the volume of goods in retail trade of 175 per cent. compared with 1928.

(c) An increase in the number of shops and stores run by the State and co-operative system by 158,000 over that of 1929.

(d) The continually increasing development of collective farm trade and collection of agricultural produce by certain State and co-operative organisations.

Such are the facts.

An altogether different picture of the condition of commodity circulation is presented in CAPITALIST countries, where the crisis has resulted in the cata-

strophic diminution of trade, in the mass closing down of enterprises, in the ruin of small and medium shopkeepers, in the bankruptcy of large commercial firms, the accumulation of large stocks of goods in commercial warehouses, while at the same time the purchasing power of the masses of toilers is continuing to decline.

Such are the results of the Five-Year Plan in four years in the sphere of the development of commodity circulation.

VII.

THE RESULTS OF THE FIVE-YEAR PLAN IN FOUR YEARS IN THE SPHERE OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE REMNANTS OF THE HOSTILE CLASSES.

As a result of carrying out the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of industry, agriculture and trade, we have strengthened the principles of socialism in all spheres of national economy and have expelled the capitalist elements from them.

What should this have led to, and what has this actually led to in relation to the capitalist elements?

It led to the last remnants of the dying classes: the manufacturers and their hangers-on, the merchants and their henchmen, the ex-nobles and priests, kulaks and their hangers-on, ex-white officers and policemen, ex-police officers and gendarmes, all sorts of bourgeois intellectuals of the chauvinist persuasion, and all other anti-Soviet elements, being knocked out of their rut.

Being knocked out of their rut, and spreading over the whole face of the U.S.S.R., these "has beens" crept into our works and factories, into our government offices and trading organisations, into our railway and water transport enterprises, and principally, into the collective farms and Soviet farms. They crept into these places and concealed themselves, donned the mask of "workers" and "peasants" and some of them even managed to creep into the Party.

What did they carry with them into these places? Of course, they carried with them a feeling of hatred towards the Soviet Government, a feeling of burning enmity towards the new forms of economy, life and culture.

These gentlemen are no longer able to make a direct attack against the Soviet Government. They and their classes have made such attacks several times, but they were defeated and dispersed. Hence, the only thing that is left to them is to do mischief and harm to the workers, to the collective farmers, to the Soviet Government and to the Party. And they are doing as much mischief as they can, working silently underground. They set fire to warehouses, and break machines. They organise sabotage. They organise sabotage in the collective farms and Soviet farms, and some of them, among whom

are certain professors, go so far in their work of sabotage as to inject the germs of bubonic plague and malignant anthrax into the cattle on the collective and Soviet farms and help to spread meningitis among the horses, etc.

That is not the main point. The main thing in the "activities" of these "has beens" is that they organise mass pilfering and theft of State property, of co-operative property and of collective farm property. Pilfering and theft in the factories and works, pilfering and theft of railway freight, pilfering and theft in warehouses and commercial enterprises—particularly pilfering and theft in the Soviet farms and collective farms—such are the main forms of the "activities" of these "has beens." Their class instinct, as it were, tells them that the basis of Soviet economy is public property, and that it is precisely this basis that must be shaken in order to do mischief to the Soviet Government—and they try very hard to shake public property by organising mass pilfering and theft.

In order to organise theft, they take advantage of the private property habits and survivals of the collective farmers, the individual farmers of yesterday, and now members of collective farms. You, as Marxists, should know that, in its development, the mentality of man lags behind his actual condition. The position of the collective farmers is no longer that of the individual farmer, they are collectivists; but their mentality is still that of the private property owner. And so, the "has beens" from the ranks of the exploiting classes take advantage of the private property habits of the collective farmers in order to organise the plunder of public property, and in that way, to shake the foundation of the Soviet system, *viz.*, public property.

Many of our comrades look complacently upon such phenomena and fail to understand the sense and significance of this mass pilfering and theft. They pass by these facts as if they were blind, and believe that "there is nothing particular in it." But these comrades are profoundly mistaken. The basis of our system is public property, just as private property is the basis of capitalism. The capitalists proclaimed private property to be sacred and inviolable when they, in their time, were striving to consolidate the capitalist system. All the more reason therefore why the Communists should proclaim public property to be sacred and inviolable in order, by that, to consolidate the new socialist forms of economy in all spheres of production and trade. To permit pilfering and theft of public property—no matter whether it is State property or the property of co-operative societies and collective farms—and to ignore such counter-revolutionary outrages, is tantamount to aiding and abetting the undermining of the Soviet system, which rests on the base of public property.

These were the reasons that prompted our Soviet Government to pass the recent law for the protection of public property. That law is the basis of revolutionary law at the present time. And it is the primary duty of every Communist, of every worker, and of every collective farmer, to strictly carry out this law.

It is said that revolutionary law at the present time does not differ in any way from revolutionary law in the first period of NEP, that revolutionary law at the present time is a reversion to revolutionary law of the first period of NEP. That is absolutely wrong. The edge of revolutionary law in the first period of NEP was turned mainly against the extremes of War Communism, against "illegal" confiscation and imposition of taxes. It guaranteed the security of the property of the private owner, of the individual farmer, of the capitalist, provided he strictly observed the laws of the Soviets. The position in regard to revolutionary law at the present time is entirely different. The edge of revolutionary law at the present time is turned, not against the extremes of war Communism which have been long forgotten, but against thieves and wreckers of social economy, against hooligans, and the plunderers of public property. However, the main concern of revolutionary law at the present time is the protection of public property and of no other.

That is why to wage the fight to protect public property, a fight waged by all the measures and by all the means placed at our command by the laws of the Soviet Government, is one of the fundamental tasks of the Party.

A strong and powerful dictatorship of the proletariat—that is what we must have now in order to shatter the last remnants of the dying classes and to frustrate their thieving designs.

Certain comrades interpreted the thesis on the abolition of classes, the establishment of classless society and the dying out of the State, to mean justification of laziness and complacency, justification of the counter-revolutionary theory of the subsiding of the class struggle and the weakening of State authority. Needless to say, such people cannot have anything in common with our Party. These are either degenerates, or double dealers, who must be driven out of the Party. The abolition of classes is not achieved by subduing the class struggle, but by intensifying it. The State will die out not by the weakening of State authority, but by strengthening it to the utmost necessary for the purpose of finally crushing the remnants of the dying classes and for organising defence against the capitalist environment, which is far from being destroyed as yet, and will not soon be destroyed.

As a result of carrying out the Five-Year Plan, we have finally succeeded in expelling the last remnants of the hostile classes from their industrial

positions, have routed the kulaks and have prepared the ground for their destruction. Such are the results of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of struggle against the last detachments of the bourgeoisie. But that is not enough. The task is to expel these "has-beens" from our own enterprises and institutions and to render them utterly innocuous.

It cannot be said that these "has-beens" could alter anything in the present position of the U.S.S.R. by their sabotaging and thieving machinations. They are too weak and impotent to withstand the measures of the Soviet Government. But if our comrades do not arm themselves with revolutionary vigilance and do not expel from their practice this smug, petty bourgeois attitude towards the theft and plunder of public property, then these "has-beens" will be able to do considerable mischief.

We must bear in mind that the growth of the power of the Soviet State will increase the resistance of the last remnants of the dying classes. It is precisely because they are dying and living their last days that they will pass from one form of attack to another, to sharper forms of attack, appeal to the backward strata of the population and mobilise them against the Soviet Union. There is no mischief and slander that these "has-beens" will not commit against the Soviet Government and around which they will not try to mobilise the backward elements. This may give ground for the revival of the activities of the defeated groups of the old counter-revolutionary parties; the Socialist Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks and the bourgeois nationalists in the centre and in the outlying regions; it may give grounds also for the revival of the activities of the fragments of counter-revolutionary opposition elements, the Trotskyists and Right deviationists. Of course, there is nothing terrible in this. But we must bear all this in mind if we want to put an end to these elements quickly, and without great loss.

That is why revolutionary vigilance is the quality that Bolsheviks particularly require at the present time.

VIII.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

Such are the main results of the fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan in the sphere of industry and agriculture, in the sphere of improving the conditions of life of the toilers and the development of the circulation of commodities, in the sphere of strengthening the Soviet Government and in developing the class struggle against the remnants and survivals of the obsolete classes.

Such are the successes and gains the Soviet Government has achieved in the past four years.

It would be a mistake to think that because of these successes everything is all right. Of course, every-

thing is not all right in the Soviet Union. We have quite enough defects and mistakes in our work. Bad management and muddle still exists in our practice. Unfortunately, I cannot now stop to deal with defects and mistakes, because the limits of my summing up report do not give me sufficient scope for this. But that is not the point just now. The point is that, notwithstanding defects and mistakes, the existence of which none of us deny, we have achieved important successes which call forth the admiration of the working-class all over the world, we have achieved a victory which, in truth, bears world historical significance.

What could play, and what has actually played, the principal rôle in the fact that in spite of mistakes and defects the Party has, nevertheless, succeeded in achieving decisive successes in carrying out the Five-Year Plan in four years ?

What were the main forces that secured this historical victory for us in spite of everything ?

First of all, it was the activity and self-sacrifice, the enthusiasm and initiative of millions of workers and collective farmers who, together with the engineering and technical forces, displayed colossal energy in developing socialist competition and shock brigade work. There cannot be any doubt that without this we could not have achieved the goal, we could not have advanced a single step forward.

Secondly, it is the firm leadership of the Party and of the Government, which urged the masses forward and overcame all the obstacles that stood in the path to the goal.

And finally, it is the special merits and advantages of the Soviet system of economy, which bears within itself the colossal possibilities necessary for overcoming all difficulties.

Such are the three main forces which determined the historical victory of the U.S.S.R.

General conclusions :

(1) The results of the Five-Year Plan have

refuted the assertions of the bourgeois and social-democrats' leading men that the Five-Year Plan was fantastic, delirium and an unattainable dream. The results of the Five-Year Plan have shown that the Five-Year Plan has already been carried out.

(2) The results of the Five-Year Plan have smashed the well-known bourgeois "symbol of faith" that the working-class is incapable of building anything new, that it is capable only of destroying the old. The results of the Five-Year Plan show that the working-class is as well able to build something new as to destroy the old.

(3) The results of the Five-Year Plan have smashed the social-democratic thesis that it is impossible to build up socialism in a single country taken by itself. The results of the Five-Year Plan have shown that it is quite possible to build socialist society in a single country, because the economic foundations of such a society have already been laid in the U.S.S.R.

(4) The results of the Five-Year Plan have refuted the assertions of bourgeois economists to the effect that the capitalist system of economy is the best of all systems, that any other system is unstable, and incapable of standing the test of the difficulties connected with economic development. The results of the Five-Year Plan have shown that it is the capitalist system of economy that is bankrupt and unstable, that it has become obsolete and must give way to another, higher, Soviet socialist system of economy, that the only system of economy that has no fear of crises and is able to overcome difficulties that capitalism cannot solve—is the Soviet system of economy.

(5) Finally, the results of the Five-Year Plan have shown that the Party is invincible IF it knows its goal and how to lead to it, and if it is not afraid of difficulties.

(Loud and prolonged applause rising to an ovation. All rise to greet Comrade Stalin.)

XIIth PLENUM LIBRARY

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Resolutions and Theses 2d. 5cts. | Workers 2d. 5cts.
(Report by D. Z. Manuilsky, C.P.S.U.) |
| 2. "Prepare for Power." (The International Situation and the tasks of the sections of the Communist International) 4d. 15cts.
(Report by O. Kuusinen) | 5. "Fulfil the Decisions." (The C.P.s of France and Germany and the tasks of the Communists in the Trade Unions) 2d. 5cts.
(Report by O. Piatnitsky) |
| 3. "War in Far East." (The Danger of Imperialist War and Military Intervention in connection with the War which has broken out in the Far East) 2d. 5cts.
(Report by Okano, C.P. Japan) | 6. Great Britain, Ireland and America ... 2d. 5cts.
(Speeches by Gusev, Pollitt, Troy and an American Comrade) |
| 4. The Soviet Union and the World's | 7. XIIth Plenum Handbook (Propagandists' Guide to the decisions of the XII Plenum) 2d. 5cts. |

MR. CAMPBELL EXAGGERATES*

NOT long ago a book in the English language appeared in America by Mr. Campbell, a well-known farm promoter, who has been in the U.S.S.R. It was entitled "Russia—Market or Menace?" In this book Mr. Campbell, among other things, gives an "interview" with Stalin, which took place in Moscow in January, 1929. The "interview" is remarkable in this, that every sentence in it is a fiction or a sensational over-statement, whose aim is to advertise the book and its author.

To expose these fictions I consider it not superfluous to say a few words :

Mr. Campbell most obviously gives rein to his imagination when he says that the conversation with Stalin, beginning at one o'clock in the afternoon "lasted long after nightfall and until dawn." Actually the conversation did not last longer than two hours. Mr. Campbell's imagination is truly American.

Mr. Campbell clearly romances when he affirms that Stalin "took my hand in both of his and said : 'We may become friends.'" In fact, nothing of the kind did or could take place. Mr. Campbell cannot be ignorant of the fact that Stalin does not need "friends" like Campbell.

Mr. Campbell again romances when he says that, in sending to him the transcript of our conversation I wrote on it : "Keep this as a memorial, it will some day be an important historic document." Actually the transcript was sent to Mr. Campbell by the translator, Comrade Yarotsky, without any inscription whatever. Clearly Mr. Campbell is actuated by a desire to profiteer a bit on Stalin.

MR. CAMPBELL ROMANCES.

Mr. Campbell romances again and again when he attributes to Stalin the statement that it was Trotsky who really tried to spread Communism over the whole world, which was the first cause of the split between Trotsky and himself (i.e., Stalin) ; that Trotsky believed in world Communism while he, Stalin, wanted to limit his activities to his own land." In this absurd fiction, turning the facts quite upside down, only Mr. Trotsky, who has fled over to the camp of Kautsky and Wels, can believe. In actual fact the conversation with

Mr. Campbell had no relation to the question of Trotsky and the name of Trotsky was not mentioned at all during the conversation. Again and again Mr. Campbell has lied.

And so on in the same manner. . . .

Mr. Campbell recalls in his book the transcript of the conversation with Stalin, but he did not consider it necessary to publish it in his book. Why? Isn't it because the publication of the transcript would have upset Mr. Campbell's whole scheme of sensational fictions around the "interview" with Stalin, designed to create an advertisement for Mr. Campbell's book in the eyes of American philistines.

I think that the best punishment for the falsifying Mr. Campbell would be the publication of the text of the transcript of the conversation between Mr. Campbell and Stalin. This would be the surest means of exposing falsehood and establishing facts.

J. STALIN.

Dec. 23, 1932.

Transcript of the Conversation between Stalin and Campbell

January 28, 1929, at 1 p.m.

After an exchange of introductory phrases, Mr. Campbell explained his desire to visit Stalin, stating that though he is in the U.S.S.R. in a private capacity, before his departure from the United States, he talked with Coolidge and also with the president-elect Hoover and received their full approval on the question of his trip to Russia. His presence here had shown him the amazing activity of the nation, which is a puzzle to the whole world. He was especially attracted by the plans for the development of agriculture. He was aware that there were many erroneous conceptions of Russia, but he himself had been, for instance, in the Kremlin and seen the work which is being done in the preservation of art memorials and in general in the field of raising the standards of culture. He was especially struck by the care given to workers and working women. It seemed to him an interesting coincidence that before his departure from the United States he had been invited to the home of the President and had seen Mr. and Mrs. Coolidge and their son, while yesterday he had been the guest of the President of the U.S.S.R. Kalinin, who had made a tremendous impression on him.

Stalin : As far as concerns plans for agricultural and industrial construction, and also our care for the development of a cultured life, we are still at the very

* The above statement by Com. Stalin, together with the transcription of his interview with Mr. Campbell, appeared in the "Bolshevik," the fortnightly organ of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., No. 22, dated November 30th, 1932, from which it has been translated.—Ed.

beginning of our work. In the building of industry we have done very little yet. Still less have we done in the field of the realisation of plans for reconstructing agriculture. We should not forget that our land was exceptionally backward and this backwardness is still a great hindrance. The difference between the old and the new statesmen in Russia consists, among other things, in this, that the old statesmen considered the backwardness of the land as a desirable trait, seeing in it a "national peculiarity," a national boast, while the new people, the Soviet people, fight it, this backwardness, as an evil which must be rooted out. Therein lies the guarantee of our success.

We know that we are not free from mistakes. But we do not fear critics, we are not afraid to look in the face of difficulties and recognise our mistakes. We accept sound criticism and welcome it. We keep an eye on the United States, since that land stands high in science and technique. We would wish that the men of science and technique in America were our teachers in the field of technique and we their pupils.

Every period of national development has its dominant note. In Russia our dominant note now is construction. This is our predominant trait at present. This explains why we are now passing through a fever of building. It is reminiscent of the period which the United States passed through after the Civil War. In this is the foundation and possibility for co-operating with the United States in industrial technique and trade. I do not know what it is still necessary to do to secure contact with American industry. Can you explain what is in the way of the realisation of such co-operation when it is established that such contact would be beneficial to both the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A.?

CAMPBELL: I am sure that there is a surprising resemblance between the United States and Russia, in size, resources and independence. The reference of Mr. Stalin to the Civil War period is correct. After the Civil War an extraordinary expansion was noticed. The American people are interested in Russia. I believe that Russia is too big a country not to be a big factor in world relations. The people standing at the head of the Russian Government have at their command the greatest possibilities for accomplishing great things. All that is necessary for that is to maintain clear judgment and be always fair.

I see the desirability of a proper business contact and I have a close connection with the Government though I am a private citizen. I carry on this conversation as a private person. Since I am asked what hinders contact between the United States and Russia I wish to answer very sincerely, boldly, with proper respect to Mr. Stalin and without offence. He is a man very objective in his thinking and this allows me to talk as one man should talk with another

in the name of the good of both lands and entirely confidentially. If we could have official recognition everyone would try to come here to carry on business either on a credit basis or on some other basis as business is carried on everywhere. The basis for the wavering of American firms in the carrying on of business and long-term credits, is the absence of recognition of your Government by our Government at Washington.

The chief reason for this, however, is not mere failure in the matter of recognition. The chief reason, we consider (and this is really so) is that representatives of your Government in our land are all the time trying to sow discontent and spread the idea of Soviet power.

We have in our land something called the "Monroe Doctrine," which means that we do not wish to mix in the affairs of any land in the world, that we attend strictly to our own affairs. So we do not want any other land whatever—England, France, Germany, Russia or any other—to mix in our private affairs.

Russia is such an enormous country that she can easily accomplish everything which all her people decide to do, Russia has her own resources on a large scale, and although it would take longer, in the end, Russians could develop their resources independently.

It is pleasant for us to feel that in many respects we are an ideal for the Russian people and I think that we can be very useful to it, especially in the matter of time-saving. Since we have solved many economic problems and our methods are copied by many lands, besides Russia, so such enterprises as the building of State farms mean a strengthening of trade relations, and in the last analysis upon trade relations will follow also diplomatic recognition on some just basis. The only way for nations, as for individuals, is to openly express themselves without offence and then very quickly the time arrives for some sort of understanding. The more we learn the more we become convinced that we can accomplish more by reason than by other means. Great peoples may differ in opinions without causing strained relations and great men will come to an understanding on big issues. They annually end their discussions with a definite agreement—going halfway to meet each other as it were—however far apart their differing points of view may have been at the beginning.

STALIN: I understand that diplomatic recognition at the present moment is difficult for the United States. The American Press has denounced representatives of the Soviet Government so much and so often that a sudden turn is difficult. Personally I do not consider diplomatic recognition the decisive point at this moment. The important thing is the development of trade relations on the basis of mutual benefit. Trade relations need normal conditions and if there shall be created a certain legal basis for them, that

would be the first and most important step on the road to diplomatic recognition. The question of diplomatic recognition will settle itself, when both sides understand that diplomatic relations are of benefit. The foundation lies in trade relations and in making them normal, which leads to the creation of certain legal forms.

Of course the natural resources of our land are rich and varied. They are more varied and richer than is officially known; and our exploring expeditions are constantly discovering new resources in our wide land. But this is only one side of our possibilities. The other side consists in this, that our peasants and workers are now freed from the former burden of landlords and capitalists. The landlords and capitalists formerly squandered non-productively what now remains in the country and increases within the country its purchasing power. The growth of demands is such that our industry, in spite of the speed of its development, lags behind the demand. The demand is tremendous for both individual and industrial consumption. In this is the second side of our limitless possibilities.

Both these facts create a serious basis for trade and industrial contacts with the United States as well as with other developed countries.

Around the question, as to which of the countries is to tackle these resources and possibilities of our country, a complicated struggle goes on among them. Unfortunately the United States still stands far from that struggle.

The Germans cry everywhere that the position of the Soviet power is unstable and so it does not pay to open serious credits with Soviet economic organisations. At the same time they try to monopolise the trade relations with the U.S.S.R., by opening credits to her.

One group of English business men, as is known, also carries on a ruthless anti-Soviet campaign. At the same time, this same group, and also the McKenna group, makes an attempt to organise credits for the U.S.S.R. It is already known from the Press that a delegation of English industrialists and bankers are coming in February to the U.S.S.R. They intend to propose an extensive project of trade relations and a loan to the Soviet Government.

What explains this double face of the German and English business men? It is explained by the fact that they want to monopolise in their hands the trade relations of the U.S.S.R., scaring and driving away the United States.

And yet, it is clear to me that the United States has more basis for wide business relations with the U.S.S.R. than has any other country. And this not only because the United States is rich in technique and capital, but because in no other land do they receive our business people so gladly and hospitably as in the United States.

As for propaganda, I must myself categorically state that no one of the representatives of the Soviet Government has the right to mix either directly or indirectly in the internal affairs of the land in which he finds himself. In this matter the firmest and strictest instructions are given to all our people employed in Soviet organisations in the United States. I am convinced that Bron and his co-workers are not in the slightest degree connected with propaganda in any form whatever. If any one of our employees had broken the firm direction regarding non-interference, he would be at once recalled and punished. Of course we cannot answer for the acts of persons unknown to us and not subordinate to us. But we can take on ourselves responsibility and give the fullest guarantee regarding the non-interference of persons who are employed in our establishments abroad.

CAMPBELL: May I transmit this to Mr. Hoover?

STALIN: Certainly.

CAMPBELL: We do not know who these persons are who sow unrest. But they are clearly there. The police find them and their literature. I know Bron and I am convinced that he is an honest, sincere gentleman, who carries on honest business. But there is something that goes on.

STALIN: Possibly propaganda for Soviets is carried on in the United States by members of the American Communist Party. But this Party is legal in the United States, it takes part legally in presidential elections, sets up its candidates for president and—it is fully understandable that we cannot interfere in your internal affairs in this case either.

CAMPBELL: On my side there are no further questions. Oh, yes, there is. When I come back to the United States business men will ask me whether it is safe to do business with the U.S.S.R. Machine-building companies especially will be interested in the question of the possibility of granting long-term credits. May I answer them reassuringly? May I receive information regarding the measures which the Soviet Government is now taking to guarantee credit advances; is there a special tax or other definite sources set aside for that purpose?

STALIN: I shouldn't like to praise my country. However, since the question is asked, I should say the following. There has not been a single case when either the Soviet Government or Soviet economic organisations did not make payments exactly and promptly on all credits, whether long or short-term. You might carry on inquiries in Germany how we pay the Germans on their three hundred million loan. Where do we get the means for payments? Mr. Campbell knows that money does not fall from heaven. Our farming, our industry, trade, forests, oil, gold, platinum and so forth—there is the source of payments. In that is the guarantee of payments. I do not want Mr. Campbell to believe me on my

word. He may confirm my statements, say in Germany. He will find that not once has there been a delay in payments though at times we have had to pay unheard-of interest rates, such as 15 to 20 per cent. As for special guarantees, I think there is no need of speaking seriously of such things in connection with the U.S.S.R.

CAMPBELL: Certainly, there is no need.

STALIN: It might not be superfluous if I should tell you in strict confidence, of the loan, not credits, but a loan, proposed by a group of English bankers—the Balfour-Kingsley group.

CAMPBELL: May I transmit this to Hoover?

STALIN: Certainly, but do not give it to the Press. This group of bankers proposes the following:

They reckon our debts to England at about 400 million pounds sterling.

They propose to fund these at 25 per cent. of face

value. That is, instead of 400 million pounds—100 million pounds.

They propose simultaneously a loan of 100 million pounds.

Thus our indebtedness would be fixed at 200 million pounds sterling with postponement of payments for several decades. In exchange we would have to give preference to the British machine-building industry. This does not mean that we must give all our orders only to England, but we must give the preference.

MR. CAMPBELL, expressing thanks for the interview, says that Stalin has impressed him as a reasonable, just, well-informed, sincere man. He is very glad to have had the opportunity to talk with Stalin and considers the interview historic.

STALIN thanks Mr. Campbell for the interview.

Transcript made by V. Yarotsky.

WHICH WAY OUT?

By S. GUSSEV.

THE most outstanding facts in international relations in recent times are the refusal of the French Chamber of Deputies to make the current payment on war debts to the U.S.A.; the statement of the British Government that the payment made on December 15th on this debt is the last which will be made on the basis of the former agreement; the refusal of Belgium, Poland and Hungary to make their regular payments on war debts; and the stoppage of payment on war debts by all the South American countries except Argentina, which, by the way, is also now demanding a moratorium on its foreign debts. Add to this Germany, which has not paid reparations for a year and a half, and Ireland, which refuses to pay imperialist tribute to England. Add to this the abandonment of the gold standard, the open and concealed inflation in a number of countries as a peculiar form of partially evading payments on foreign debts, and a long series of bank crashes.

Take further the farmers of the U.S.A. who are refusing to pay their debts and demand a moratorium, and are even beginning to talk about their debts being "released" (i.e., annulled). Take a number of capitalist countries where the peasants are energetically resisting the forcible collection of debts from them by auction, where the mass struggle of the unemployed and the workers is simultaneously commencing against evictions for failure to pay rent.

In very truth, it is a real epidemic of refusal to pay debts.

What do all these facts show? They show that the very foundation of capitalism—the "sanctity" of private property—is beginning to totter;

that the whole system of international credit, which links the capitalist countries together, is beginning to break down. Among the great masses, the belief in the "sanctity" of private property is falling with catastrophic speed. And who is it who is undermining this belief? It is not only the Bolsheviks, who have destroyed private property in the means of production and annulled debts on one-sixth of the globe, but it is also the most ardent defenders of private property—the governments of capitalist countries, and also the warmest supporters of private property—the peasants and farmers.

A particularly strong impression was produced in the capitalist world by the refusal of the French and English imperialists to continue payments of their war debts. If defeated countries, like Germany or Hungary, do not pay, or if it is a dependent country, like a South American republic, or finally, if it is a second-rate imperialist power, like Belgium or Poland, then things are not so dangerous. But England and France! These are big imperialist powers with tremendous colonies, sharing their domination over the world (not counting one-sixth of the world, of course) with the U.S.A., Italy and Japan. If these giants of imperialism refuse to pay, this is an irreparable blow at the "sanctity" of private property, it is a contagious example which, in all probability, will be copied by others, it is a serious blow at the whole credit system, it is the "destruction of capitalist morals," it is a "tremendous blow at civilisation."

The whole of the capitalist press, both in England and the U.S.A., is full of jeremiads on this

subject. The soundest organ of American imperialism, "The Magazine of Wall Street," warns the English and French imperialists of this danger: "If you don't pay, your own debtors will stop paying you." Chamberlain discoursed on the same danger in his speech in the House of Commons, stating that the bankruptcy of the British Government would be echoed throughout the world, and would serve as a justification for other debtors, and an incentive to follow its example, to the point of refusing payment on public and private debts within the country.

What is the conclusion drawn by Chamberlain from this? That the payment should be made? You are mistaken. In the same speech Chamberlain stated that the payment on December 15th would be the last.

The situation becomes confused—we must not refuse to pay, but we will not pay! Capitalism finds itself in a vicious circle. There seems to be no way out. The very representatives of capitalism begin to understand how hopelessly they have become entangled in debts, no less hopelessly than in other imperialist contradictions.

For example, the "New York Times" writes:

"If we drive our debtors into a corner, there arises a serious danger of insolvency. If the American Government abandons its debts, this might rapidly extend to private debts, bringing indescribable ruin to thousands of our citizens who are already in great difficulties."*

So it seems that on the other side of the ocean they are confronted with the same dilemma—on the one hand, they cannot annul the debts, but, on the other hand, they must not demand payment.

But while the representatives of capitalism are racking their brains to find a way out of the debt impasse, life is rapidly and stubbornly marching forward. At the present time a tremendous proportion of the capitalist countries, almost a majority of them, have joined the ranks of the defaulters. And we may be sure that the matter will not stop here, and that not only the governments, but also the peoples oppressed by the bourgeoisie, will move rapidly forward under the slogans of non-payment, the moratorium, and the annulling of debts.

* * *

But possibly a way out can be found by direct agreement between the debtors and the creditors? Maybe it will be possible to come to an agreement on a reduced sum for the debts, or a moratorium, in exchange for definite compensation to American imperialism, by the French and British imperialists?

It is true that Hoover definitely stated in his

last message to Congress that "the U.S.A. must refuse to reconsider the debt agreements until it gets compensation in other respects, and until other problems are settled." Hoover openly names some of these compensations—the return to the gold standard, the introduction of bi-metalism and the stabilisation of currency, the reduction of armaments. He says nothing about other compensations, such as the refusal to reorganise Manchuria. In addition, Hoover definitely states that the United States will only negotiate with the debtors separately, and only with those debtors who continue to pay.

The organ of American imperialism, "The Magazine of Wall Street," in an article "Annulment? Delay? Reversal?" backed by statistics, sets forth the conditions on which American imperialism will agree to consider the question of debts. This solid journal, if we strip its real thoughts of their high-flown, wordy coverings, begins and ends its article with the same chorus: "Immediate payment; cash down." The journal penetrates into the secret strong-rooms of the British and French capitalist banks, carefully pokes into every corner, counts over all their gold reserves and other wealth, and triumphantly proclaims that they are able to pay. The journal condescendingly agrees to negotiate on debts on the following conditions: for debt reductions — colonies, rubber, nickel, disarmament. "The prospects of debt reduction can be used to a certain degree as a convincing argument for disarmament," hints the journal, very significantly. Towards the end of the article, however, extremely pessimistic notes begin to break in. It calls the debts a "dead horse" which is poisoning the world with its putrefaction, and which it is no one's business to clear away, for which purpose, in any case, considerable time would be necessary, and time much more quiet than the present.

This is how matters stand on the American side.

On the other side, for the British imperialists, the return to the gold standard and concessions in respect to armaments cannot be accepted, not to speak of the surrender of part of the colonies, and part of the rubber. French imperialists do not want to listen to any talk about reductions of armaments and demand that negotiations on debts should be carried out collectively with all the debtors, i.e., they wish to confront American imperialism with a united front of debtors (while the Americans aim to break up this front by using the rule "divide and conquer"). Finally, neither England nor France is inclined to forego its alliance with Japan, or to make concessions on the Manchurian question, as was clearly shown by the whole history of the occupation and concealed annexation of Manchuria by Japan.

* Quotation re-translated.

The prospects of a possible compromise are thus extremely unfavourable. But who knows? Maybe they'll haggle and haggle until they agree on something? In the U.S.A. a number of projects have already appeared for an amicable agreement with France and England, the basic idea of which amounts to the fact that the noble Americans will make some small concessions while the good-hearted Englishmen and the obliging Frenchmen, in return for these concessions, will begin to increase their purchases of American goods, as the result of which "prosperity" will come. "The ability of Europe to pay," soothingly states the "New York Times," "will restore its purchasing powers for American goods and will be a stimulus for our own trade and for the return of prosperity to our country."

Isn't this a wonderful, simple, extremely simple project for getting out of the crisis, and not a whit worse than Hoover's project for getting out of the crisis by stabilising currency and raising prices! For a couple of billion dollars it is possible to buy "prosperity." What could be simpler?

And here is another marvellous little project, composed by Tabor, the chairman of the biggest farmers' organisation of the U.S.A., "National Grange." The debts are just and must be paid, said Tabor. But we have no right to put the big nations of the world in a position of compulsory insolvency and increase the present-day international confusion. The fall of commodity prices, the devaluation of foreign currency, and the establishment of tariff walls, require that the whole problem of debts should be revised in the light of world stabilisation. A new extension of time on the debts must be given, simultaneously appropriating new credits to the French and British for the purchase of products produced by farmers.

How ingeniously simple is Tabor's solution of all difficulties! The banks will finance the French and English (from what funds?), while the noble French and English will buy the products of the farmers (which they don't require, as they have a surplus of their own). The farmers (we add, on our part) make increased demands for industrial goods. Industry rapidly stretches its limbs enchained by the crisis. The new kingdom of prosperity returns.

In short, there are innumerable projects for compromises and ways out of the crisis. And if these projects don't materialise, then there is still one excellent way out of the situation—England and France will simply refuse to pay the war debts, will declare a one-sided annulment of debts, and there you are! Their purchasing power will grow (we add, once again, on our part), they

will begin to buy goods from the U.S.A., etc., etc. As the result, "prosperity" again.

Such is the great thought of the American "Evening Post." The French refusal puts an end to the war debts, says this paper. All the plans of the Government of the U.S.A. to bargain concessions for debts have collapsed. The U.S.A. is deprived of the possibility of doing anything against the French Government, because a government which has already decided to refuse to pay its debts can always say: You don't want to accept our terms. What do we care? We just won't pay and that is all.

Why did the British and French imperialists not do this earlier, we may ask of this naïve paper?

The fundamental blemish of all these projects for the regulation of war debts and ways out of the crisis, the fundamental falsity of all the arguments on the possibility of coming to a peaceful agreement about debts (and debts only?) consists precisely in the fact that the debt question is considered in an isolated manner, without the connections of this contradiction with all the contradictions of the two imperialist groups (England, France, Japan, on the one hand, U.S.A., Italy, on the other hand). There is nothing easier than to invent dozens of projects for a rapid, simple and painless solution of the debt problem, if this question is taken by itself. But it never was an isolated question. It has always been connected with a series of other big contradictions between the imperialists. There have already been cases when debts have been revised and lowered, but this peaceful agreement was connected with agreements on naval armaments. Can it be possible that the present time, when the basic contradictions between the imperialists have become particularly sharpened owing to the crisis, which is now in its fourth year, is it possible that the conditions for an isolated solution of the debt question are more favourable than formerly? Of course not. It is precisely at the present time, when the incomes of all the capitalist countries have fallen considerably, when it is becoming ever more difficult to squeeze out taxes, when the South American republics are not paying their debts to the U.S.A. and Great Britain, when France is not receiving German reparations, when the vassals of French imperialism (Rumania, Jugo-Slavia, Poland) are on the verge of bankruptcy and are in need of further "nourishment" by France—it is precisely at the present moment that the question of war debts, the payments of which form 25 per cent. of the European war budgets, according to Hoover's calculations, are becoming a question of sources for further armaments. The payment of the war

debts by France and England weakens the growth of their armaments, while the receipt of the war debts increases the growth of the armaments of the U.S.A. It is no chance that war debts have occupied such a prominent place precisely at the present time, because, in view of the reduction of other sources of income, the war debts have become far more important than previously in the matter of the development of armaments. The connection between debts and other imperialist antagonisms is now far stronger than ever before.

Hoover states openly and directly to the European powers, in his last message to Congress: "Cut down your armaments by one-fourth, and you will have the means to pay your debts." Hoover directly and openly connects up the question of debts with the question of armaments.

Take any copy of a newspaper, take only the headings of the telegrams, and you will see this connection with the greatest plainness. Here, for example, are the titles of telegrams for a single day: "Geneva does not budge on the Manchurian Conflict," "Japan's Position Unchanged," "'Temps' Supports the Japanese Point of View," "Hoover's Plan for Control over the Export of Arms" (in connection with the Anglo-American oil war between Bolivia and Paraguay), "New Japanese Units in Manchuria," "Preparations for Advance on Jehol," "Roosevelt Refuses to Collaborate with Hoover," "Negotiations on Debts Postponed till March," "Anti-French Decision of U.S.A. Tariff Board," "Conflict Between Italy and Jugo-Slavia."

We must firmly realise that, at the present time, the connection between war debts and other imperialist contradictions is far closer than before, that therefore an isolated solution of the debt question, without the solution of the other contradictions and, above all, the armament conflict, is extremely unlikely at the present time. This means that the debt question can only be finally solved in connection with the other fundamental contradictions of imperialism, and by the same methods. There has never yet been such an intensification of the struggle over debts as there is now. For the first time, both England and France have taken the risky step of openly refusing to pay their war debts. An open conflict on war debts is "easier," "less dangerous," than on the other imperialist contradictions. However, in this intensification of the struggle over war debts is reflected, as in a mirror, the intensification of *all* the contradictions between the two groups of imperialists — both on the question of armaments and on the question of Manchuria and on the question of tariffs, and on the question of oil. At such a moment of the intensification of all con-

tradictions, to speak about the isolated peaceful solution of the debt conflict, as is done by some learned American economists, and petty-bourgeois semi-Socialist intellectuals who group themselves around the "Nation" and "New Republic," means to turn away from stern reality, and float in sweet pacifist dreams of peacefully creeping out of the crisis, of a painless return to the heaven on earth of prosperity.

Of course, the imperialists may still come to an agreement on a *temporary prolonging of the decision on the debt question*, as they have done on the question of armaments, and in respect to all the other antagonisms which separate them. There is still a possibility that they will reach some agreement, which externally will have the appearance of a solution of the question but which in reality will solve nothing, change nothing and in reality will only be dragging the thing out. Such a prolongation, however, must not hide the fact that all these contradictions, including the debt question, cannot be solved by peaceful means. Furthermore, this prolongation cannot last very long, because the whole system of international credit is crumbling, while the war in China is continuing and passing through a new stage.

It is ridiculous to suppose that when Roosevelt takes power in place of Hoover there will be any serious change in the relations between the imperialists. Exactly at the present time many rumours are beginning, information from "reliable" sources highly connected with the Parliamentary tribune, highly promising indefinite hints connected with Roosevelt's taking over the presidency in March, 1933. Until March, the bourgeois press has plenty of material to fool the people, to imbue them with the idea that international imperialism is organised, that it is equal to the task of dealing with all contradictions, and will find ways and means of coming to a peaceful agreement on all disputed questions. Naïve hopes! As if Roosevelt can change the line of American imperialism on the question of armaments, on the question of Manchuria, on the question of oil, etc.? As if he can tear the question of war debts away from the other imperialist contradictions?

The relative stabilisation of capitalisation has ended. The agreement of the imperialists to divide up spheres of influence in China has been torn to pieces. The Anglo-American oil war between Bolivia and Paraguay lays the foundation for the tearing-up of the agreement of the imperialists on mutual non-interference, in the matter of plundering and oppressing "their" colonies. The Disarmament Conference recently almost broke down and is now on the eve of actual liquidation. The break-down of the agreement on war debts

is a new and heavy blow at crumbling stabilisation.

* * *

The break-down of the war debt agreement, the crumbling of the international credit system, which is undermining the foundations of capitalism—the belief in the sanctity of private property—not only signify a tremendous advance in the collapse of capitalist stabilisation, especially in connection with the rapid growth of the world revolutionary upsurge, but they also signify a big step in the direction of imperialist war. This does not mean that war will take place on the question of war debts. It does not even mean that war debts will be a pretext for war. No one knows or could know, when and how, and on what pretext, the war will begin. It only means that the extreme and unprecedented intensification of the struggle for debts displays the intensification of all the imperialist antagonisms, which, under the influence of the crisis, are approaching their “natural” goal, natural from the point of view of the imperialists, namely, imperialist war. The break-down of the war debt agreement has strengthened the division of imperialist forces, which is not the outcome of a single day, and which is determined by the fundamental contradiction of the imperialist world—the contradiction between British and American imperialism. It is laughable to talk of the isolation of France, because this country did not make its regular payment, while England did. It is laughable to talk of the isolation of France because the U.S.A. refuses to talk to her about debts until the regular payment is made, while it (the U.S.A.) tries to draw England, who has paid, to its own side by indistinct promises not to demand the full pound of flesh, but an ounce or so less during the future negotiations. It is a fact that for every dollar England has to pay two and a half dollars, and Keynes has good reason to shriek that the war debt is “pure usury,” and propose to pay only dollar for dollar. The contradictions between British and American imperialism are too deep for them to be able to come to an arrangement. The capitalist world is sliding, on a slippery incline, down to a new cycle of wars and revolutions, revolutions and wars.

The breakdown of the war debts, and the collapse of the whole credit system, have introduced serious changes in the international conditions as a whole in the sense of changing the relations of forces between the world of Socialism and the world of capitalism. Nowadays the formation of an international front against the U.S.S.R. is becoming more difficult than ever before, not only because of the growth of the internal force of the U.S.S.R., not only because

of the revolutionary upsurge in the capitalist world, not only because of the peaceful policy of the U.S.S.R., which has so often been crowned with success, but also by the intensification of the struggle between the two imperialist groups.

* * *

Our position on the question of foreign debts (including war debts) is that one of the first acts of any revolutionary workers' and peasants' government must be the complete annulment of foreign debts. Such a revolutionary annulment of foreign debts, after the pattern of the annulment carried out by the October Revolution, must be the fundamental idea of all our propaganda and agitation in connection with the question of war debts in the form in which it stands at present, and this idea must be connected with the idea of a revolutionary way out of the crisis.

But we must now determine our tactics towards the question of war debts (and foreign debts in general) in connection with the enormous crisis through which the whole system of foreign debts is passing, in connection with the fact that everywhere concrete demands for a moratorium on foreign debts are being put forward, for their reduction or even the complete annulment of debts, and that a number of capitalist countries have ceased to make payments on their foreign debts, both war debts and others.

There cannot be any simple, uniform slogan, equal for all countries, “logically” derived from the basic idea of the revolutionary annulment of all foreign debts, such as, for example, the slogan “Don't pay” or “The Complete Annulment of Debts.” Such a slogan is abstract, as it wipes out the distinctions between the revolutionary and the imperialist annulment of debts, the distinction between conquering and defeated countries, the distinction between dependent countries and imperialist countries, the distinction between countries which pay and those which do not pay, the distinction between creditor countries and debtor countries. When working out our tactics and our slogans in connection with the question of foreign debts as it is raised by life itself at the present time, we must take strictly into account all these distinctions and work out our tactical principles for various groups of countries, applying them in each individual country on the basis of an all-round analysis of the concrete situation in the given country.

We will begin with the group of countries which were defeated in the imperialist war (Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria). Here, the annulment of debts can be carried out only by a proletarian revolution, but the slogan of the annulment of reparations in these countries has, even at the present moment, a direct revolutionary

importance, as the slogan of the national liberation struggle. Our tactics here are clear and have been settled for a number of years by the German Communist Party, and the only change introduced into the struggle against reparations by the new situation, on the question of war debts, is that in the defeated countries we must put forward the slogan of the annulment of reparations *immediately*. Under such a slogan, linked up with the central slogan of the repeal of the Versailles Treaty, the mobilisation of the masses must take place in the defeated countries in connection with the question of war debts, and this campaign should be extended to all foreign debts, and should be linked up with all the slogans of struggle against wage cuts, against the reduction of relief for the unemployed, etc. At the same time it is necessary to expose the wavering policy of the governments and the bourgeois parties, including the Fascists and the Social-Fascists, on the question of the *immediate* annulment of reparations.

The group of dependent and colonial countries — China, India, the South American republics, etc. The slogan of the annulment of debts is here also at the present day a slogan of the national liberation revolutionary movement. Here also we can, and must launch the slogan of the *immediate* annulment of foreign debts, stating at the same time that the future revolutionary government will annul all foreign debts, and referring to the example of the Russian Bolsheviks, who, as early as 1916, warned the European imperialists, who were giving billions for the strangling of the Russian revolution, that the Russian revolution would refuse to pay foreign debts, and in 1917 made good their words. The correct tactics in the dependent and colonial countries consist of struggle against all the imperialists — both British and American and French and Japanese.

In imperialist countries like England, France, Belgium, Poland, the slogan of the annulment of debts cannot at the present time possess such revolutionary importance as in defeated countries, and dependent countries. These imperialist countries are not faced with the task of national liberation. The revolutionary annulment of foreign debts can be carried out here only by a revolutionary government, as the result of the victory of the proletariat. The annulment of debts by the present governments cannot have anything but an imperialist character, and the first attempts at such an annulment have already led to a decided sharpening of the relations between the two groups of imperialists.

The British Government has taken the line of complete annulment, ever since the problem of war debts arose. At the present time, the British

Government, without giving up its "principle" of the total annulment of war debts, has put forward the demand for the revision of the whole problem, having in mind, above all, a moratorium on these debts. The Labourists completely support the position of the government, i.e., the total annulment of debts, the revision of all problems, a moratorium. In France, the majority of the Chamber of Deputies, with the support of the Socialists, refused to make the regular payment, and put forward the demand for such a revision of all the problems, that would be directed towards the total annulment of debts. In essence, this is only another form of the British position, in which, naturally, there is nothing revolutionary. The slogan of the annulment of war debts is put forward both in England, and France, by the most aggressive imperialist circles of the bourgeoisie.

A mere bare support for the demand for the annulment of foreign debts or the slogan "No Payments," would be incorrect in such countries as England and France, etc., and would lead only to a support of the position of the most aggressive imperialists. The support of the slogan "No Payments" is possible in these countries only on the following five conditions:

(1) A pacifist interpretation of this slogan is impermissible. While not denying the possibility of a temporary agreement on the question of debts, it is necessary to emphasise that the problem of debts is connected with all the basic contradictions of imperialism, which have not been solved by the bourgeois governments, and inevitably, together with all these contradictions, it will lead to war.

(2) It is impermissible to slip into the position of supporting the government or a whole imperialist group consisting of England, France and Japan against the other group consisting of U.S.A. and Italy in the struggle for the annulment of war debts.

(3) In connection with the campaign on the annulment of war debts, it is necessary to put forward also revolutionary slogans, such as "Not a cent for war debts or the war budget," and also the demand for transferring the sums set free by the non-payment of debts to aid for the unemployed, etc.

(4) The slogan of the annulment of debts assumes a revolutionary significance in all imperialist countries, without exception, if it is put forward with respect to the colonies and dependencies oppressed by the given country. The slogan of the annulment of the debt of Great Britain to the U.S.A. is not revolutionary. The slogan of the annulment of the debt of China to Great Britain, France or the U.S.A., etc., is a revolutionary slogan.

(5) One of the chief elements in the revolutionary tactics in connection with the question of the annulment of debts must be in all capitalist countries (imperialist, dependent, colonial) the launching and support of the slogan of the annulment of all kinds of indebtedness of the peasants to the trusts, the banks and the government, calling on the peasants not to pay debts and taxes. This slogan can become one of the most popular slogans of the peasant revolt at the present time in those places where the peasants are already rising to the mass struggle (Poland, Czechoslovakia, U.S.A.). Only the proletariat is capable of consistently supporting peasant revolts to the end, uniting them, giving them correct slogans. Only the proletariat is interested in raising this movement from the slogan of a moratorium on debts, which has already been launched in places, to the slogan of the annulment of debts. Of course, in every country, taking into account its national peculiarities, this slogan should be concretised in a special form.

Consequently, in imperialist countries such as England, France, Poland, etc., i.e., in debtor countries, support for the slogan of the annulment of debts to the U.S.A., must *compulsorily* conform to the above-mentioned five conditions. Only a combination of support for the slogan of the annulment of the debts of the colonies, the mandate territories, the dependencies, etc., and also the demand for the annulment of the debts of the peasants, and with such slogans as "Not a cent for war debts," with calls for a struggle against taxes, with the demand for the diverting of the economised sums for the assistance of the unemployed, etc., can best of all save the revolutionary proletariat from slipping into the position of "their" bourgeoisie.

In the U.S.A., a country which is a creditor nation, the slogan of the annulment of debts, if we avoid the possible Pacifist distortions of it, is directed entirely against American imperialism, exposes this imperialism and unites the proletariat and the poor farmers for a revolutionary struggle against it. We should not hesitate because a considerable part of the farmers

(probably even a majority) are at present definitely against the annulment of debts. We should not hesitate because the Communist Party will be accused by the bourgeoisie of betraying the interests of their fatherland. We should not hesitate because a considerable section of the American proletariat will not, at first, understand such an attitude on the part of the American Communist Party, and will not support it. The Party must insistently, consistently, systematically explain its policy on the question of war debts from day to day, pointing out that the workers and poor farmers are not interested in the American bankers receiving their foreign debts. A consistent revolutionary policy, in the long run, will turn the proletariat and the poor farmers to the side of the Communist Party. The American Communist Party would not carry out its revolutionary duty if it did not now come out with the greatest energy for the annulment of debts to the United States. Naturally, this slogan must be combined with the demand for the annulment of the debts of the farmers, social insurance, etc.

* * *

The last thing which should be specially emphasised on the question of debts is the necessity of carrying on this campaign as a wide mass campaign. This is the very backbone of the whole campaign. Without it, the campaign loses all meaning. It is necessary for the wide masses to understand that the struggle which is now blazing up between the two imperialist groups means the menace of new wars, that the imperialists are seeking a way out of the crisis through war, that our way out of the crisis is the most painless way out, a way which corresponds to the interests of the workers, a revolutionary way out of the crisis. The broad masses, the workers, the farmers and the poor of the towns must know that the revolutionary struggle for the annulment of debts is one of the chief lines of the struggle for the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

The bourgeoisie seek a way out of the crisis in war and intervention.

The proletariat seek a way out of the crisis in revolution.

CORRECTIONS No. 2.

Page 80. Sixth paragraph : *Whitley* Commission, NOT *Wheatley*.

Page 85. Point 12 of the 21 points of the Communist International, should read :

12. All the Parties belonging to the "C.I." should be formed on the basis of the principle of

democratic *centralism*. At the present time of acute civil war the Communist Party will only be able fully to do its duty, when it is organised in a sufficiently thorough way, when it possesses an iron discipline, and when its Party centre enjoys the confidence of the members of the Party, who are to endow this centre with complete power, authority and ample rights.

LENIN, LUXEMBOURG, LIEBKNECHT

BY MARTYNOV.

DURING January we honour the memory of Luxembourg and Liebknecht, together with that of the great Lenin, because Luxembourg and Liebknecht were the best of the small number of prominent Western European revolutionary social-democrats of the Second International; because, in the epoch of the greatest historical changes, when Western European social-democratic parties were put to the severest test and really verified, failing disgracefully, they fought as revolutionary social-democrats—though in many respects inconsistently—because they had the courage to go against the stream in the fight against the opportunism and centrism, which reigned in the Second International, even before the war, and to go against the stream in the struggle against social-chauvinism during the war; because, by their courageous behaviour, they helped to convert the imperialist war into civil war; because, with all their vacillations, they came to Communism, and fell at their revolutionary post, in the decisive moment of revolution in Germany.

But our January campaign under the slogan of the “three L’s” aims not only at honouring the memory of our fallen fighters, honouring their revolutionary services of the past. This campaign is being carried on primarily for the purpose of steeling and sharpening our ideological weapon in the fights of to-day. During the January days, we are each time obliged again and again, in connection with the estimation of Lenin, Luxembourg and Liebknecht, to raise the question of the attitude of Western European Marxist left radicalism to Leninism, which laid the foundation of the Communist International in all its significance; in other words, the question of the ideological sources of the Comintern, for all vagueness on this question bears the fruit of vacillation, and deviation from the line of the Comintern in the current struggle, hindering us from gaining the majority of the working-class. Unfortunately it has to be admitted that complete clarity on this question is not to be found in our parties, even to the present day.

Comrade Stalin, in his famous letter to the editorial board of the “Proletarian Revolution” in 1931*, gave warning of insufficient vigilance, and the presence of rotten liberalism on the historical front of the Party, in connection with the masked, Trotskyist attempts, in the pages of our Press, to distort the rôle of Lenin in the pre-war Second International, in particular with regard to the rôle of Lenin in the struggle against centrism. Comrade Stalin’s letter aimed at raising the theoretical level inside the Communist Parties, and to a *certain degree* this aim has already been achieved. The official leaderships of our

Parties, German, Polish and others, have correctly formulated the Party position on this question, and last year’s January campaign under the slogan of the “three L’s” which was carried on from this point of view, assisted in further clarifying the true ideological roots of the Comintern.

However, in 1932 we were again witnesses to a new theoretical confusion on this question. On the one hand, there appears the extremely pretentious, and equally ignorant book of Comrade Sauerland†, which, to “make more profound,” Lenin and Stalin proves, that during the whole epoch of the Second International there was no historic movement forward whatsoever in the socialist movement, and that the Comintern could inherit *nothing* from the Second International, as though, during the whole of this period, the class struggle ceased, and class contradictions ceased to become sharper, as though this class struggle and this sharpening of contradictions found no expression in struggle, even inconsistent, between Marxism and opportunism inside the Second International. The author of this wonderful book even goes so far as to say that between the opportunist mistakes of Bebel and Kautsky during the long period before 1904-1909, and the social-fascism of the present renegade Kautsky, there is no difference *in principle*; that there was also no difference *in principle* between the opportunism of the centrists, and the opportunist mistakes of Luxembourg, Mehring and Liebknecht. On the other hand, as against this theory, distinguished for its utter blindness in the sphere of historic conception, another thesis is put forward by Comrade Alpari: that the source of the mistakes of the left radicals should be sought for *not* in what they wrote (i.e., *not* in their heads), but in the then “objective conditions,” in the conditions of peaceful development of those countries in which they were active. And this thesis, on the whole, (which eliminates the rôle of the brain in the leaders of left radicalism!) finds sympathetic response in certain organs of the German Party Press. Thus we have before us typical examples of “left” and right opportunist estimations of the past. This shows us that the task raised before the Communist Parties by Comrade Stalin in 1931 is even now far from solved, and obviously, to solve it, we should not take the road of unprincipled eclecticism and seek the “happy medium” between “left” and right deviations, but should more deeply explain what in truth is Marxism-Leninism, and the Marxist-Leninist approach to the pre-history of the Comintern.

* See No. 20, “Communist International,” 1931.

† “Dialektische Materialismus.”

"Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution," said Comrade Stalin.

Marxism was constituted in an epoch when the great French revolution was still within living memory, when the Chartist uprising and the 1848 revolution was taking place, when the uprising of the Paris commune took place in 1871; it was constituted in a revolutionary epoch, but at the same time in an epoch "when the proletarian revolution was not yet a direct practical inevitability" (Stalin). The Second International was formed in the following epoch of comparatively prolonged "prosperity" for capitalism, the pre-imperialist period, and of the development of the working-class movement on a *broad scale*, with a simultaneous ebb of the revolutionary wave. Leninism, lastly, was formed in the epoch of a new revolutionary upsurge, in the epoch of imperialism—the last stage of capitalism—in the epoch of the belated bourgeois revolution in Russia, in the epoch when the proletarian revolution was on the order of the day throughout the world.

In the epoch of the Second International, Marxism, corresponding to the rapid growth of the working-class and its concentration into large-scale undertakings, spread very considerably in the *broad sense*, thus assisting the creation of mass working-class organisations; but Marxism itself, according to the interpretation of the leaders of the Second International, *degenerated*. The leaders of the Second International, having fallen victims to the opportunist pressure of the epoch of stagnation, soaked in legalism, watered down Marxism, castrated it, corroded away many of its essential, revolutionary elements; and in the period when the aristocracy of labour crystallised, on the Continent and in the United States, in connection with the birth of imperialism; it became the basis of the Second International, actually, though not in words; opportunism triumphed in the pre-war Second International.

A new fresh revolutionary wind blew from Russia. Lenin, thanks to the exclusively favourable circumstances in Tsarist Russia for revolution, which combined concentrated industry with the strongest survivals of bond slavery, and Asia-ism, thanks to the enormous international importance of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, the one-time most important support of Western imperialism, thanks to his profound study of Marxism and great knowledge of the international working-class movement; illimitable revolutionary temperament; and brilliant sagacity, was immediately able to rise to the height of the tasks facing the world proletariat in the new epoch of imperialism and, in particular, the Russian proletariat, destined to lead in the Russian bourgeois revolution, and pioneer the world proletarian revolution. Lenin was correspondingly able, not

only to regenerate Marxism, but develop it further in all spheres of theory and practice, and lead the Russian proletariat and bring it to victory on this basis, having already laid the foundation of the October revolution and the Communist International in the pre-war period, in the form of the Bolshevik Party.

From the very beginning to the end, Lenin waged a relentless struggle against open opportunism and the centrism of the Second International. By waging this struggle, he not only rectified the Marxist line; distorted by the opportunism of the Second International, but raised all questions *anew*, as was demanded of true, living, uncongealed, undogmatised Marxism, in the new historic situation.

"The orthodox Marxists," of the Second International, taking as a starting point Marx's thesis that "the new, higher productive relations never come to light before the material conditions for their realisation are matured in the bosom of the old society," interpreted Marx falsely, fatalistically. Bowing before the spontaneity of the historic process, they considered that the material conditions for the socialist revolution would mature only in the far-distant times (which, incidentally, will never arrive), when large-scale capitalist production has completely squeezed out small-scale production, when the majority of the peasantry are proletarianised, when the proletariat in the capitalist countries will constitute the huge majority of the population, when the social-democratic parties win the majority in the Parliaments, and so on. Lenin, from the very beginning, in 1903, carried on a relentless struggle against this and all other forms of *Kvostism** against all kinds of attempts to bow before spontaneity, against all belittling of the revolutionary rôle of the subjective factor.

"The orthodox Marxists" of the Second International extracted historical materialism from the general theory of dialectical materialism considering it possible to reconcile Marx with Kant and mastered only the materialistic side of the historic materialism of Marx and Engels, and this with mechanistic distortions, manifesting to a greater or lesser degree complete blindness to Marx's dialectics. This vulgarisation of historical materialism also applies to Plekhanov, although he paid far more attention to problems of philosophy and the theory of dialectic materialism, than the Western European "orthodox ones." In the struggle against the subjective school of sociology of the Russian Populists, in the struggle, which constituted his historic service, he popularised Marx's historic materialism very considerably in Russia. But, in putting forward the materialism of Marx's teachings in this struggle, he vulgarised his dialectics and correspondingly himself mechanically

* Kvostism: from kvost—tail, i.e., dragging at tail.

distorted the materialism of Marx. Although he broke many a lance in the struggle against the enemies of Marxism, defending its dialectics, nevertheless, as Lenin showed, he overlooked certain essential elements in Marxism, and in practice turned out to be of slight value as a dialectician. It was just for this reason that, as Rosa Luxemburg so aptly expressed at the Fifth Congress of the Russian Socialist Democratic Labour Party, he showed himself, during the 1905 revolution, to be a "congealed Marxist" with his face to the past. *It was just he who overlooked no more and no less a factor than the advent of the new imperialist epoch, the epoch of decaying, dying capitalism.* In this connection he did not raise the problem of the transition of the Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution into the proletarian ; and, mechanically transferring the experience of previous bourgeois revolutions (when the bourgeoisie was still in the ascendant), to the Russian revolution of the twentieth century, slid down into Menshevism already in 1903. Becoming a Menshevik pursuing a liberal-labour policy and not understanding the new imperialist epoch ; during the imperialist war, he mechanically transferred the experience of the national liberation war of the middle of the nineteenth century to the former and finally degenerated into social-chauvinism.

Lenin not only corrected these distortions of Marxism, but also developed Marxist dialectics further, sharpening the dialectic method on the whetstone of the enormous upheavals in the sphere of science and political life, on the whetstone of the universal development of the class struggle in the present epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, and consummately applied this dialectic method in practice.

"The orthodox Marxists" of the Second International built up parties which, not denying the "social revolution" in words, actually were imbued with legalism, with the routing of the comparatively "peaceful" period, were afraid of sharp changes, did not believe in them, and consequently did not raise any revolutionary tasks. They built up parties which postponed the decision of these problems for the objective historic process ("revolutions are not made, they make themselves"). Correspondingly, they occasioned peaceful cohabitation inside the Party between Marxists and revisionists, and in the pre-war epoch they allowed "proletarian interests to be subjected to the interests of the petty bourgeoisie inside one common party." Lenin, facing the Party with enormous revolutionary tasks, raised the Party and Party morals to enormous heights, built up and completed the building of a Party of a *new* type, a monolithic Party, which manifested the greatest intolerance to all kinds of bourgeois influences penetrating the working-class, and at the same time a Party which, thanks to its tactics is linked up with the

widest masses through its transmission belts.

Lenin revived and developed still further in the conditions of the epoch of imperialism, decaying capitalism, Marx's idea of the socialist revolution growing out of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, finding a new form for this transition in the institution of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and showed in action in 1917, how this transition can be realised in the given concrete historic situation.

Lenin revived and considerably developed the roughly drafted idea of Marx of uniting the proletarian revolution with the "peasant war," of the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, under the leadership of the proletariat, and correspondingly filled the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat with new, most rich content.

Lenin raised the national question in a new form, looked upon it as a question of the right of nations to self-determination even up to separation ; he made it part of the general question of the bourgeois democratic revolution in the pre-October period, and part of the general question of the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the October period.

Lenin, for the first time, gave a correct theory concerning imperialism. Lenin, for the first time, worked out the new theory of the possibility of building socialism in one country, from the unequal rate of development in the epoch of imperialism, and proved that this was possible, in actual practice.

In the struggle against the social-patriots, who in the epoch of imperialism, of dying capitalism, concealed their social-patriotism behind references to the tactic of Marx to war, in an entirely different historic situation of bourgeois national wars, Lenin, for the first time, put forward the slogan of "convert the imperialist war into civil war," and that of "defeat of one's own national government."

Lenin revived and developed Marx's teaching on the State and proletarian revolution still further, and disclosed the modern form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as expressed in Soviets, created by the proletariat. Lenin revived and developed still further Marx's teaching concerning the transitional period from capitalism to Communism, and correspondingly drew up his great strategic plan of the building of socialism under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is now being further developed and victoriously realised under the leadership of his best pupil and follower, Comrade Stalin.

Lenin revived and still further developed the teachings of Marx in all spheres that they might *correspond* to the new epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution. Does it follow that the retreat *back* from the teachings of Marx on several points, that the *hiding up* of several essential elements of Marxism on the part of the "orthodox" leaders of

the Second International, also *corresponds* to the conditions of the earlier stagnation epoch and could be justified by these conditions, as Comrade Alpari apparently thinks? Of course not. Doubtless, the tactics used in the epoch of stagnation should differ from those of the revolutionary epoch, but the Marxist can and must maintain their revolutionary character in the stagnation period also. Lenin, building a new Bolshevik Party said, that it would be "prepared for everything, beginning with saving the honour, prestige and heritage of the Party in the moment of the greatest revolutionary oppression. . . ."

It was this, the desire "to save the honour, prestige and succession" of revolutionary Marxism during the stagnation epoch, which was lacking in the leaders of the Second International, to the extent required, even in their best years. And Marx and Engels, far from belittling the importance of the big positive achievements of the German social-democratic party, unflinchingly pointed out to its leaders when they committed opportunist errors, that with their opportunist way of saying nothing about the main questions of the revolution, they were sacrificing the interests of the future, for the sale of the transitory interests of the present. The correctness of these warnings has been historically justified. In the comparatively "peaceful" pre-imperialist epoch, the "orthodox-Marxist" leaders of the Second International did useful work. Lenin wrote :

"Bourgeois democracy is outlived, as the Second International, which performed a historically necessary useful work, when the preparation of the working masses within the framework of bourgeois-democracy stood on the order of the day."

In spite of the fact that by adapting their methods to legalism the leaders of the International avoided fundamental questions like that of the "relation of the State to the social revolution and the social revolution to the State," they fulfilled the *chief* task of the "peaceful" epoch, to the extent that they founded mass political and economic organisations of the working-class, that they lead its class struggle in the economic and parliamentary arena, repudiated class co-operation in principle, coalition policy, votes for credits, to the extent that they were internationalists. Consequently, in estimating their work *in this* comparatively "peaceful" epoch, Engels could speak of the enormous successes of German social-democracy, and Lenin of the "comparatively small sins of German social democracy" (Vol. XVII, p. 126, Russian Edition). But thanks to this indicated silence they first of all armed the proletariat for *future* revolutionary struggles insufficiently; secondly, when the epoch of imperialism ensued, with its sharpening of all contradictions, we find among the "orthodox-Marxist" leaders of the Second International, according to Lenin, that "of the sum total of their avoidance of the question, their silence, their

deviations, there came about the inevitable, complete transition to opportunism."

Lenin and the Leninist Party did not behave in this way. During the period of the greatest oppression of the revolutionary movement, in the full bloom of the Stolypin reaction, Lenin demanded a corresponding change in tactics, the transition from "French" methods of struggle to "German," that "all legal possibilities" should be utilised, and, on this basis, he waged a fight against the "left" deviators who continued to insist upon the boycott of the Duma and the recall of deputies from the Duma. At the same time he fought against the liquidators, including Trotsky, who repudiated underground work, and the propaganda of revolutionary slogans: the republic, confiscation of landlords' estates, eight-hour working day.

Lenin was an irreconcilable revolutionary, who never forgot for a moment that the Marxist Party must be and remain the *vanguard* of the working-class never ceasing for a moment to fight against *Kvostism*. But this revolutionary singleness of purpose does not exhaust Leninism. Lenin was a mighty strategist and great tactician, and his strategy and tactics were based on the deepest understanding of the theory of dialectic materialism. For Lenin, *Marxism was not a dogma, but a guide to action. Lenin did not build up a philosophical sect, but built a Party, closely linked with the masses, penetrating into the depths of life with all its contradictions*, rapidly reacting to every change of circumstance, to every ebb and flow, bearing in mind the level of the masses which it aims at drawing into the revolutionary struggle, reckoning with the class nature of the allies of the proletariat; he built a Party prepared to compromise with the allies of the proletariat, if these compromises really serve to raise the revolutionary movement to a higher stage, or would make it possible to defend the revolutionary positions already gained.

Lenin drew up a strategic plan for every stage of the revolution. He drew up one plan in Russia in 1903 to the February revolution, during the period of struggle for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, another—from the February revolution to the October revolution during the epoch of transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist; a third—after the October victory. During the pre-war period, also, he discriminated between the strategic tasks in Russia, which was passing through a revolutionary situation, and in the Western European countries, which were experiencing (up to a certain time) a still comparatively "peaceful" period. Lenin applied his strategic plans with extreme severity and rigidity, yet within the limits of each strategic plan, his tactics were distinguished for their extreme *flexibility*. It suffices to refer to three well-known examples. During the October revolution Lenin decided to accept the Social Revolutionaries programme

of "socialisation," in so far as it assisted in drawing the peasantry over to the side of the proletarian revolution, with the intention, after the victory of the proletarian revolution and on the basis of the key positions won by the proletariat, of placing the proletariat in a position to convince the peasantry, by their own experience, of the correctness of the Bolshevik agrarian programme. Lenin decided to sign the "foul" Brest peace, in so far as it created a definite breathing space for the Soviet Government, during which it would collect its forces together for the new advance. Lenin decided to make the rapid turn from military Communism to the New Economic Policy, when the main task of the period of military Communism—the rout of military intervention—was finally completed and when, at the same time, the Kronstadt uprising signalled the need for going forward to the same goal in a more prolonged, round-about way.

Lenin manifested the same flexibility of tactics to various tendencies in the Second International at various times also. Following the tactics of Marx and Engels, Lenin did not throw all those who deviated opportunistically in one respect or another from revolutionary Marxism into one pot. He had one "way" of criticising those who, despite their opportunist mistakes, for a given period urged the movement *forward*, fulfilling the *main* task in the given historical period, and another "way" of criticising those who, because of their opportunism, were a hindrance to the movement. In the first case, his criticism aimed at helping, uplifting; in the second, his aim was to destroy. This is what explains Lenin's varying attitude, for example, to Kautsky, in varying periods: (1) before he became definitely centrist; (2) after he had become centrist, subjecting the interests of the proletariat to those of the petty bourgeoisie, and forming a bloc with open revisionists; and finally (3) after he had openly gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie, and become a renegade. This also explains his varying attitude to the left radicals on the one hand, and the centrists on the other.

It is just this that comrades like Sauerland cannot understand, who, while vowing himself to be 100 per cent. loyal to dialectic materialism, actually, in practice, betrays dialectics and materialism, and loses all possible concrete historic ground from under his feet, since he considers it *sufficient* for an estimation of the political rôle of a Marxist to define the extent to which he has understood "Hegel's logic." These pitiable Marxists do not even suspect, that in considering that the degree to which dialectic materialism has been understood, is *sufficient* criterion for deciding the political rôle of a Marxist, they are basely betraying the very spirit of dialectic materialism. These pitiable Marxists do not understand that in divorcing the theory of dialectic materialism, from

the vital revolutionary struggle, and fixing a *priority* of the first over the second, they are *idealistically* distorting the very theory of Leninism—the theory of dialectic materialism; for Leninism, which is contemptuous of crawling empirism and ascribes theory an enormous importance, does not originate in a love of "philosophising," but in the following, and only the following: that correct revolutionary theory is an indispensable *guide to action*. Correspondingly, Leninism judges political leaders *primarily by their actions, and the political results of their actions*.

At the price of this idealistic distortion of Leninism, the above-mentioned pitiable dialecticians, despite their apparent 100 per cent. intolerance in the sphere of theory, are capable, in practice, of falling; and do indeed fall, on all sides into the grossest right-opportunist mistakes.

In spite of the severe sentence passed by these pitiable Leninists upon Rosa Luxembourg and Karl Liebknecht, Lenin, in his theses, in his report to the First Congress of the International, declared that in these two "there had tragically perished the finest people and leaders of the truly proletarian Communist International."

Why is it that Lenin, who criticised the semi-Menshevik mistakes of Rosa Luxembourg so often, which mistakes had been so easy to find in Karl Liebknecht as well, nevertheless spoke of them so highly? Because, in spite of their mistakes, they had accomplished considerable revolutionary services.

What were these revolutionary services of Rosa Luxembourg? During the period 1893-98 she was one of the founders of the Marxist Party in Poland (the Social-Democratic Party of Poland and Lithuania), she fought against nationalism and for internationalism in the Polish workers' movement, against "social-patriotism" on the part of the Polish Socialist Party. This was her first big service, although in this struggle she made one mistake in principle on the national question, which she did not afterwards correct, and which brought her to the opposite goal to that which she was seeking: i.e., it strengthened the influence of the Polish Socialist Party upon the Polish working class movement, since the nationalists in the P.S.P. were able to win a trump by defending the principle of *independence* right at the beginning, in *the struggle against the Polish social-democrats*. During the time of the struggle against Bernsteinism and Jaurès-ism, Rosa Luxembourg fought in the front ranks of the revolutionary social-democrats. During the 1905 Russian revolution, she did much to popularise Russian revolutionary methods among the Western European proletariat, although in connection with the estimation of these methods she herself made more than small mistakes. At the Stuttgart International Congress in 1907 she, with Lenin, introduced an amendment to the resolution on war, which obliged socialist parties, in the event of an imperialist

war, to convert it into a struggle to overthrow capitalism. When centrism formed in German social-democracy, she waged an energetic struggle against it. Already in 1905, at the Jena Party Congress, she joined in the attack upon Bebel, who enjoyed enormous popularity, not only in the Party, but among the masses, detecting elements of chauvinism in the central leadership of the Social-Democratic Party. She fought stubbornly against the trade union bureaucrats in the German trade unions. Beginning with 1910, she fought against the centrism of Kautsky (who defended the famous strategy of starving out the enemy) and insisted upon the need for making use of the revolutionary mass strike weapon in Germany, and reckoning upon the masses of unorganised workers as well as the organised. After the betrayal of August 4 she accused German social-democracy of having become a "reeking corpse." Together with Liebknecht she organised the "Internationale" group, and later the "Spartak" group. On her release from prison, in her speech at the Spartak Congress on December 31, 1918, she hurled the following fiery words into the teeth of the social-democrats trying to strangle the Russian revolution :

"See what is happening in Riga, in the occupied regions. In Riga, thanks to the abominations of Scheideman and the work of August Winnig, German trade union leader, German proletarians with the allied troops and the Baltic barons, are advancing against the Russian Bolshevik troops. This is so foul that I declare quite unhesitatingly and calmly that the German trade union leaders and leaders of German social-democracy are the biggest scoundrels."

Finally she joined the camp of Communism and, participating in the January uprising, fell at her revolutionary post at the hands of the hangmen of the social-fascist Noske. Such is the list of those acts for which Lenin named Rosa Luxembourg an "eagle."

And what were the revolutionary services of Karl Liebknecht? Karl Liebknecht, in spite of his poor Marxist training, thanks to his revolutionary temperament, internationalism and contempt of all philistinism, took up a militant position at the first signs of a sharpening in the situation in Germany, and the approaching menace of war, thus causing the German social-democratic leadership, steeped in the slough of legalism, considerable anxiety. Liebknecht struggled stubbornly against militarism. Already at the Bremen Party Congress in 1904 he proposed that the Congress develop its anti-militarist work, asserting that "militarism is the corner stone of capitalism." But he did not carry on this struggle under the banner of pacifism, but revolution. He organised the Socialist Youth League, and encountered the opposition of the "venerable" leaders of

German social-democracy, who looked askance at the fact that the "greenhorns," not yet wise by experience had been drawn "adventurously" into politics by Liebknecht.

Liebknecht made one of the main tasks of the Youth League the most active struggle against militarism; for the youth, after all, are called upon first to play the rôle of cannon fodder during war. He even dared to propose that anti-militarist propaganda be carried on inside the army, not fearing to break through the framework of legality. He also utilised the parliamentary tribune for the purpose of revealing the secret preparations for war, not fearing that he would be accused of "high treason." When war was declared, he spoke alone in the parliamentary fraction against voting war credits; however, during the first division in Parliament itself, in a misunderstood sense of Party discipline, he raised his hand in favour of credits. After this, however, he agitated against social-chauvinism, organised the "International" group together with Rosa Luxembourg and Mehring, and afterwards the "Spartak" Union; and at the second vote in Parliament, he alone—of all the Social-Democratic Party—during a frenzied wave of chauvinism throughout Germany, dared to vote against war credits. This courageous action on the part of Liebknecht immediately found its response among the soldiers and in particular among the French soldiers. This is how Henri Barbusse describes this: After one encounter in 1915, in which the French were unsuccessful, one soldier was heard to say among a group of French soldiers: "And are there on earth people who are fighting against this hell; even individuals who step out alone on the road of world history and shout: 'Down with war.'" In reply, another French soldier said: "Yes, Karl Liebknecht."*

From his prison cell, Karl Liebknecht issued slogans in his letters: "It is our business now to declare: not civil peace, but civil war. This is the slogan of our times—and there cannot be many." In one of his appeals to the soldiers, Liebknecht wrote:

"Kill the monsters who command you or others to shoot mother or father, brother or sister in the name of the 'fatherland,' or 'his Highness the Emperor,' as it is called in the bourgeois State. Kill every bloodsucker in bourgeois uniform who commands you to shoot your brother, or hang him in the name of His Highness, because he refuses to obey the bloody orders of militarism.

"Kill your own bourgeois swine who prevent the liberation of the proletariat, and who seek to maintain you and your brother proletarians in capitalist slavery, unworthy of human beings."

* "Under Fire." J. M. Dent, Ltd.

On his release from prison Liebknecht, like Rosa, became a Communist, and took part in the January uprising, also meeting a glorious death at the hands of the social-fascist hangmen.

* * *

This is why Lenin said of Karl and Rosa that, in these two "there tragically perished the finest people and leaders of the truly proletarian Communist International." But Luxembour and Liebknecht made several semi-Menshevik mistakes.

Rosa Luxembour clung firmly to her semi-Menshevik mistakes and began to study again only after her release from prison during the German revolution, under the impressions of the lessons of the October revolution; in consequence of her tragic death, however, she was unable to change her views to the full. She began to change, but her mistakes outlived her. Those of her followers who began to defend these mistakes in quite another political situation, ended in the camp of counter-revolution.

All the semi-Menshevik mistakes of Rosa Luxembour arose methodologically out of her one *main mistake*—out of her *mechanical understanding of Marxism, and submission to the spontaneity of the historical process.*

This is most clearly and concentratedly expressed in her book "The Accumulation of Capital." In this book Rosa Luxembour, just as the revisionists, began with not understanding Marx, and finished by "correcting" and "supplementing" his "opportunist" mistakes. Luxembour wrote the following concerning Marx's outline of the accumulation of capital in his second volume of "Capital":

"How can this process (the realisation of commodities.—A.M.) and its internal laws of movement truly be embraced in bloodless theoretical fiction, which declares that this environment, this struggle and its inter-actions are non-existent."

Rosa Luxembour declared that Marx's scheme of accumulation was an empty abstraction, a "bloodless fiction." This clearly showed that, in essence, she really did not understand the methodology of "Capital." In the first volume of "Capital," Marx takes as his starting point the fact that commodities exchange according to their value, and also laid down the thesis, which Rosa, to remain true to herself, should have called a "fiction" or empty abstraction; for, indeed, they exchange not according to their values in actual fact, but according to their prices of production, as Marx showed in his third volume of "Capital." In just the same way she might call the law of gravity a "fiction" on the basis that a stone falls to the ground and a balloon flies upwards—not understanding that this is explained by the law of gravity. But the whole thing that Rosa did not understand was that only by taking this general law of the exchange of commodities according to their values as a starting point, was it possible, by intro-

ducing the process of equalisation of the rate of profit, to arrive at the more concrete law that commodities are exchanged by their prices of production. In exactly the same way, only starting with Marx's scheme proving the possibility of realising commodities in capitalist society, both in simple and extended reproduction, is it possible, by introducing the questions of the development of contradictions between unlimited effort to accumulation and limited purchasing power, and the development of the organic composition of capital, and the anarchy of production, to arrive at the conclusion that the possibility of realising commodities becomes an actuality only in conditions of the existence of periodical crises. Not having understood Marx, Rosa Luxembour raked among the historic archives and found the "third persons" theory of the Populists long since rejected by Russian Marxists, in order to explain crises to herself; the theory that the realisation of commodities is only possible in the co-existence of capitalist and non-capitalist economy, and correspondingly came to the fatalist conclusion that capitalism must inevitably automatically perish, because of the "vanishing" of the "third persons," because of the curtailment of markets. Thus the theory of imperialism as the last stage of capitalism, with all its qualitative peculiarities, with all its contradictions fell right out of her conception; and also the rôle of the subjective factor—the growth of indignation among the working-class and, primarily, the rôle of the Party in organising the proletarian revolution.

The same mechanist conception of Marxism and subjection to the spontaneity of the economic process brought Rosa Luxembour to her root mistake on the national question. In her first dissertation on the "industrial development of Poland" published in 1897, taking as a starting point the single fact of capitalist development in Poland, which apparently embroiled all classes in Poland in capitalist development, disinterested in the formation of an independent Polish State, with only the petty bourgeoisie, doomed to extinction, really interested in the independence of Poland; Rosa Luxembour came to deny the slogan of the right of Poland to self-determination, right up to separation; and continued to insist on her mistake even when an epoch of bourgeois-democratic revolutions dawned in Eastern Europe and Asia, and when, in the words of Lenin, the petty-bourgeoisie of all lands, with "servile rapidity" hastened to consider the changing of State boundaries created by force to be "utopian."

It was the same mechanist, undialectic conception of Marxism and the same subjection to the spontaneity of the historical process that led to the fact that Rosa Luxembour, like all the leaders of the Second International, taking as a starting point the economic doom of the small peasantry, totally

ignored the rôle of the peasantry as a possible revolutionary factor, and in consequence, at one with Parvus and Trotsky, took up their general notorious theory of "permanent revolution."

The same subjection to spontaneity rendered Rosa Luxembouré incapable of understanding the definite rôle of the Party; inspired her at the outset to join the Menshevik choir, which accused Lenin of "Blanqism," to deny the possibility of organising armed uprisings, and revolution in general; urged her, when in prison, to write against Bolshevik terror, forced her at the same time to interpret force as Lassalle did, i.e., "spiritually," denying the method of revolution "with the help of pitchforks."

All these semi-Menshevik mistakes, mistakes which sprung from the same ideological root, bound Rosa Luxembouré, like the weaver to the loom, to German social-democracy and the Second International, even when, according to her own expression, they were a "reeking corpse." And this brought her to her main mistake in practice: that she refused at the beginning of the growth of centrism, to adopt the course for a split with the opportunists and organisational preparations for the split; which brought no small harm to the German revolution.

The theoretical mistakes of Karl Liebknecht were far more serious than those of Rosa Luxembouré, although they were far less dangerous and harmful, because Karl Liebknecht was never seriously regarded as a theoretician. However, his theoretical mistakes were very characteristic, testifying how low the level of Marxism in the Second International was.

Karl Liebknecht, as a spontaneous revolutionary, as a temperamental revolutionary, fought stubbornly against "militarism," as he expressed himself, and consequently actually fought against imperialism. Nevertheless, he had not the slightest conception of the essence of imperialism; and interpreted it just as Kautsky did, when he had already become a downright centrist. During the discussion at the Chemnitz Congress of the Party in 1912, Liebknecht talked the following opportunist twaddle about imperialism:

"It is not true that the tendencies are lacking in the capitalist system, which are directed against militarism and the competition of armaments. . . . Imperialism, briefly, is capitalist business. . . . The historic mission of the proletariat in imperialism is . . . so to increase the risk of using the militarist form of international competition . . . for the ruling classes of the interested countries, that it will appear to be more advisable from a commercial point of view to liquidate international competition by means of peaceful agreement, say, in the form of trustification."

Liebknecht, in practice, was a revolutionary, but when he tried to base his revolutionary activities theoretically, he dropped into vulgar radicalism, which has nothing in common with Marxism; and

therefore lapsed into opportunism in his arguments, unknown to himself. Even in 1902 in the "Neue Zeit," and then in his notes, written in gaol, he evolved the theory that "social development proceeds along the lines of compromises, under the apparent guidance of compromising factors." "Opposing social forces," said he, "of a given side, act the more strongly upon the direction of the diagonal of the parallelogram of forces, the more extreme, i.e., the more radical, their direction is. If the radical forces were not in action, then the compromising factors would move along another line, for compromising factors have no line of their own."

He drew the following conclusion from this mechanist theory:

"The maximum possible is attainable only in the case of the impossible. The most real possibility is that most equally efficacious of the impossibilities to which it strives. Thus, objectively to wish for the impossible does not signify to engage upon senseless fantasy and self-bedazzlement, but signifies practical politics in the most profound sense." Out of this cheap-jack philosophy—ask more, and you'll get something—Liebknecht logically draws the opportunist conclusion that the Marxists, in advocating the theory of catastrophe, actually do not work in principle for the advent of the catastrophe.

"Only our militance makes us capable of concluding agreements in social life, gives us the opportunity of opening the bag of political, social and economic reforms, and would, if this were possible at all, bring about the avoidance of the catastrophe."

* * *

We have given a whole bouquet here of opportunist, semi-Menshevik mistakes on the part of Rosa Luxembouré and Karl Liebknecht, which mistakes Rosa Luxembouré, towards the end of her life, began to understand and correct. Those who resurrect and persist in these mistakes to-day, when there is already a mass Communist Party in Germany, when the camps of revolution and counter-revolution in Germany, as in all the capitalist world, are now clearly defined, unavoidably pass to the camp of the counter-revolution as shown by Brandler, Thalheimer and Trotsky. But at the time when Rosa and Karl lived and worked the situation was different. There was no Communist Party in the Western European countries. Rosa Luxembouré, Karl Liebknecht and other left radicals were fulfilling the revolutionary task of pioneers of the revolutionary struggle in the West at that time, despite their semi-Menshevik mistakes; they were acting against the united front of the opportunists and centrists. For this reason, Lenin, in criticising unwaveringly all the mistakes of Rosa Luxembouré at the time, and during these conditions, criticised her in a friendly way, trying to give her every support with his criticism, to assist her to rectify her line and take the genuine

Marxist road. And we know that Lenin reached his goal, because in the end both Rosa and Karl joined the camp of Communism, the camp of fighters for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This gives the answer to our question : what were the real ideological roots of the Communist International? Its ideological roots are—Leninism. Left radicalism *in the ideological sense*, could add nothing, absolutely nothing positive to what Leninism had given it already. That which distinguished left radicalism from Leninism was taken from Menshevism, and left radicalism could come to the Comintern, only in so far as it forsook its semi-Menshevik mistakes. Leninism, and Leninism alone, revived revolutionary Marxism and developed it still further. It also accepted from the Second International all that was positive in it, and threw aside all that was opportunistic. It gave a positive factor only in the sphere of creating mass political and economic organisations of the working-class, and in the matter of popularising Marxism and its wide dissemination, which unfortunately encountered a temporary degradation of the height of the revolutionary level, which led in the end to the complete collapse of the Second International. To repeat, Leninism was alone in fulfilling its task of reviving and further developing *revolutionary Marxism*; and it fulfilled this task from the very beginning of its inception, laying down the ideological foundation for the Communist International as early as during the epoch of the first Russian revolution.

We have seen that left radicalism did not enter the Communist International as an *independent* tendency, but *in practice*, it has done considerable work *in its time*, since by means of its revolutionary work it helped the wide sections of the Western European working-class movement to throw off the influence of opportunist social-democracy, to mingle with the stream of the Communist movement, under the banner of Leninism. Hence it follows that the task of the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries is not to supplement Lenin with some other teaching, but to master his teachings, developing them in strict agreement with his principles, not retreating from an iota of his principles, and apply them in correspondence with the concrete conditions of time and place; in other words, their main task is to become bolshevised, for now there can be no other Communism but that which fights under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin. All attempts to touch up or re-paint this banner in another colour must be

decisively rejected, and most decisively of all must we reject the newest attempts from the "left" and the right, which have been mentioned above; which try to bring a "new interpretation" into the estimation of the historic rôle of left radicalism.

It is not hard to see where these attempts would lead us, if they were not immediately dragged out by the roots. Comrade Alpari's attempt, to put the blame for the semi-Menshevik mistakes of the left radicals in their heads on to objective conditions, unfavourable to the revolution, may easily drop into right opportunism and capitulation in the face of difficulties, and big difficulties are inevitable. On the other hand, the attempt of Comrade Sauerland to throw into one heap Kautsky the Marxist and Kautsky the renegade, Rosa Luxembourg, Mehring and Karl Liebknecht with the centrists is very closely linked up with, and strongly reinforces all kinds of "left" deviations.

But these attempts can not only harmfully affect the ideological condition of our Parties; at the same time they throw up barriers which prevent the influx of the radicalising social-democratic workers to the camp of Communism. Indeed, what sort of conclusion can these social-democratic workers arrive at from Comrade Alpari's theory? Only one. The Otto Bauer conclusion. If everything depends solely upon objective conditions, then since the Bolsheviks themselves say that in the objective conditions of the Western European countries greater difficulties stand in the way in connection with the seizure of power by the proletariat, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat than stood in the way of late Tsarist Russia, then the Russian way, however it may be valued, is not possible for the Western European proletariat. And what sort of conclusion can the social-democratic workers come to from the philosophic excursion of Comrade Sauerland? After all, just the same. If Leninism has no roots in the Western European socialist movement of the epoch of the Second International, then Leninism is a purely "Moscow" product, which is absolutely uneatable for the workers of other countries. Thus, both attempts to revise Leninism "just a little," the attempt from the "left" and that from the right, lead equally to the opportunist Rome. But our Parties will allow no one to drag them into the slough of opportunism. They will go forward under the banner of Leninism, and under this banner will be victorious.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF KARL MARX

IN accordance with the decision of the XIIth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. to carry on a wide campaign for the popularisation of Marxism-Leninism in connection with the fiftieth anniversary of the death of the great teacher and leader of the working-class, Karl Marx (March 14th, 1933), the editors of the "Communist International" are commencing the publication of certain documents from the literary heritage of Marx and Engels in the possession of the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of the C.C. C.P.S.U. with this issue, and various essays dealing with the activity of the founder of scientific Communism and the originator of the international Communist movement, Karl Marx.

The further intensification of the world economic crisis in the period of the end of the relative stabilisation of capitalism, the growth of the revolutionary upsurge, the successes of the Communist Parties in capitalist countries among the working masses and especially the victorious march of socialism in the Soviet Union, are all practical and theoretical victories of Marxism, which re-compel its enemies to disguise themselves as "Marxists."

Certain social-democratic leaders are already beginning to talk of the "two Marxist parties," so that thereby they can surround their anti-worker policy with a "Marxist" cloak. Just as there could not be two Marxisms, there cannot be two Marxist parties. In Marxism, the *most important point* was, and is, the teachings on the *historic rôle of the proletariat*, which consists of the winning of the proletarian dictatorship, as the preliminary condition to the liquidation of all classes, and the construction of classless society. This historic rôle of the proletariat was first carried out by the Party of the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin, who alone consistently continued the work of Marx and Engels, the creator of Leninism—"the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions," and continues to be carried out under the leadership of Stalin, the best disciple and follower of Lenin, in the field of the theory and practice of the proletarian revolution and socialist construction. There is no other Marxism in our epoch but Marxism-Leninism, and all attempts on the part of social-democracy to lay claim to the teachings of Marx which they have "criticised" and "refuted," falsified and betrayed; both in its various parts, and as a whole, is nothing but a new attempt of social-democracy to trick the working-class, in the interests of the bourgeoisie, in the circumstances of the transition to a new cycle of revolutions and wars.

The sections of the Comintern must remember that the struggle of the working-class for freedom

does not take place in two forms—the political and economic—but in three forms—the political, economic and *theoretical* struggle, that the power and invincibility of the Communist movement consists precisely in this combination of all these forms of struggle.

The fiftieth anniversary of the death of Marx must be utilised for the widest propaganda of the rich heritage of Marx-Engels-Lenin, for the strengthening of the theoretical sector of the class struggle, in this way strengthening also the two other sectors of the front: the political and economic struggle. The greater the efforts applied to the inculcation of the teachings of Marx among the working masses, the more powerful will become the force which deals a deadly blow at capitalism.

THE EDITORS.

Questionnaire for Workers

On April 20th, 1880, a "Questionnaire for Workers" (Enquête Ouvrière) was published in the French magazine "La Revue Socialiste." As is evident from Marx's Letter to Sorge, dated November 5th, 1880, this questionnaire was drawn up by Karl Marx. In addition to publishing it in "La Revue Socialiste" the editors of that magazine published it as a separate leaflet which was widely distributed all over France. The Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute has no information as yet as to what were the results of this enquiry.

Since the time it was issued the questionnaire has been forgotten, it was never translated into any other language, or republished in France; and yet it is one of the last works of Marx, written in the last years of his life. Its contents are of great interest to the international labour movement of the present day.—MARX-ENGELS-LENIN INSTITUTE.

NO Government (whether monarchical or republican-bourgeois) has ever dared to conduct a serious enquiry into the condition of the French working-class. But, on the other hand, how many enquiries have there not been into agricultural, financial, industrial, commercial and political crises!

The infamies of capitalist exploitation revealed through the official investigation of the English Government, and the legal consequences arising from these revelations: (limitation to ten hours of the legal working day, laws limiting the labour of women and children, etc. . . .) have rendered the French bourgeoisie even more fearful of the dangers which an impartial and systematic enquiry might present.

Pending the time when we shall be able to induce the republican Government to imitate the monarchical Government of England by opening up a huge enquiry into the deeds and misdeeds of capitalist exploitation, we shall try, with the feeble means at our disposal, to begin one ourselves. We hope to receive in this task the support of all the town and country workers, who understand that they alone can describe, with full insight, the ills they endure; that they alone, and not any saving Providence, can apply energetically remedies for this social poverty from which they suffer. We are counting, too, upon socialists of all schools who, desiring a social reform, must desire an *exact* and *positive* knowledge of the conditions of labour and of existence of the working-class—the class to which the future belongs.

This *Collection of Labour Data* is the first task imposed upon the socialist democracy in its preparation for the social renovation.

The following hundred questions are the most important ones. The answers must bear the number corresponding to the questions. It is not necessary to answer all the questions; but we recommend that answers be as full and as detailed as possible. The name of the working man or woman answering will not be published unless specially authorised, but it must be given, together with the address, so that he or she may be communicated with if necessary.

The answers must be sent to the manager of the *Revue Socialiste*, Monsieur Lecluse, 28 Rue Royale à Saint Cloud, près Paris.

The answers will be classified and will furnish the materials for special monographs which will be published in the *Revue Socialiste* and, later on, in volume form.

I.

1. What is your trade?
2. Does the workshop in which you work belong to one capitalist or to a company of shareholders? Give the names of the capitalist *employers* or of the directors of the company.
3. Give the number of persons employed.
4. Give their age and sex.
5. What is the youngest age at which children (boys or girls) are admitted?
6. Give the number of supervisors and other employees who are not ordinary wage-earners.
7. Are there any apprentices? How many?
8. Apart from the workers employed ordinarily and regularly, are there others who come in from outside at certain times?
9. Does your employers' firm work exclusively or chiefly for local customers? For the home market in general?—or for foreign export?
10. Is the workshop situated in town or country? Name the place.

11. If your workshop is situated in the country, does your industrial labour suffice to keep you alive? Or must you combine it with agricultural labour?

12. Is your work done by hand or with the aid of machinery?

13. Give details of the division of labour in your industry.

14. Is steam employed as motive power?

15. Give a list of the rooms in which the different branches of the industry are practised. Describe the special function in which you are employed; tell us not only what you do technically, but also what this imposes upon you in the way of muscular and nervous fatigue, and what is its general effect upon the health of the workers.

16. Describe the sanitary conditions of the workshop; the dimensions of the rooms; the space allotted to each worker; the ventilation, temperature, the lime-whiting of the walls; the lavatories; general cleanliness; noise of machinery; metallic dust; dampness, etc.

17. Is there any municipal or governmental supervision of the sanitary condition of the workshops?

18. In your industry, are there any specially deleterious matters given off* which engender specific diseases among the workers?

19. Is the workshop overcrowded with machinery?

20. Is the motive power, the power transmission apparatus, and the machinery fenced off in such a way as to prevent any accident?

21. Give a list of the accidents which have occurred in your personal experience.

22. If you work in a mine, give a list of the precautionary measures taken by your employer to insure ventilation, and to prevent explosions and other dangerous accidents.

23. If you work in a factory producing chemical products, or metallic objects, or in any industry attended with special dangers, make a list of the precautionary measures taken by your employer.

24. What method of lighting is used in your workshop (gas, paraffin, etc.)?

25. Are there adequate means of escape in case of fire?

26. In case of accident, is the employer *legally* obliged to compensate the worker or his family?

27. If not, has he ever compensated those who have met with misfortune while working to enrich him?

28. Is there a medical service in your workshop?

29. If you work at home, describe the condition of your workroom. Do you use tools or small machines? Are you assisted by your children or by other persons (adults or children, males or females)?

* In the original "emanations"—dust, hairs, fumes, germs, etc.

Do you work for private customers or for a contractor? Do you deal directly with him or through an intermediary?

30. Give a list of the hours of daily work, and the days of work during the week.

31. Give a list of public holidays during the year.

32. What breaks are there in the day's work?

33. Are meals taken at definite intervals or irregularly? Are they taken inside or outside the workshop?

34. Does any work go on during mealtimes?

35. If steam is employed, when is it turned on, when is it shut off?

36. Is there any night work?

37. Give a list of the hours of work of children and young persons below sixteen years of age.

II.

38. Are there shifts of children and young persons replacing one another during the hours of work?

39. Are the laws on child labour enforced by the Government or by the municipality? Do the employers submit to them?

40. Are there schools for the children and young persons employed in your trade? If there are, what are the school hours? Who conducts them? What is taught therein?

41. Where there is night and day work, what is the system of shifts?

42. What is the usual overtime during periods of great industrial activity?

43. Are the machines cleaned by workers specially engaged for this work? Or are they cleaned without cost by the workers employed at the machines during their day's work?

44. What are the rules about, and fines for, lateness? When does the day's work begin? When does it begin again after meals?

45. What time do you spend in going to the workshop and in returning home?

III.

46. What contracts do you sign with your employer? Are you engaged by the day?—by the week?—by the month, etc.?

47. What are the conditions laid down for giving and receiving notice?

48. In the case of a broken contract, when the employer is at fault, what is his penalty?

49. When the worker is at fault, what is his penalty?

50. If there are apprentices what are the terms of their contract?

51. Is your work regular or irregular?

52. In your trade is there work only at certain seasons, or is the work, normally, distributed more or less evenly throughout the whole year? If you work only at certain seasons, how do you live in the interval?

53. Are you paid by time, or by the piece?

54. If you are paid by time, are you paid by the hour or by the day?

55. Are there extra wages for extra work? What are they?

56. If your wages are paid by the piece, how is the rate determined? If you are employed in industries in which the work executed is measured by quantity or weight, as is the case in the mines, does your employer (or do his substitutes) try by means of trickery to swindle you of part of your earnings?

57. If you are paid by the piece, do they use the quality of the article as a pretext for fraudulent deduction from your wages?

58. Whether you are paid by the piece or by time, when are you paid? In other words, for how long do you extend credit to your master before receiving the price of the labour performed? Are you paid after a week, a month, etc.?

59. Have you noticed that the delay in the payment of your wages obliges you to have frequent recourse to the pawnshop—paying there a high rate of interest, and depriving yourself of things you need—to run up debts at the shopkeepers', becoming their prey because you are their debtor? Do you know of cases where workers have lost their wages by the bankruptcy of their bosses?

60. Are wages paid directly by the boss or by intermediaries (gang masters, butties, etc.)?

61. If wages are paid by gang masters or other intermediaries, what are the terms of your contract?

62. What is the rate of your wage in money by the day and by the week?

63. What are the wages of women and children co-operating with you in the same workshop?

64. In your workshop, what was the highest wage for day work during the last month?

65. What was the highest wage for piece-work during the last month?

66. What was your wage during the same time? And if you have a family, what were the wages of your wife and children?

67. Are wages paid entirely in money or otherwise?

68. If your employer lets you your domicile, what are the conditions? Does he deduct the rent from your wages?

69. *What are the prices of necessary objects, such as:*

(a) Rent of your dwelling-place, conditions of tenancy, the number of rooms comprising it, and of persons living in it; repairs; insurance; buying and upkeep of furniture; heating, lighting, water, etc.

(b) Food—bread, meat, vegetables, potatoes, etc., milk, eggs, fish, butter, oil, lard, sugar, salt, groceries, coffee, chicory, beer, cider, wine, etc., tobacco.

- (c) Clothing for parents and children ; laundry, cleaning, baths, soap, etc.
- (d) Miscellaneous expenses : delivery of letters ; loans and deposits at the pawnbroker's, children's school expenses, apprenticeship, newspapers, books, etc. ; contributions to trade union, clubs and friendly societies, etc.
- (e) Expenses, if any, occasioned by the exercise of your trade.
- (f) Rates and taxes.
70. Try to set out a weekly and an annual budget of your income and of that of your family ; of your weekly and annual expenditure.
71. Have you noticed during your personal experience, that the price of the objects necessary for life (such as food, lodging, etc.) has risen more than have wages ?
72. Enumerate any fluctuations in the rate of wages which you know of.
73. Mention the drops in wages in times of stagnation and industrial crisis.
74. Mention the rises in wages in (so-called) times of prosperity.
75. Mention the interruptions caused to work by changes of methods and by particular and general crises. Describe your own periods of involuntary idleness.
76. Compare the *prices of the articles you produce* or of the services you render, with the price of your toil.
77. Cite cases you have known of workers displaced by the introduction of machinery, or by other improvements.
78. With the development of machinery and of the productivity of labour, have the intensity and duration of labour been increased or diminished ?
79. Do you know of any raising of wages in consequence of this progress of production ?
80. Have you ever known of any ordinary workers who have been able, at the age of 50, to retire and live on the money they have earned in their capacity of wage-earners ?
81. What is, in your trade, the number of years in which a worker of average health can continue to work ?
- IV.
82. Do trade unions* exist in your trade, and how are they conducted ? Send their statutes and regulations.
83. How many strikes have occurred in your trade in the course of your experience ?
84. How long did these strikes last ?
85. Were they general or partial ?
86. Did they aim at a rise in wages or were they made to resist a reduction in wages ; or were they concerned with the length of the working day or were they prompted by other motives ?
87. What were their results ?
88. Give details of the action of the arbitrators.
89. Has your trade supported strikes of workers belonging to other trades ?
90. Give details of the regulations and penalties established by your employer for the government of his wage-earners.
91. Have there been coalitions of employers to impose wage reductions ; to extend or intensify labour ; to hinder strikes ; and, generally, to impose their will ?
92. Do you know of cases where the Government has misused the armed forces, putting them at the service of the employers against their wage workers ?
93. Do you know of cases in which the Government has intervened to protect the workers against the exactions of the masters and their illegal† coalitions ?
94. Does the Government carry out against the masters the existing laws on labour ? Do its inspectors fulfil their duty ?
95. Do there exist in your workshop societies for mutual aid in cases of accident, illness, death, temporary incapacity for work, old age, etc. ? Send their statutes and regulations.
96. Is the entrance to these societies voluntary or compulsory ? Are the funds exclusively under the control of the workers ?
97. If the contributions are compulsory and under the control of the masters, do they deduct them from your wages ? Do they pay interest on the sums retained ? Are they returned to the worker when he gives notice or is sacked ? Do you know of cases in which workers have benefited from so-called saving clubs controlled by the bosses, whose capital is made up of levies upon the wages of the workers ?
98. Are there co-operative societies in your trade ? How are they run ? Do they employ workers from outside in the same way as the capitalists do ? Send their statutes and regulations.
99. Are there in your trade workshops where the remuneration of the workers is paid partly under the name of wages and partly under the name of a so-called co-partnership in the profits ? Compare the sums received by these workers and those received by the other workers where no so-called co-participation in profits exists. Give a list of the undertakings of the workers living under this system. Can they conduct strikes, etc. ? Or are they merely permitted to be the humble servants of their masters ?
100. What are the general physical, intellectual and moral conditions of the working men and women employed in your trade ?
101. General observations.

END OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

† Illegal in France at this period under laws prohibiting restraint of trade.

*In the original "sociétés de résistance."

Marx's Questionnaire for Workers

By A. S. BERNSTEIN.

THE "Questionnaire for Workers" published in this issue first appeared anonymously in "La Revue Socialiste" in 1880. It is one of those numerous works of Marx which flashed across the pages of the international Press of the time, and were subsequently forgotten. This work will be included in the XV Volume of the Collected Works of Marx and Engels, which is now being prepared for the Press by the Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute of the C.C. C.P.S.U. (b). It is easy to establish the authorship of Marx from his letter to Sorge on November 5th, 1880, where he wrote: "I have drawn up a questionnaire for him (i.e., Malone), which was published first in the 'Revue Socialiste' and then distributed as a separate publication on a large scale throughout France."

The workers' movement in France, which was crushed and driven underground in the first years after the defeat of the Paris Commune, had again begun, at that time, to raise its head. The Marseilles Congress in 1879 marked the first serious victory of the *collectivists* in the French labour movement. The *collectivist* nucleus of the French workers' movement of that time, however, consisted of very heterogeneous elements—the Guesdeists, the left section of the Proudhonists who joined with them, anarchists, Blanquists, Jacobinists. In some strata of the varied composition of the French workers and handicraftsmen of this period, there was still to be found the soil which nourished the roots of various trends of petty bourgeois "socialism" which had been destroyed by the practice of life. The French workers' party, the programme of which was being worked out at this time, was faced with a complex struggle for the final victory of Marxism against the slogans of the Proudhonists, Blanquists and others, which still displayed considerable vitality. This was shown by the later history of the French workers' party, a history full of splits and sharp factional struggles, when, for instance, at one time six definitely formed organisations were fighting for supremacy in the workers' party.

The "questionnaire" emanating from the pen of Marx is a list of a hundred questions addressed to a French worker. These questions were divided into four sections. The first section contains twenty-nine questions concerning the description of the industry and the conditions of labour in it. The second section (question 30 to 45) deals with the working day. The third section (46 to 81) deals with wages and the fourth (82 to 100) with various forms of the struggle

of the working-class for the improvement of the conditions of labour.

The exceptional skill of Marx is not only shown in the selection of the questions, which cover all the problems of the conditions of labour and life of the worker with the greatest completeness, but in the strict concreteness and simplicity of each separate question. Each section contains a number of questions selected and formulated in such a way as to help the rank and file worker, by simple consideration of his experience, to arrive at a decisive condemnation of the capitalist system and all petty-bourgeois illusions. From this point of view the "Questionnaire" is one of the best examples of the irreconcilable struggle of Marx on two fronts.

As a counterpoise to the "ignoring" of the State as preached by Proudhon, and the riotous struggle against the State as practised by Bakunin, Marx gives a series of leading questions which describe the class character of the capitalist State. "Is there municipal or government inspection of the hygienic conditions in the workshops?" (Question 17), "Is the employer forced *by law* to compensate the worker for accidents?" (Question 26), "What penalty does an employer suffer under the law, and what is the penalty for a worker if one of them violates an agreement" (Questions 48 and 49),—such is one type of question. And, finally, is another, more biting: "Does the Government seek to ensure that the existing labour laws will be carried into effect against the interests of the employers? (No. 94). Finally, the question is put directly: "Do you know of cases when the Government has misused armed forces, putting them at the service of employers against their wage workers?" "Do you know of any cases in which the Government has come out in support of the interests of the workers?" (92 and 93). By the simplest consideration of his own experience, the worker must here inevitably come step by step to an understanding of the essence of the capitalist Government.

In reply to the "class collaboration" of Louis Blanc, to the peaceful "mutualism" of Proudhon, to the dreams of Fourier of the solidarity of all classes, Marx demonstrates that the employer, the capitalist, is the fiercest and most determined enemy of the proletariat. This is the basic motive of the questionnaire, which is illustrated by practically every question. There was good reason for placing emphasis, in the first section, on questions dealing with accidents, and the refusal of the employers to spend money on safety devices or the further "compensation" of the workers. There was good reason for demonstrating in the second section—on the working day—all the artificial methods of prolonging the working day—cleaning machines, coming from home to work, and going home, the absence of proper meal intervals, etc. And in the third section—on

wages—the question is asked: “Does your employer use trickery to cheat you out of part of your earnings?” (56 and 57).

The question of whether wages are paid by the day, the week or the month is given in an instructive leading form: “How long do you give credit to your employer before you receive pay for the work which you perform?” (58). The following question (No. 59) is characteristic: “Have you noticed that delays in paying wages force you to go to the pawnshop and pay high interest there, depriving yourself of necessary articles, getting into debt to storekeepers, becoming their victim, because you are their debtor?” And after this, the worker understands that when counting up the absolutely necessary expenditures of his family he must include “loans and payments to the pawnbrokers” (69). In the same form (“Have you noticed”) the worker gets an idea of the dynamics of his *real* wages, of the periodical “unwanted rest” periods in years of crisis (No. 75). Finally, there are two connected synthetic questions: “Did you ever know a rank-and-file worker who, at the age of 50, could give up work and live on the money he had earned?” and “How many years can a worker of average health work in your trade?” (80 and 81). The thing becomes clear. The capitalist is a merciless enemy, persecuting the worker right up to his death. How can there be illusions here? The worker has only one path—the path of battle. But *how* can he fight?

A whole section is devoted to this—the last nineteen questions. These nineteen questions are a classical example of the Marxist leadership of the mass movement, and his irreconcilable struggle on two fronts. How to battle? Mutiny, says the anarchist of the Bakunin school. A conspiracy of the class-conscious minority, says the Blanquist. But Marx pours cold water on them by his first serene question: “Are there resistance societies in your trade, and how are they led? Send their rules and regulations” (82). The last ground is cut from under the feet of the “left” rowdies by question No. 95, on voluntary societies for insurance against accident, sickness, death, old age, the rules of which the questionnaire requests to be sent. Not to split away from the masses, not to rush ahead, to be only “one step ahead” in advance of the mass movement—such is the teaching arising from every one of the questions of Marx. “How many strikes have taken place in your trade during your work in it, how long did they last? what were the results?” (83 and 87). asks the questionnaire quietly. But the next question already leads us forward: “Have there been cases in which strikes in your trade were supported by the workers in other trades?” (89). And the simple and clear questions No. 90-94 take us still further. In replying to them, the workers clearly see the inevitability of the growth of economic strikes into political strikes,

the inevitability of clashes with all the forces of the capitalist Government.

The questions flow one after another, mercilessly striking at the right opportunists. “Tell what you know of the actions of arbitration courts,” says Question 88 with cool irony. Question No. 97 puts the mutual aid societies (which are formed with the participation of the capitalists and under their control) under the microscope: “Do you know of cases,” asks Marx in the same style, “in which the workers obtained any benefit from the so-called pension societies under the control of the employers?” A well-deserved blow is struck at the productive associations of Louis Blanc and Lassalle, which were revived in a still more disgusting form in the theory of Brusse (the leader of possibilism) on “services publiques.” “Are there workshops in your trade in which the workers receive their pay, partly in the form of wages, and partly in the form of so-called participation in the profits? Give the duties of the workers who live under such a régime. Can they strike, etc., or are they only allowed to be faithful servants of the employer?” This consummately put question at once shows up the reactionary rôle of such associations. All such opportunist recipes for peaceful liberation from capitalism are useless. Only a definitely mass revolutionary struggle, by the working-class against the exploiters and their Government, only the dictatorship of the proletariat, can solve the problem.

* * *

The “Questionnaire for Workers” is an excellent example of the masterly skill of the founder of scientific socialism in linking up complex theoretical questions with the practical life and elementary needs of the masses. This example was followed by Lenin, who was able to link up the question of fines and hot water, with the political struggle for the seizure of power and the dictatorship of the working-class. This example was followed by Comrade Stalin, who linked up his Six Historic Points with the struggle for the continued improvement of the living conditions of the proletarian masses. This example of our talented teachers is followed by the Bolshevik Parties of the Communist International.

This forgotten work of Marx has lost none of its meaning to-day, fifty-two years after its first appearance, for the proletarian masses, fighting, and not far from the final victory. On the contrary, it is precisely at the present moment, in the conditions of the most intense crisis of capitalism, of unprecedented exploitation and poverty of the working-class, that every one of the questions put by Marx, and every answer to them, is a clear accusation against the bourgeoisie. The “Questionnaire” of Marx must be made widely known to the workers. The Communists must learn to put questions to the workers as practically and popularly as Marx in this “Questionnaire” we publish.