

**- INTERNATIONAL -**  
**PRESS**  
**CORRESPONDENCE**

Vol 6 No. 77

20th November 1926

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

**The 15th Party Conference of the C. P.  
of the U. S. S. R.**

**The Opposition Bloc and the Situation in the Party.  
Report of Comrade Stalin.**

(Verbatim Report.)

**I. The Stages of Development in the  
Opposition Bloc.**

Comrades, the first question which I much touch upon in my report is the question of the development of the oppositional bloc, the question of the various stages it has passed through, and finally the question of its process of decomposition which has already set in. The discussion of this question is, in my opinion, very necessary, as an introduction to the discussion of those questions which form the actual subject of the theses on the opposition bloc.

As early as the 14th Party Conference comrade Zinoviev gave the signal for the combination of all oppositional tendencies into one united force. The comrades who are present at this conference as delegates may remember the speech delivered by comrade Zinoviev. There can be no doubt that such an appeal was bound to meet with a response among the ranks of the Trotzkyists, who have always been of the opinion that groupings are more or less free, and that they must combine more or less with one another for the purpose of combatting the main line pursued by the Party, the line with which Comrade Trotzky has long been dissatisfied.

This was, in a sense, the preliminary work towards the formation of the bloc.

**THE FIRST STAGE.**

The first step towards the crystallisation of a bloc was taken by the opposition at the time of the April Plenum of the C. C., in connection with the theses of Comrade Rykov on the economic situation. Although perfect harmony did not by any

means reign at that time between the new opposition and the Trotzkyists, still there is no doubt that in all essentials the bloc was already complete. Those comrades who have read the stenographic minutes of the April Plenum will know that this was the case. In all essentials the two groups were at one, but there were still some reservations, so that they did not propose joint amendments to the theses of Comrade Rykov on behalf of the whole Opposition, but two parallel series of amendments. The one series emanated from the "new opposition", headed by Kamenew, and the other from the Trotzky group. It is, however, an incontestable fact that both groups substantially represented the same standpoint, and that the Plenum stated at the time that they were restoring the August bloc in a new form.

What were the reservations made at that time?

At that time Comrade Trotzky made the following statement:

"In my opinion the fault with Comrade Kamenew's amendments is that they treat the question of differentiation among the peasantry as being to a certain extent independent of industrialisation, whilst in reality the importance, the social significance, and the rate of peasant differentiation is determined by the growth and speed of industrialisation in relation to the whole of the peasantry."  
A fairly important reservation.

In reply to this Kamenew brought forward a reservation against the Trotzkyists:

"I cannot agree" — he stated — "with that part (of Trotzky's amendments to Rykov's draft of the resolution) which contains an estimate of the past economic policy of the Party, which I have defended to 100 per cent."

*Comrade Stalin's Theses on the Opposition Bloc appear on page 1330.*

The New Opposition was not pleased to have Comrade Trotsky criticise the economic policy which Comrade Kamenev had conducted in the period just past. And on the other hand Comrade Trotsky was not pleased that the New Opposition separated the question of differentiation from that of industrialisation.

### THE SECOND STAGE.

The second stage was the July Plenum of the C. C. At this Plenum we could already observe a formally united bloc, a bloc without reservations. The reservations regarding Comrade Trotsky were withdrawn, put aside ad acta, and with them the reservations regarding Comrade Kamenev. A joint "declaration" was made, known to you all as an anti-Party document. What are the characteristic features of the second stage of development of the oppositional bloc?

In this period the bloc crystallised, not only on the basis of a mutual abstention from amendments, but on the basis of a mutual "amnesty". It was during this period that we heard Comrade Zinoviev's interesting declaration that the Opposition, the main centre of the Opposition since 1923, that is, the Trotskyists, had been right in the question of the degeneration of the Party, that is, in the main question of the practical standpoint of Trotskyism, corresponding to its fundamental standpoint. And we remember, too, the not less interesting declaration from Comrade Trotsky, that his "Lessons of October" — directed especially against Kamenev and Zinoviev as the "Right wing" of the Party, now repeating their errors of October 1917 — were an error, and that the point of departure of the Right deviation in the Party, the point of departure of the degeneration, was not to be sought in Kamenev and Zinoviev, but, let us say, in Stalin.

In July of this year Comrade Zinoviev made the following statement:

"We state that there is no doubt that the main centre of the opposition of 1923, as is proved by the line taken by the leading fraction (that is, by the majority of the C. C.), gave a justified warning of the danger of deviating from the proletarian line, and of the growing regime of the apparatus."

In other words, Comrade Zinoviev's recent assertions, and the resolution passed by the XIII. Party Congress, to the effect that Trotsky was revising Leninism, and that Trotskyism represents a petty bourgeois deviation — all these assertions are an error, a misunderstanding, and the chief danger is not Trotskyism, but the C. C.

This "amnesty" for Trotskyism shows a conspicuous lack of principle.

On the other hand, Trotsky declared in July:

"In the 'Lessons of October' I admittedly connected the names of Zinoviev and Kamenev with the opportunist deviations in policy. Experience of the ideological struggle in the C. C. have shown this to have been a great error. The explanation of this error is the fact that I had had no opportunity of following the ideological struggle among the seven leaders, and to ascertain at that time that the opportunist deviations were produced by the group led by Comrade Stalin against comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev."

This means that Comrade Trotsky abandons the "Lessons of October", which made such a sensation, and gives an "amnesty" to Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev in exchange for the "amnesty" which he has received from Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev. A direct and unprincipled bargain!

Hence: abandonment of the reservations made in April, and a reciprocal amnesty at the expense of the principles of the Party. These are elements enabling the bloc to become crystallised as a bloc against the Party.

### THE THIRD STAGE.

The third stage in the development of the bloc was its open opposition to the Party at the end of September and the beginning of October of this year, in Moscow and Leningrad. This was the period in which the leaders of the bloc, having recuperated in the South and gathered together their forces, returned to the Centre and prepared a direct attack upon the Party. Before passing from illegal to open forms of opposition, they appeared, it transpires (I was not in Moscow at the time),

in the Polit Bureau and declared: "We shall show you; we shall go to the workers' meetings, and the workers may tell you who is right."

Now they began to go from nucleus to nucleus. The results of this action were, however, quite lamentable for the Opposition, as you will know. They suffered defeat. We know from the press that the oppositional bloc received a decided rebuff from the members of the Party, both in Moscow and Leningrad, and both in the industrial and the non-industrial districts of the Soviet Union. The number of votes which they received, and the number of members who declared in favour of the C. C., need not be repeated here, as they will be known to you from the press. One thing is certain, the Opposition bloc found that it had considerably miscalculated.

From this moment onwards the Opposition began its change of front, and strove to make peace with the Party. The defeat of the opposition was thus not in vain. On 4. October the opposition made its declaration of peace to the C. C., and we heard for the first time, after so many attacks and reproaches, words worthy of Party fighters. That it was high time to end the "inner-Party conflict" and to begin "joint work".

The opposition has been forced by its defeat to do what it has frequently called upon the C. C. to do: to call for peace within the Party.

It need not be said that the C. C. — faithful to the instructions of the 14th Party Conference on the necessity of unity — gladly agreed to the propositions of the opposition, though aware that these were not quite sincere.

### THE FOURTH STAGE.

The fourth stage is the period during which the leaders of the Opposition elaborated their "declaration" of 16. October of this year. This declaration is generally designated as a capitulation. I shall not employ any sharp designation. But at least it is clear that the declaration does not speak of the victory of the Opposition, but of its defeat. I need not go over our negotiations. The negotiations have been stenographed, and anyone can refer to the stenographed minutes.

I should, however, like to mention one incident. The Opposition bloc proposed to state, in the first paragraph of its declaration, that it held to its old standpoint, and not simply held to it, but held to it "completely". We induced the opposition bloc to abstain from this. Why? For two reasons:

In the first place because the very fact that the oppositional leaders abandon fractional activity, and with it the theory and practice of the liberty to form fractions, and the fact that they leave the line of Ossovsky, of the "workers' opposition", and of the Maslov-Fischer-Urbahns group, mean at the same time that the opposition abandons not only the fractional methods of struggle, but its political views. Is it then still possible to state that the opposition bloc holds "completely" to its erroneous views, and to its ideological standpoint? It is naturally impossible to do so.

In the second place, we endeavoured to make it clear to the Opposition that it would be disadvantageous to themselves to proclaim that they are holding completely to their old standpoint, for the workers would then rightly say that the Opposition intend continuing their struggle against the Party, it follows that their beating has not been severe enough, and they must be beaten further. (Laughter, and: Hear, hear!)

The Opposition did not, however, accept our proposal. They agreed to leave out the word "completely", but retained the sentence stating that they held to their old views. Having thus made their bed, let them lie on it. (Voices: Hear, Hear.)

### LENIN AND THE QUESTION OF THE FORMATION OF BLOCS WITHIN THE PARTY.

Comrade Zinoviev recently observed that the C. C. had no reason to condemn the bloc of the Opposition, since Lenin is alleged to have approved of the formation of blocs within the Party. I must declare, comrades, that Comrade Zinoviev's statement has nothing in common with Lenin's viewpoint. Lenin never approved of the formation of blocs as such in the Party. Lenin was solely in favour of the formation of blocs defending the principles of revolution against the Mensheviks, against the

liquidators and Otsovists. Anti-Party blocs, which had lost sight of the Party principles, were invariably combatted by Lenin.

Is it not known to all of you that Lenin combatted Trotzky's August bloc, as an anti-Party-principle bloc, for three years, until he won the complete victory? Lenin was never in favour of the formation of blocs. Lenin was only in favour of Party blocs based on real principles and aiming at strengthening the Party against the liquidators, against the Mensheviks, and against all vacillating elements. The history of our Party gives us the example of such a bloc formed by the Leninists and Plechanovists (in 1911/12) against the bloc of liquidators, at the time when the August bloc was formed against the Party. Potressov and other liquidators, Alexinsky and other Otsovists, belonged to this bloc, at the head of which stood Comrade Trotzky. Thus at that time there was an anti-Party bloc, adventurist and without principles, and there was another bloc, that between the Leninists and the Plechanovists or revolutionary Mensheviks (at that time Plechanov was a revolutionary Menshevik). Lenin always acknowledged blocs of this description, and we all recognise them.

If a bloc within the Party strengthens its fighting capacity and drives the Party forward, then we are in favour of such a bloc. Comrades of the Opposition, has your bloc increased the fighting capacity of the Party? Is your bloc founded on real principles? What are the principles uniting you, for instance, with the Medvedyev group? What principles unite you, let us say, with the Souvarine group in France or the Maslov group in Germany? What principles unite the New Opposition, which not so long ago regarded Trotzkyism as a species of Menshevism, with the Trotzkyists, so lately designated by the New Opposition as opportunists? And then, Comrades of the Opposition, is your bloc aiming at a goal likely to benefit the Party, or is it not directed against the Party? Has it increased the fighting capabilities and the revolutionary energy of our Party by one iota? Today the whole world knows that during the six or eight months of your existence your endeavour has been to drag the Party back into the "revolutionary" phrase, to lack of principle; to disintegrate the Party; to paralyse and split it.

No comrades, the opposition bloc has nothing whatever in common with that bloc formed by Lenin in 1912 against the August bloc of the opportunists. On the contrary. The present opposition bloc reminds us more of Trotzky's August bloc, both as regards its lack of principle and its opportunist basis.

The comrades of the Opposition, in forming their bloc, departed from the fundamental line which Lenin endeavoured to lay down. Lenin always told us that a right policy must be based on principles. The Opposition, which has formed itself into a group, has however adopted the standpoint that a right policy is one without principles.

Such an opposition cannot live long, it is bound speedily to decay.

These are the various stages of development passed through by the oppositional bloc.

### THE PROCESS OF DISINTEGRATION OF THE OPPOSITION BLOC.

How is the present state of the opposition bloc best described? It can be described as a state of decay, a state of gradual crumbling away of its constituents, a state of decomposition in the bloc. This is the only correct description of the present state of the bloc. And this is only right, for an opportunist bloc, without principles, cannot exist long in our Party. We already know that the Maslov-Urbahns group no longer belongs to the bloc. Yesterday we heard that Medvedyev and Schlyapnikov have abandoned their errors and left the bloc. We are also aware that within the bloc itself, that is, between the "new" and the "old" oppositions, there is a disunity which is bound to become apparent at this conference.

We thus see that these comrades have organised a bloc with much pomp and circumstance, but that its results have been entirely opposite to those which they anticipated. According to the rules of arithmetic, they should have gained a plus, since every addition yields a plus, but they forget that besides the rules of arithmetic there are rules of algebra, according to which not every addition yields a plus (Laughter), since the

calculation does not depend solely on the addition of the separate items, but on the signs placed before the items to be added. (Prolonged applause.)

We see that though they were good at arithmetic, the Opposition are weak in algebra, and their combination of forces has not merely failed to enlarge their army, but has reduced it to a minimum, and caused it to fall to pieces.

What was the strength of the Zinoviev group?

Its strongest point was that it carried on a determined struggle against the fundamentals of Trotzkyism. But as soon as the Zinoviev group abandoned its fight against Trotzkyism, it cut off the source of its power with its own hand.

What was the strength of the Trotzky group?

The strongest point of this group has been its energetic fight against the errors committed by Zinoviev and Kamenev in October 1917, and against a repetition of these errors. But as soon as this group abandoned its fight against the deviations of Zinoviev and Kamenev, it too quenched the sources of its own power.

The bloc was thus a combination of forces which had been negated. (Applause.) It is plain that the sole result could be confusion, and it is plain that the sincerest elements of the Zinoviev group felt bound to leave it, and the best of the Trotzkyists separated themselves from the Trotzky group.

### WHAT IS THE OPPOSITION BLOC CALCULATING UPON?

What are the prospects of the opposition? What do they reckon upon? I believe they are calculating upon worsened conditions in the country and in the Party. For the moment they cease all fractional work, for they have come upon "hard" times. But if they do not renounce their fundamental standpoint, if they cling fast to their old views, then this means that they are waiting for "better times", when it will be possible for them to muster their forces and attack the Party once more. Not long ago a comrade from the Opposition, comrade Andreyev, a worker who recently came over to the side of the Party, related amazing things about the plans of the Opposition, of which, in my opinion the Conference should be informed. At the October Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. Comrade Yaroslavsky referred to this matter as follows:

"Comrade Andreyev, after working in the Opposition for a long time, came to the conclusion that he could not work with the opposition any longer. He was driven to this conclusion chiefly by the fact that he heard two things with reference to the Opposition. Firstly, that the Opposition objected to the "reactionary" mood in the working class, and secondly, that the economic situation was not so bad as they had thought."

I am of the opinion that Comrade Andreyev, a former member of the Opposition, but an adherent of the Party today, here stated openly what the Opposition has most at heart, but will not declare openly.

The Opposition apparently feel that the economic situation is better than they had imagined, and that the workers are not so dissatisfied as they had thought, that is, they are "reactionary". It is this that has induced them to the policy of ceasing "work".

It is certain that if the economic situation should become less favourable — and the Opposition is convinced that this will happen — and the workers become less satisfied in consequence — of which the Opposition is equally convinced —, then they will not hesitate to take up "work" again, and will once more unfurl the banner of that ideological standpoint which they have abandoned, and resume their open struggle against the Party.

This then is the possible future of the oppositional bloc which is now falling into decay, but not yet decayed, and not soon likely to fall into decay unless combatted energetically and relentlessly by the Party.

But if the Opposition is preparing for the struggle, and awaiting "better times" for resuming its open conflict against the Party, the Party must not remain inactive. The following tasks arise for the Party: It must carry on an energetic ideological campaign against the erroneous ideological views insisted on by the Opposition, it must unmask the opportunist character of these oppositional ideas, however revolutionary their phraseology may appear, and force the Opposition to abandon their errors out of fear of complete annihilation.

## II. The Fundamental Errors of the Opposition Bloc.

Comrades, I now come to the second question, the question of the fundamental error made by the oppositional bloc in the most important question of all, that of the character and future of our Revolution.

The main point dividing the Party from the opposition bloc is the question: **Is the victory of Socialism possible in our country?** Or, in other words: **What is the character, and what are the prospects, of our revolution?**

Comrades, this question is not new. It was raised among others at the April Conference in 1925, and at the XIV. Party conference. Now it turns up again under new circumstances, and we must deal with it in detail. And as Comrades Trotsky and Kamenev complained at the last joint plenary session of the C. C. and the C. C. C. that their views had been incorrectly stated in the theses on the opposition bloc, I shall be obliged to quote in this report a large number of documents confirming the main assertions of the theses. I apologise for this in advance, comrades, but cannot avoid it.

We are faced by three questions:

Firstly: is the victory of Socialism possible in our country, in consideration of the fact that at the present time our country is the only one ruled by a proletarian dictatorship, that the proletarian revolution has not yet been victorious in other countries, and the speed of the world's revolution has slowed down?

Secondly: If this victory is possible, can we call it a complete victory, a final victory?

Thirdly: If this victory cannot be called final, what prerequisites are necessary to render it a final victory?

These are three questions involved in the general question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country, that is, in our country.

### PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS.

How was this question regarded by earlier Marxists, in the forties of last century for instance, and in the fifties and sixties? At that time the monopolist development of capitalism had not yet come about, the law of the unequal development of capitalism had not yet been discovered, and could not have been discovered, so that the question of the victory of Socialism in one country was not so important as it is now. All Marxists, from Marx and Engels onwards, were at that time of the opinion that it was impossible for Socialism to be victorious in one single country; they considered it necessary for the revolution to take place simultaneously in a number of countries, at least in a number of the most advanced and civilised countries. And at that time this was right.

A characteristic passage from Engels' draft on the "Principles of Communism" will best show his clear presentation of the question. This draft afterwards served as a basis for the "Communist Manifesto". It was written in the year 1847. This draft was not published until a few years ago; it contains the following passage:

Question: Will this revolution (that is, the proletarian revolution. J. St.) be capable of being carried out in one single country, alone?

Reply: No; big industry, in creating the world markets, has brought all the peoples of the earth, especially the civilised peoples, into such close connection with one another that each separate people is dependent upon what occurs among the others. It has further so equalised social development in all civilised countries, that in all these countries bourgeoisie and proletariat form the two decisive classes of society, and the struggle between these two is the chief struggle of the day. **The Communist Revolution will, therefore, not be merely a national one, but a revolution taking place simultaneously in all civilised countries, that is, at least in England, France, Germany, and America.** In each of these countries it will develop at a greater or lesser speed in proportion to the more advanced industry, the greater wealth, or the larger amount of productive forces possessed by one or the other country. The development will therefore

be slowest and most difficult in Germany, quickest and easiest in England. It will react upon the other countries of the world, entirely changing their ordinary course of development and greatly accelerating it. It will be a universal revolution, and will therefore have a universal territory."

This was written in the forties of last century, before monopolist capitalism came into existence. It is characteristic that Russia is not even mentioned here. But this is perfectly comprehensible, for Russia, with its revolutionary proletariat, Russia as a revolutionary force, did not and could not exist at that time.

Was Engels right when he wrote this under the conditions of pre-monopolist capitalism? Does this apply correctly to the period in which it was written? Yes, perfectly.

But is his assertion correct today under the new conditions imposed by monopolist capitalism and the proletarian revolution? No, they no longer, apply.

In the old period, in the pre-monopolist and pre-imperialist period of capitalism, before the globe was divided up amongst various financial groups, before the forcible redistribution of what had already been distributed had become a vital question for capitalism, before the inequality of economic development had become so apparent as it is now, nor could be so apparent, before the inherent contradictions of capitalism had reached a stage converting a once flourishing capitalism into an expiring capitalism, making possible the victory of Socialism in a single country, in this period Engels' formula was indisputably correct.

In the new period, the period of imperialist development, in which the inequality of development in the capitalist countries has become a decisive factor of imperialist conflicts, inevitable conflicts and wars between the capitalists weaken the front of imperialism and enable a breach to be made in this front in some countries, in which the law of unequal development discovered by Lenin has become the point of departure for the theory of the victory of Socialism in a single country, — under these circumstances Engels' old formula is no longer correct, and must inevitably be replaced by another formula stating the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one single country.

Lenin's greatness consisted precisely of the fact that in developing the teachings of Marx and Engels he never became the slave of the letter of Marxism. He was a follower of Marx in a true sense, for he never forgot what Marx himself repeated so often: that Marxism is no dogma, but a rule of guidance for action. Lenin recognised this fully, and in distinguishing strictly between the letter and the essence of Marxism, he never succumbed to the error of regarding Marxism as a dogma, but made it his endeavour to adapt Marxism, as the fundamental method, to the new conditions imposed by capitalist evolution. Lenin's greatness consisted precisely in his fearless ability to raise the question of the necessity of proletarian revolution in the separate countries, without asking whether the opportunists of all countries would cling to the old formulas in the hope of concealing their opportunist action behind the names of Marx and Engels.

On the other hand, it would be absurd to demand of Marx and Engels, great thinkers as they were, that they should, 50 or 60 years before the development of monopolist capitalism, predict with perfect accuracy every possibility of the proletarian class struggle during the period of monopolist imperialist capitalism.

This is not the only case in which Lenin, with the aid of the Marxist method, developed the teachings of Marx and Engels without clinging to the letter of Marxism. Another similar case is that regarding the dictatorship of the proletariat. It will be known to you that Marx expressed the idea that the dictatorship of the proletariat represents a necessary stage towards the development of Socialism in the countries of the Continent, a means for shattering the old State apparatus and creating the new apparatus of the new proletarian state, and that he considered an exception possible in the case of England and America, since, in his opinion, militarism and bureaucratism were but little developed in these countries, or not at all, so that here there might be the possibility of another mode of transition to Socialism, a "peaceful" transition. This was true for the seventies of last century.

Comrade Ryasonov: Even at that time it was not true!

Comrade Stalin: I believe that this statement was perfectly true for the seventies, when militarism was not so developed in England and America as was the case later. You could have convinced yourself of the correctness of the statement by a reference to the chapter on this subject in Lenin's pamphlet on: "Taxation in kind", in which he considers the development of Socialism by means of an agreement between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie to have been possible in England in the seventies, in a country where the proletariat forms the majority, where the bourgeoisie is used to proceeding by way of compromise and where militarism and bureaucratism were still weak.

But a statement applicable to the conditions of the seventies of the last century is now no longer applicable in the present period of imperialism, when England is no less bureaucratic or militarist than any other country, and is even more militarist than any country of the Continent. In this same connection Lenin observes in his pamphlet: "The State and Revolution", that the limitations made by Marx with reference to the Continent no longer apply, since new conditions have arisen cancelling the exception made in the case of England.

It was part of Lenin's greatness that he was no slave to the letter, that he grasped the actual essence of Marxism, and developed as a Marxist the theses of Marx and Engels.

This, comrades, is the way in which one must deal with the question of the possibility of the victory of the revolution in separate countries in the pre-imperialist and pre-monopolist period of capitalism.

### LENINISM OR TROTZKYISM?

Lenin was the first Marxist to submit imperialism to a really Marxist analysis as the latest and last phase of capitalism, to point out the new aspects of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in individual capitalist countries, and to offer a positive solution of the problem. I may remind you of Lenin's pamphlet on "Imperialism", of his article on: "The slogan of the United States of Europe", published in 1915. I may remind you of the polemical debate between Lenin and Trotzky on the slogan of the United States of Europe as opposed to that of the United States of the World, at the time when Lenin first issued his theses on the possibility of the victory of Socialism in a single country. In this article Lenin wrote as follows:

"The slogan of the 'United States of the World' would scarcely be correct as an independent slogan, for in the first place it would merge in Socialism, and in the second it would give rise to erroneous ideas as to the impossibility of the victory of Socialism in one country, and on the relations between such a country and the other countries.

The inequality of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism; consequently the victory of Socialism in a few or even one single capitalist country at first, is possible. The victorious proletariat of this country, after having expropriated the capitalists and organised socialist production, would rise up against the surrounding capitalist world, winning over the oppressed classes of the other countries, bringing about the insurrection of these classes against the capitalists, and proceeding, if necessary, with military force against the exploiting classes and their States."

For:

"a free association of the nations under Socialism is impossible without a more or less prolonged and tenacious struggle between the Socialist Republics and the other States."

This was written by Lenin in 1915.

What is this law, the law of the unequal development of capitalism, the effects of which under imperialist conditions lead to the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one single country?

When Lenin spoke of this law, his starting point was that the old pre-monopolist capitalism had already developed into imperialism; that world economics are now developing under the conditions imposed by the fierce struggle among the leading imperialist groups for new territory, for markets, for raw materials, etc.; that the division of the world into spheres of influence held by various imperialist groups has already been concluded; that the development of the capitalist countries is not proceeding regularly, but jerkily owing to the supplanting of

countries at one time in the front rank, or by the rise of new countries to a leading position; that this manner of evolution is bound to lead to conflicts and wars among the capitalist countries for the redistribution of the world already distributed; that these conflicts lead to a weakening of imperialism; that the international fighting front of capitalism is therefore weaker in some places than in others; and that in consequence the victory of Socialism in one single country becomes possible.

Only very recently England marched at the head of all other imperialist countries. Then Germany began to catch up and demanded its place in the sun at the expense of other countries, especially of England. The imperialist war of 1914/18 broke out precisely in connection with this circumstance. Now, after the imperialist war, the United States of America have overtaken all rivals, and have left England and the other European powers far behind. It can hardly be doubted that this circumstance brings with it the danger of fresh great conflicts.

The fact that the imperialist front was broken through in Russia at an opportunity provided by an imperialist war, shows that, under the present conditions of capitalist development, the imperialist chain is not of necessity to be broken through in a country of highly developed industrialisation, but in the country where the chain is weakest, and where the proletariat has a powerful ally against the imperialist power, as the Russian proletariat had in the peasantry. It is quite possible that the next breach will be made in a country where the proletariat possesses a real ally in the great revolutionary freedom movement, as in India for instance.

When Lenin spoke of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one single country, it will be remembered that his sharpest polemics were directed against comrade Trotzky and against the social democrats.

What reply did comrade Trotzky make to the article and theses of Lenin on the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country?

Trotsky wrote at the time (1915) as follows in reply to Lenin's article:

"The sole historical consideration claiming any degree of concreteness in opposing the slogan of the United States was formulated in the Swiss 'Socialdemokrat' (at that time the central organ of the Bolsheviki, in which the above-mentioned article of Lenin's was published. I. St.) in the following sentence: 'The inequality of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism.' From this the 'Socialdemokrat' drew the conclusion that the victory of Socialism in one country is possible, and there is, therefore, no reason to make the dictatorship of the proletariat in every separate country dependent on the formation of the United States of Europe. That capitalist evolution is unequal in different countries is a perfectly incontestable proposition. But this inequality is in itself extremely unequal. The capitalist level of England, Austria, Germany, or France is not the same. But in comparison with Africa and Asia all these countries together form the capitalist 'Europe', ripe for the social revolution. That no single country should 'wait' for the others is an elementary idea whose repetition is useful and necessary, in order to prevent the idea of parallel international action from being substituted by the idea of international waiting inactivity. Without waiting for the other countries, we begin and continue our struggle on a national basis, fully confident that our initiative will give an impetus to the fight in other countries. But should this not be the case, then it is hopeless to suppose — and both historical experience and theoretical consideration prove it to be hopeless — that a revolutionary Russia, for instance, could continue to exist in the face of a conservative Europe, or that a socialist Germany could continue to exist isolated and surrounded by a capitalist world.

Comrade Trotzky wrote this in 1915 in the Paris periodical 'Nashe Slovo' (Our word), and the article was later reprinted in a collection of Comrade Trotzky's articles published for the first time in 1917 under the title of: "The programme of peace".

You will observe that in the two passages quoted, Lenin and Trotzky present two entirely opposing theses. Whilst Lenin is of the opinion that the victory of Socialism is possible in one country, and that the proletariat can not only maintain the power once seized, but can go forward to the expropriation of the capitalists and the organisation of economics, in order

to be able to render efficient help to the proletariats of the capitalist countries, Comrade Trotzky represents the contrary standpoint, that unless a victorious revolution is followed within a very short period by victorious revolutions in other countries, the proletariat will not even be able to retain power (not to speak of organising socialist economics), since it is hopeless to suppose that a revolutionary power can be maintained in Russia in face of a conservative Europe.

These are two fundamentally different views, two fundamentally different attitudes. To Lenin the proletariat, after seizing power, represented a very active and energetic force, organising economics and hastening to the aid of the proletariats of other countries. To Trotzky the proletariat, having once seized power, is a kind of semi-passive force, waiting for immediate outside help in the form of the victory of Socialism in other countries, and living with the Damocles sword of immediate loss of power hanging over its head. And if this immediate victory of Socialism in other countries does not follow, what then? Then we may as well stop working.

It may be said that this difference between Lenin and Trotzky belongs to the past, that in the course of work this difference could have been reduced to a minimum, or have vanished altogether. To be sure it might have diminished to a minimum or vanished altogether. But unfortunately it has done neither the one nor the other. On the contrary, this difference remained in full force until the death of Comrade Lenin. It still exists, as you will see. I maintain that this difference between Lenin and Trotzky, and the polemics on this point, have continued the whole time during which the articles by Lenin and Trotzky on the subject have been published. A secret polemical discussion has been carried on, without mention of names.

I adduce a few facts:

In 1921, when we introduced the NEP, Lenin again raised the question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism, and this time in a more definite form, in the form of the possibility of building up the socialist foundation of our economics under the conditions of the NEP. When the NEP was introduced in 1921, a section of our Party, especially the "workers' opposition" accused Lenin of sweeping Socialism aside with the admittance of the NEP. It was probably in reply to this that Lenin's articles and speeches at that time contained frequent declarations that the introduction of the NEP did not signify any intention on our part to deviate from our path, but is merely another method of attaining our goal under different conditions, and of building up the "socialist foundation of our economics", "in co-operation with the peasantry", "under the leadership of the working class". (See: "Taxation in kind" and other articles by Lenin on the NEP.)

It was as an answer to this, so to speak, that comrade Trotzky published in January 1922, the "Preface" to his book "1905", in which he maintained that the building up of socialism in our country with the aid of the peasantry is impossible of execution, since the life of our country was bound to be on lines leading to hostile encounters between the working class and the peasantry, until the proletariat of the West has been victorious.

Comrade Trotzky's "Preface" contains the following passage:

"The proletariat, having seized power, comes into hostile conflict (The emphasis is mine. J. St.) not only with all those groups of the bourgeoisie from which it received support at the commencement of its revolutionary struggle, but with the broad masses of the peasantry with whose help it has come into power. The contradictions in the position of a workers' government in a backward country with a preponderantly peasant population can only find their solution on an international scale, in the arena of the proletarian world revolution." (Written in 1922.)

Here again two different theses oppose one another. Whilst Lenin allows the possibility of building up the socialist foundation of our economics in co-operation with the peasantry and under the leadership of the working class, Trotzky finds the leadership of the peasantry by the working class, together with the joint building up of the socialist foundation to be incapable of realisation, since the political life of the country will be carried on amidst hostile conflicts between the workers' power and the majority of the peasantry; and these conflicts can only be solved in the arena of the world revolution.

Further, we may refer to a speech made by Lenin a year later, in which he returned again to the question of establishing Socialism in our country. Here he says:

"Socialism is today not a question for the distant future, it is no longer a mere abstraction or sacred emblem. With regard to sacred emblems, we retain our old and very unfavourable opinion of them. We have brought Socialism into our daily lives, and we must learn to apply it. This is the task of today, the task of our epoch. Permit me to conclude my speech by expressing my full confidence that however difficult this task may be, however new in comparison with our former tasks, and however great the difficulties it may bring us, we are going to solve this task at all costs, if not tomorrow, then in a few years, so that the Russia of the NEP may become a socialist Russia.

As a kind of reply to this, or perhaps as an explanation of the statements in the passage from Trotzky quoted above, Comrade Trotzky published in 1922 a "Postscript" to his pamphlet: "The programme of Peace", in which we find the following:

"The assertion made several times in the "Programme of Peace", that the proletarian revolution cannot be completely victorious within the confines of one nation, appears to some readers to be confuted by the five years' experience of our Soviet Union. There is, however, no sufficient reason for such a conclusion. The fact that the workers' state has held its position in one country, against the whole world, and in so backward a country, bears witness to the colossal power of the proletariat, and shows what miracles it could perform in other more advanced and civilised countries. But whilst we have defended our State in a political and military sense, we have not accomplished the establishment of a socialist state of society, we have not even approached it... So long as the bourgeoisie hold power in the other States of Europe, so long we shall be compelled by our struggle against economic isolation to seek an understanding with the capitalist world; and it may be confidently stated that such understandings can at best help us to heal this or that economic wound, to take this or that step forward, but actual progress towards a socialist state of society in Russia is only possible after the victory (the emphasis is mine. J. St.) of the proletariat in the leading countries of Europe.

Here again you will see that the theses of Lenin and of Trotzky are distinctly opposed to one another. Whilst Lenin is of the opinion that we have already brought Socialism into our daily life, and that despite all difficulties it is still possible for us to make a socialist Russia out of the Russia of the NEP, Trotzky believes that until the proletariat has been victorious in other countries we are not only unable to convert the Russia of today into a socialist Russia, but we cannot even accomplish any real progress towards socialist economics.

Finally, we may turn to some references made by Comrade Lenin in his articles on "Co-operation" and "Our Revolution" (against Suchanov), written by Lenin shortly before his death, and forming part of his legacy to us. These references are of special interest here, as they once more deal with the question of the possibility of Socialism in our country, and formulate Lenin's views in a manner which excludes all doubts:

"How infinitely stereotyped, for instance, is their (the heroes of the Second International. J. St.) conclusion, learnt by rote during the development of West European Social Democracy, that we are not yet ripe for Socialism, that we — to use the terminology employed by the "learned" gentlemen among them — have not yet arrived at a stage in which the economic premises of Socialism exist. And it never occurs to anyone to ask himself, could a people, plunged into a revolutionary situation, a situation such as that brought about by the first imperialist war, could it not be induced by the hopelessness of its position to plunge into a struggle which at least offered it some prospect of obtaining some not quite customary preliminary conditions for the further development of civilisation?..."

"If a special level of culture is required before Socialism can be realised (even though nobody is in a position to state the nature of this definite "level of culture"), why should we not begin with the conquest of the prerequisites for this definite level, and then stride forward to catch up the civilisation of the other peoples, with the

facilitations afforded by the workers' and peasants' government, and the Soviet organisation?..."

You say that civilisation is necessary for the establishment of Socialism. Very good: Now why cannot we first create among us such prerequisites to civilisation as the abolition of the large landowners and of the Russian capitalists, after which we can proceed to Socialism? In what books have you read that such changes are impermissible or impossible in an ordinary historical period?" (Lenin: "Our Revolution". With reference to N. Suchanov. Published in the "Inprecorr", 1925.)

Again, in Lenin's articles on the co-operatives we find the following passage:

"Is then the power of the State over all the most important means of production, the State power in the hands of the proletariat, the alliance of this proletariat with the many millions of the poor and the poorest of the peasantry, the security of the leadership of the proletariat over this peasantry, etc. — is not all this in reality all that is required to make of co-operation, and of co-operation alone, which we treated at one time as a petty shopkeeping affair, and may again so treat in a certain sense under the new economic policy — to make out of co-operation alone the means towards the complete structure of the socialist state of society? It is not yet the structure of the socialist state of society, but it is everything which is necessary to build up this society, and it suffices."

We have thus two divergent opinions in the main question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in our country, the possibility of the victory of the socialist elements over the capitalist elements in our economics. For, comrades, the possibility of the victory of Socialism in our country means nothing less than the possibility of the victory of the socialist elements of our economics over the capitalist elements. These two divergent lines are those of Lenin and of Trotsky and the Trotskyists. Leninism answers the question in the affirmative, whilst Trotskyism denies the possibility of the victory of Socialism in our country if we can offer no better basis than the internal forces of our revolution. The first line is the line of our Party, the second an approach to Social Democracy.

Hence the assertion in the draft of the theses on the Opposition, that Trotskyism represents for our Party a social democratic deviation.

This brings us again to the incontestable fact that our revolution is a socialist revolution, a revolution which is not only a signal, an impetus, and a point of departure for the world revolution, but at the same time a basis for the building up of a complete socialist state of society in our country, and a necessary and perfectly adequate basis.

From this we see that we can and must defeat the capitalist elements in our economics, we can and must build up the socialist state of society in our country. But can we call this victory a complete and final victory? No, we cannot. We can defeat our capitalists, we can work at our socialist structure and build it up. But this does not mean that we are therefore in a position to secure the country of proletarian dictatorship from external dangers, from the dangers of intervention and the possibility of the restoration of capitalism. We are not living on an island, but in the midst of capitalist countries. The fact that we are working at constructive socialism, and are revolutionising the workers of the capitalist countries by our example, is bound to arouse the hate and animosity of the capitalist world. It would, indeed, be a delusion to suppose that the capitalist world is quite indifferent to our economic success, a success which is drawing the workers of the capitalist countries over to the side of revolution. Therefore, we cannot regard our victory as final so long as we are surrounded by capitalism, and until the proletariat is victorious in at least some other countries. However great our success in the work of establishing socialism at home, we cannot regard the country of the proletarian dictatorship as being secure from outside dangers. Complete security for our victory can only be attained when our present capitalist environment is supplanted by a socialist environment, and when the proletariat rules in at least a few of these countries. Until this point is reached we cannot consider our victory as complete and final.

Lenin wrote as follows with regard to this:

"We are not merely living in a State, but in a system of States, and the continued existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist States for any length of time is unthinkable. In the end either one group or the other will conquer. Until then a series of terrible conflicts between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois States is inevitable. This means that the proletariat, as a ruling class, if it intends to rule and is to rule, will have to prove this by its military organisation."

We see that the danger of military intervention still exists, and will long continue to exist. It is another question whether the capitalists can undertake a serious intervention against the Soviet Republic at the present time. This is still a question. Much depends on the attitude of the workers in the capitalist countries, on the amount of sympathy which they express for the proletarian dictatorship, and on the extent of their inclination to the cause of Socialism. That the workers of the capitalist countries cannot, at the present moment, support our revolution by a revolution against their own capitalists is for the time being a fact. But it is equally a fact that the capitalists are not in a position to drive their "own" workers into a war against our republic. And today it is impossible to carry on war against the country of the proletarian dictatorship without exposing capitalism to deadly danger. This is evidenced by the innumerable workers' delegations visiting our country to examine our work for the realisation of Socialism, and again by the far-reaching sympathy felt for the Soviet Republic by the working class all over the world. The international relations of our Republic are based on this sympathy. Without it we should be confronted to-day by a fresh series of attempts at intervention; we should be exposed to interruptions in our constructive labours and should not be enjoying our present "pause for breath".

But if the capitalist world is not in a position to carry on a military intervention against us at the moment, this does not mean that it may not be in a position to do so at some future date. We may be sure that the capitalists have not gone to sleep, and that they are doing their utmost to weaken the international position of our Republic, and to create the prerequisites for an intervention. We must not imagine that all danger of fresh attempts at intervention, or at restoration of the old order, is past.

Lenin was therefore right when he said:

"So long as our Soviet Republic remains the sole boundary of the whole capitalist world, it would be a ridiculous flight of imagination, a Utopia, to believe in the disappearance of this or that danger. So long as the fundamental antagonisms exist these dangers continue to exist as well, and there is no escape from them."

And this again was Lenin's reason for saying that: "the final victory is only possible on an international scale, and through the combined exertions of the workers of all countries".

What is the meaning of the victory of Socialism in our country?

It means the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the realisation of Socialism, the overcoming of the capitalist elements of our economics on the basis of the inner forces of our revolution.

And what is the meaning of the final victory of Socialism in our country?

It means the creation of a complete guarantee against all attempts at intervention or restoration, based on the victory of the socialist revolution in at least several countries.

If the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country means the possibility of solving the internal contradictions in one country (we are naturally thinking of our own country), then the possibility of the final victory of Socialism means the possibility of solving the contradictions between the country of Socialism and the countries of capitalism; and the contradictions can only be overcome by the forces of the proletarian revolution in several countries.

Those who confuse these two groups of contradictions with one another are either hopeless muddle-heads, or incorrigible opportunists.

## THE RESOLUTION OF THE XIV. PARTY CONFERENCE OF THE C. P. OF THE S. U.

I have now set forth the main line of our Party. This line was given official expression by the Party for the first time in the well-known resolution passed by the XIV. Party conference on the international situation, the stabilisation of capitalism, and the establishment of Socialism in one country. I am of the opinion that this history of the Party, not only because it contains a magnificent demonstration for the Leninist policy in the question of socialist development in our country, but because it signifies at the same time a direct condemnation of Trotzkyism. I think it will hardly be superfluous to quote the most important points of this resolution, which — strange though it may appear — was passed on the basis of a report given by Comrade Zinoviev. (Sensation.)

This resolution contains the following passage on the victory of Socialism in one country:

"In general, the victory of Socialism (not in the sense of a final victory) is quite possible in one country."

In the question of the final victory of Socialism, the resolution states:

"The existence of two diametrically opposed systems of society involves the constant danger of the capitalist blockade and other forms of economic pressure, armed intervention, and restoration of the old order. The sole guarantee for the final victory of Socialism, that is, the sole security against the restoration of the old order, is therefore, the victorious socialist revolution in several countries."

The resolution further contains the following on the question of the realisation of the completely socialist state of society, and with reference to Trotzkyism:

"The conclusion is, however, by no means to be drawn from this that the development of a completely socialist state of society in such a backward country as Russia is impossible without the "state aid" (Trotzky) of countries more advanced in respect to technics. One constituent of Trotzky's theory of permanent revolution is the assertion that a real advance of socialist economics in Russia will only be possible after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe (Trotzky 1922), an assertion which condemns the proletariat of the Soviet Union to a fatalist passivity during the present period. Comrade Lenin wrote as follows on such "theories":

"How infinitely stereotyped is, for instance, their conclusion, learnt by rote during the development of West European Social Democracy, that we are not yet ripe for Socialism, that we — to use the terminology employed by the "learned" among them — have not yet arrived at a stage in which the objective premises of socialism are present." (Comments on Suchanov.) (Resolution passed by the XIV. national Party conference of the C. P. of Russia on: "The results of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. and the tasks of the Comintern and the Russian C. P.")

I believe that these main points in the resolution of the XIV. Party Conference require no comment. They could not be expressed more clearly or definitely. The passage of the resolution placing Trotzkyism parallel with Suchanovism is worthy of special attention. And what is Suchanovism? We know from Lenin's well known articles against Suchanov that it is a variety of Social Democracy, of Menshevism. This must be especially emphasised if we are to grasp why comrade Zinoviev, who defended this resolution at the XIV. Party Conference, then changed his attitude towards it and took up the standpoint held by Trotzky, with whom he is in the same bloc at the present time.

With reference to the international situation the resolution further places on record two deviations from the main line of the Party which are likely to involve danger for the Party:

"Two dangers can threaten the Party in connection with the situation now existing in the international arena: firstly, a deviation in the direction of passivity, resultant on an exaggerated interpretation of the stabilisation of capital which has come about here and there, and of the slower speed of international revolution, expressed in the absence

of a sufficient impulse towards energetic and systematic work for the development of the socialist state of society in the Soviet Union, in spite of the slower speed of the international revolution. Secondly, a deviation in the direction of national limitedness, a forgetfulness of the duties of international proletarian revolutionists, an unconscious disregard of the closest interdependence of the fate of the Soviet Union with even a slowly developing international proletarian revolution, the failure to realise the fact that not only does the international revolution require the continued existence, the firmer establishment, and the reinforcement of the power of the first proletarian state of the world, but that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union requires at the same time the support of the international proletariat."

(Resolution passed by the XIV. Party national conference of the C. P. of Russia on the: "Results of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. and the tasks of the Comintern and the C. P. of Russia.")

We see from the passage quoted that the XIV. Conference, when speaking of the first deviation, had in mind the lack of faith in the realisation of Socialism in our country which has been spread by Trotzky, whilst when speaking of the second deviation it referred to that forgetfulness of the international aims of our revolution which we too often observe, even among some of the functionaries occupied with the international policy of the Soviet Union, who are inclined to slip down to a standpoint of creating "spheres of influence" in the dependent countries.

In stigmatising these two deviations, the entire Party and its Central Committee have declared war against all the dangers arising out of these deviations.

These are the facts.

How has it come about that Comrade Zinoviev, after defending the resolution of the XIV. Conference in a special report, could later stray from the line of this resolution, and thereby from the line of Leninism? How has it come about that his deviation from Leninism could be accompanied by the ridiculous accusation of national limitedness against the Party, an accusation merely veiling his desertion of Leninism? I shall endeavour to throw some light on this conjuring.

## THE TRANSITION OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION" TO TROTZKYISM.

The differences between the present leaders of the "New Opposition", Comrade Zinoviev and Kamenev, and the Central Committee of our Party, in the question of the development of Socialism in our country, first assumed an open form on the eve of the XIV. Party conference. I remember one meeting of the Polit Bureau of the C. C., before the conference, at which Kamenev and Zinoviev attempted to defend a remarkable standpoint in this question, a standpoint having nothing in common with the line of the Party, and agreeing in all essentials with Suchanov's standpoint.

A few months later — in December 1925 — the Moscow Committee of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, in its reply to the declaration made by the former Leningrad leaders, wrote as follows:

"At a meeting of the Polit Bureau Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev recently defended the standpoint that we should not be able to overcome the internal difficulties caused by our technical and economic backwardness unless the international revolution comes to our aid. But we and the majority of the C. C., believe that we can develop Socialism, that we are developing it and will actualise it, regardless and in spite of our technical backwardness. We believe that our work of constructive socialism will of course proceed much more slowly than under the conditions afforded by an international victory, but none the less we are advancing, and shall continue to advance. And we believe, too, that the standpoint taken by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev is the expression of a lack of faith in the inner forces of our working class and the masses of peasantry co-operating



with it. We believe that this standpoint is a departure from Leninism."

I must observe, comrades, that Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev did not even attempt to refute this declaration of the Moscow Committee, published in the "Pravda" on the opening day of the XIV. Party Conference. They thereby acknowledged that the accusations brought by the Moscow Committee corresponded with the truth.

At the XIV. Party conference Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev formally recognised the line pursued by the Party in the question of the development of Socialism in our country. They were, apparently forced to do so by the fact that the standpoint represented by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev awakened no sympathy among the members of the C.C. And further than this, Comrade Zinoviev, as I have already mentioned, even gave a special report at the conference, defending the resolution passed by the XIV. national conference, in which the Party line was plainly expressed. Subsequent events proved, however, that Zinoviev and Kamenev only defended the Party line at the XIV. conference outwardly and as a matter of form, whilst in reality they adhered to their own standpoint. The publication of Comrade Zinoviev's book on "Leninism" in September 1925 was in this respect the "event" which drew the line of separation between the Zinoviev who defended the Party line at the XIV. national conference, and the Zinoviev who has left the line of the Party and taken up the ideology of Trotzkyism.

In this book comrade Zinoviev writes:

"Under the final victory of Socialism we must at least understand:

1. The abolition of class antagonisms, and consequently
2. The abolition of the dictatorship of one class, in this case the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to express myself more clearly on the subject of this question as it stands in the Soviet Union in 1923, we must distinguish between two things:

1. The securing of the possibility of building up Socialism; it is needless to state that such a possibility of building up Socialism within the confines of one country is perfectly imaginable, and
2. The final realisation and establishment of Socialism, the realisation of the socialist order, the socialist state of society."

("Leninism". Pages 291 and 293.)

We see that here everything is mixed up together, upside down. According to Zinoviev it appears that the victory of Socialism in one country signifies that it is possible to work at building socialism, but not to realise it: we can build with the certainty that the building will not be completed. This is Zinoviev's idea of the victory of Socialism in one country. (Laughter.) He confuses the idea of the actualisation of the socialist state of society with the question of final victory, and thus proves that he understands nothing of the actualisation of Socialism in our country. Constructive work for a socialist structure which he is conscious will not become a finished edifice — this is the standpoint to which Comrade Zinoviev has descended.

It need not be emphasised that such a standpoint has nothing in common with the fundamental line of Leninism in the establishment of Socialism. It need not be emphasised that such a standpoint weakens the will of the proletariat to the realisation of Socialism in our country, and thus retards the unfettering of revolution in other countries and completely reverses the most fundamental principles of internationalism. It is a standpoint in full accordance with the ideology of Trotzkyism.

The same must be said of the speeches made by Comrade Zinoviev at the XIV. Party Congress in December 1925.

"Observe how far Comrade Yakovlev strayed in his speech at the last Government Party Conference. He asks: "Can we, in one single country, surrounded on all sides by capitalist enemies, can we under such circumstances establish Socialism in one country?" And he replies: "On the basis of all that has been said we have a right to declare that we are not only working at building Socialism,

but that we shall establish it, even if we remain for the present the sole Soviet country of the world."

Is this a Leninist standpoint? Is this speech not permeated with national limitedness?"

According to Zinoviev, Comrade Yakovlev is open to the charge of national limitedness, although in substance he defended the line of the Party and of Leninism. It appears that the defence of the line laid down by the Party in the well-known resolution passed at the XIV national conference implies national limitedness! This is what Zinoviev calls going too far! These are conjuring tricks performed by Comrade Zinoviev in his endeavour to cloak his transition from Leninism to Trotzkyism by means of a ridiculous accusation of national limitedness against the Leninists.

The theses on the opposition bloc state the plain truth when they assert that the New Opposition has gone over to Trotzkyism in the fundamental question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in our country, or — what is the same thing — in the question of the character and future of our revolution.

Formally, Comrade Kamenev stands for a special viewpoint in this question, and this must be mentioned. It is a fact that Comrade Kamenev, in spite of Comrade Zinoviev, expressed his solidarity with the Party line in the question of the realisation of Socialism in our country, both at the XIV national conference and the XIV party Congress. Nevertheless, the XIV Party Congress did not take Comrade Kamenev's declaration seriously, it did not fully believe him, and in the resolution on the activities of the C. C. he was counted among those comrades who had departed from the line of Leninism. Why? Because Comrade Kamenev was unwilling, and considered it unnecessary, to back up his declaration of solidarity by deeds. And what deed would have been the confirmation of his declaration? Break with those who carry on a struggle against the line of the Party.

The party is familiar with several cases in which persons expressing solidarity with the Party have at the same time maintained a political friendship with elements conducting a struggle against the Party. In such cases Lenin generally observed that such "adherents" of the Party line are worse than its opponents. It is known, for instance, that during the epoch of the imperialist war Comrade Trotzky frequently expressed his solidarity with and fidelity to the principles of internationalism. And yet Lenin designated him at that time as an "accomplice of the social chauvinists". Why? Because Comrade Trotzky, though declaring his allegiance to internationalism, was not willing to break with Kautsky and Martov, with Potressov and Tschaidse. And of course Lenin was right. Anyone who wants a declaration to be taken seriously must confirm it by deeds, and must cease to maintain political friendship with persons carrying on a struggle against the line of the Party.

I am therefore of the opinion that Comrade Kamenev's expressions of solidarity with the Party in the question of the realisation of Socialism in our country cannot be taken seriously, since he does not confirm his words by action, and remains in the Trotzkyist bloc.

**How did Comrades Trotzky, Smilga, and Radek, attempt to wriggle out of the Position.**

It may be said: this is all very well, but are there not records and documents which go to show that the leaders of the opposition bloc are inclined to return from their social-democratic deviation back to Leninism once more? For instance, there is Comrade Trotzky's book: "Towards Socialism or Capitalism?" Is this book not a sign that Comrade Trotzky is inclined to abandon his fundamental errors?

There are even comrades who believe that Comrade Trotzky has actually abandoned his errors in principles in this book, or has at least endeavoured to do so! I as a sinful human being suffer from lack of faith in this case (Laughter), and must state that such an assumption is, unfortunately, not in accordance with the truth.

Let us take for instance the most striking passage in Trotzky's book: "Towards Socialism or Capitalism":

"The state planning commission has published the balance table to the control figures of the economics of the Soviet Union for the economic year 1925/26. All this appears extremely dry and even bureaucratic. But from these dry

columns of statistics, and the almost as dry and reserved commentary, there resounds the magnificent historical music of growing Socialism".

What kind of a thing is that: "the magnificent historical music of growing Socialism?" What is the sense of this "magnificent" phrase, if it has any sense at all? Does it contain an answer, or at least a hint of an answer, to the question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in our country?

We could speak of the magnificent historical music of growing Socialism in 1917, when we overthrew the bourgeoisie, and in 1920, when we swept the intervention troops out of our country; for, indeed, that was a truly magnificent historical music of growing Socialism when in 1917, after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and later, after driving out the intervention troops, we showed the world a magnificent example of the force and power of growing Socialism in our country. But has this, and can this, have anything to do with the possibility of the victorious establishment of Socialism in our country? We can — so says Comrade Trotsky — work towards Socialism. But can we arrive at Socialism? That is the question. To proceed towards Socialism with the certainty that we shall never arrive there — is that not stupidity? The "magnificent" phrase of Comrade Trotsky on historical music, etc. is no reply to the question, but a lawyer's subterfuge, a "musical" avoidance of the question. (Hear, hear!)

I fancy that we can place this magnificent and musical wriggling on Comrade Trotsky's part in the same category as those passages in his pamphlet: "The New Course", in which he attempted to avoid the question of the qualification of Leninism. Is it not extremely agreeable to hear:

"Leninism as a system of revolutionary action presupposes a revolutionary perception schooled by thought and experience, the equivalent in social activity to the reaction of the muscles in physical work".

Leninism as a "reaction of the muscles" — is that not a profound and original idea? Can you grasp it? (Laughter.) All this sounds beautifully musical, and even magnificent if you will. There is only one trifle missing; a simple and generally comprehensible definition of Leninism.

Lenin was thinking of just such cases as this — in which Comrade Trotsky has distinguished himself by particularly musical phrases — when he wrote the following severe, but just words on Trotsky:

"All is not gold that glitters. There is much sound and brilliance in Trotsky's phrases, but this does not land them purport." (Lenin, complete works, Russian ed. vol. III. p. 449.)

The same applies to comrade Trotsky's book: "Towards Socialism or Capitalism?", published in 1925.

If we then turn to more recent times, we may refer to a document signed by Comrade Trotsky in September 1926, from which we see without a shadow of doubt that Trotsky is still holding to the standpoint condemned by the Party. This document is the letter sent by Comrade Trotsky to the adherents of the Opposition. It contains this passage:

"The Leningrad opposition raised an alarm at that time on account of the hushing up of the differentiation among the peasantry; on account of the rise of the kulaks and their influence not only upon the elementary processes of economics, but upon the politics of the Soviet power; on account of the fact that within our Party, under the leadership of Bucharin, a theoretical school had been formed in which the pressure exercised by the petty bourgeois elements of our economics are clearly mirrored. The Leningrad opposition protested energetically against the theory of Socialism in one country, as being the theoretical substantiation of national limitedness ...." (From the supplement to the stenographic protocol of the sessions of the Polit Bureau on 8. and 11. Oct. 1926.)

Here in this document, signed by Comrade Trotsky, we find the whole matter stated. Even that the leaders of the "New Opposition" have gone over from Leninism to Trotskyism — and that Comrade Trotsky holds firmly and completely to his old standpoint, to the standpoint of a social-democratic deviation in our Party.

What attitude has been taken by the other leaders of the opposition bloc? Comrade Smilga or Comrade Radek, for instance? I believe that these comrades, too, are leaders of the opposition bloc. Why should Smilga or Radek not be a leader? What judgment have these comrades formed on the standpoint of the Party, the Leninist standpoint in the question of the establishment of socialism in our country?

Comrade Smilga, for instance, spoke as follows in September 1916, at the Communist Academy:

"I maintain that he (Bucharin. J. St.) has fallen completely under the spell of the reconstruction ideology; he considers it proved that the economic backwardness of our country is no obstacle to the establishment of a socialist state of society in Russia .... I believe that we, in occupying ourselves with the establishment of Socialism, are certainly working towards Socialism. The question is, however, whether the period of reconstruction can be regarded as a reason for the revision of that central point of Marxism and Leninism, the point that it is impossible to establish socialism in a technically backward country." (The emphasis is mine. J. St. — Speech delivered by Comrade Smilga at the Communist Academy, on the occasion of the debate on the control figures.)

You will observe that we have here again a standpoint agreeing in all essentials with the standpoint held by Suchanov in the main question of the character and future of our revolution. Is it not true that Comrade Smilga's standpoint corresponds in every respect to Comrade Trotsky's standpoint, which I have rightly designated as a social-democratic deviation? (Hear, hear!) Can we assume that the opposition bloc is responsible for such speeches as that of Comrade Smilga? Yes, we can and must assume this.

Has the opposition bloc ever attempted to oppose Comrade Smilga? Not, it has never attempted to do so. On the contrary, it lent every possible support to Comrade Smilga in his speeches at the Communist Academy.

And what of Comrade Radek, the other leader, who spoke at the Communist Academy at the same time as Comrade Smilga? Our records show that Comrade Radek laughed and scoffed at the theory of the establishment of Socialism in our country, and designated it the theory of the establishment of Socialism in "one district", or even in "one street", and replied to the interjections of those comrades who pointed out that it was a Leninist idea, by the following:

"You have read your Lenin badly; if Lenin were still alive, he would tell you that this is a Stschedrin idea. There is an eccentric character in the "Pompadours" by Stschedrin (Russian author) who establishes Liberalism in one district."

Comrade Radek's derision, liberal bourgeois and poor in taste, of the idea of the establishment of Socialism in one country, can scarcely be designated otherwise than as a complete break with Leninism. Does the opposition bloc take the responsibility for this bad taste on the part of Comrade Radek? Doubtless it does. Why does it not disclaim him? Because the opposition bloc has not the slightest intention of abandoning its unLeninist standpoint.

## THE DECISIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE QUESTION OF THE PROSPECTS OF OUR CONSTRUCTIVE SOCIALISM.

It might be asked: Why all these disputes on the character and future of our revolution, why all the quarrels as to what the future may or will bring? Would it not be better to lay all these contentions aside, and to turn to practical work?

I am of the opinion, comrades, that this standpoint is entirely erroneous, and has nothing in common with Leninism.

We cannot advance without knowing to what goal our footsteps are leading us. We cannot build without an idea of the future, without the certainty that our efforts towards socialised economics will result in the establishment of Socialism. Our Party cannot guide constructive socialism without a clear goal in view. We cannot live according to Bernstein's recipe: "The movement is everything, the object nothing". On the contrary. As revolutionists we must subject our forward movement and our practical work to the fundamental class aims of our pro-

letarian construction. If we fail to do this, then we sink hopelessly into the bog of opportunism.

And further, the masses of the workers cannot take **conscious** part in the work of construction unless they have the **certainty** of being able to realise socialism. Without this they cannot lead the peasantry with any certainty of aim. Without this there can be no real will to realise Socialism. Who can feel any inclination to build without the certainty that the edifice will be completed? The absence, therefore, of a socialist prospect for our work towards socialisation is **inevitably** and **absolutely** bound to weaken the will of the proletariat to this socialisation.

Further: The weakening of the will of the proletariat to the realisation of Socialism is bound to strengthen the capitalist elements of our economics. For what does the building up of Socialism mean if it does not mean the combat against the capitalist elements of our economics? The pessimistic defeatist trends of feeling among the workers are bound to revive the hopes of the capitalist elements for the restoration of the old order. Those who underestimate the decisive importance of a socialist prospect for our economics are supporting the capitalist elements, and are promoting capitulation.

And finally, the weakening of the will of the proletariat to the victory over the capitalist elements of our economics, which hamper our work towards Socialism, retards the unchaining of international revolution in the other countries. It must not be forgotten that the international proletariat is looking on at our economic construction, with the hope that we shall emerge victorious from the struggle. The numerous workers' delegations which visit us from the West, and examine into every corner of our socialist work, show that our struggle for the realisation, of Socialism is of immense international importance, exercising a revolutionary influence on the proletariat of all countries. Those who seek to disparage the socialist prospects of our construction are quenching the flame of hope of the international proletariat in our victory. And to crush these hopes is to violate the most elementary demands of proletarian internationalism. Lenin was a thousand times right when he said:

"Our main source of influence upon the international revolution now is our economic policy. The workers of every country in the world — without exception and without exaggeration — are looking to the Soviet Republic. In this sphere the struggle acquires political importance for the whole world. If we can accomplish this task, then our cause has triumphed on an international scale, with **certainty** and **finality**. (The emphasis is mine. J. St.) Therefore, all questions concerning our economic construction become of extreme importance. Here we must obtain the victory by a slow and gradual — for it cannot be done rapidly — but steady advance." (Lenin, collected works. Russian ed. vol. X./I. p. 282.)

I believe, therefore, that our dispute over the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country is of the utmost importance, for in this dispute there will be determined the question of the ultimate results of our work, of the class aims of this work, and the fundamental viewpoint from which we work in the immediate future. Hence, I am of the opinion that the question of the socialist prospects of our work of construction is of first class importance.

## THE POLITICAL OUTLOOK OF THE OPPOSITION BLOC.

The political outlook of the opposition is the result of its main error in the estimation of the character and prospects of our revolution.

Since the international revolution is delayed, and the opposition has no faith in the internal forces of our revolution, it is confronted by two perspectives:

Either the degeneration of the state apparatus, the actual separation of the "best elements" (that is, the opposition) of Communism from those in power, and the development of a new "purely" proletarian Party out of these elements, in opposition to the official and not "purely" proletarian Party — this is Ossovsky's position.

Or the opposition proclaims its own impatience with actual facts, denies the relative stabilisation of capitalism, and makes

"superhuman" and "heroic" leaps both in home politics (super-industrialisation) and in foreign politics — ultra Left phrases and gestures.

I believe that of all the adherents of the Opposition Ossovsky is the most courageous and consistent. If the opposition bloc had courage enough, it would follow in Ossovsky's footsteps; but since the opposition bloc is neither courageous nor consistent, it flies to the second possible position, that of the "superhuman" and "heroic" leaps.

Hence there arises the denial of the partial stabilisation of capitalism, the slogan of abandoning or leaving the trade unions of the West, the demand for the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the demand that our country should be industrialised within, so to say, six months, etc.

Hence the adventurousness in the policy pursued by the opposition bloc. In this connection the theory of the opposition bloc (that is, the theory of Trotzkyism) with regard to passing over the peasantry in our country whilst industrialising the Soviet Union, and to passing over the trade unions of the West, especially in connection with the strike in England, gains special significance.

The opposition bloc is of the opinion that if the Party has worked out a correct line of policy, this suffices to render the Party a mass Party, and the Party will then be able to lead the masses to the decisive battle immediately, without a moment's pause. The opposition bloc does not realise that such a standpoint with respect to leading the masses has nothing in common with the Leninist standpoint.

Were the April theses given by Lenin on the Soviet revolution in 1917 correct? Yes, they were correct. Why did Lenin not appeal at that time for the immediate overthrow of the Kerensky government? Why did he combat the ultra-Left groups in his Party, when these proclaimed the slogan of the immediate overthrow of the provisional government? It was because Lenin knew perfectly well that for the completion of the revolution it is not sufficient for a party to have a correct line of policy. And Lenin knew that it required something more; the broad masses of the workers must be convinced, on the basis of their own experience, that the line taken by the Party is correct. This again demands time, unceasing work by the Party among the masses, unceasing work to convince the masses of the workers of the correctness of the Party line. It was for this reason that Lenin, when working out his April theses, included in them the slogan of "patient" propaganda among the masses, in order to convince the masses of the correctness of the theses. At that time this patient work required eight months. But they were revolutionary months, worth at least as many years in ordinary "constitutional" times. We were victorious in the October revolution because we proved capable of distinguishing between the correct line to be taken by the Party and the recognition of the correctness of that line by the masses. The oppositional heroes of the "superhuman" leaps have never grasped this, and do not want to grasp it.

Was the standpoint taken by the Communist Party of Great Britain during the period of the strike correct? Yes, in all essentials it was correct. Then why has our English brother Party not succeeded at once in drawing millions of British workers over to its side? Because the time has been too short to allow it to convince the masses of the correctness of its line. Because there is a longer or shorter interval between the elaboration of a correct Party line and the situation in which the Party leads millions behind it; an interval during which the Party must labour unwearyingly to convince the masses of the correctness of its policy. This interval cannot be leaped over. It is nonsense to suppose that it can. The time can only be spent in patient work for the political enlightenment of the masses.

Even the most elementary truths of Leninist leadership of the masses are unknown to the opposition bloc, and here lies the source of its political errors.

I shall here cite only one example out of many in illustration of the policy of "superhuman" leaps and frantic efforts, of Comrade Trotzky:

"The Russian proletariat, having come into power, if only by means of a temporary opportunity afforded by our

bourgeois revolution, will meet an organised hostility on the part of international reaction, and a readiness to organised support on the part of the international proletariat. A Russian working class, left to its fate, will inevitably be crushed by counter-revolution the moment the peasantry deserts it. It will have no choice but to link the fate of its political rule, and consequently the fate of the whole Russian revolution, with the fate of the socialist revolution in Europe. That huge state political force lent the working class by the present stage of the Russian bourgeois revolution will be thrown by the working class into the balance of the class struggle in the whole capitalist world. **With state power in their hands, with counter-revolution behind them, and with European reaction before them, the Russian workers will once more appeal to their class comrades all over the world with the old slogan, this time the slogan of the last attack; "Workers of the world, unite!!!"** (Trotzky: Results and perspectives". The emphasis is mine. J. St.)

Is this not wonderful! The proletariat must seize power in Russia, but after having seized it it is bound to fall out with the peasantry; and after it has fallen out with the peasantry, it is bound to plunge into a desperate struggle with the international bourgeoisie, "with counter-revolution behind it and European reaction before it."

It must be admitted that this "Schema" of Comrade Trotzky contains much that is "musical", "superhuman" and "magnificently desperate". But there can be no doubt that here there is not a jot of Marxism, not a jot of revolutionary spirit, that here we have merely an empty playing at revolution, the phrasemongering of the political adventurer.

And yet it is perfectly certain that this "Schema" of Comrade Trotzky represents a direct expression of the present political perspectives of the opposition bloc, the result and the fruit of the Trotzkyist theory of "springing over" forms of the movement which have not yet come into existence.

### III. The Political and Organisatory Errors of the Opposition Bloc.

The political and organisatory errors of the opposition bloc represent a direct continuation of its main error in the fundamental question of the character and future of our revolution.

When I speak of the political and organisatory errors of the Opposition, I refer to such questions as that of the **hegemony of the proletariat in economic construction**, the question of **industrialisation**, the question of the **Party apparatus** and of the "regime" within the Party, etc. The Party proceeds from the standpoint that in its policy in general, and in its economic policy in particular, it is impossible to separate agriculture from industry, and that the development of these two main branches of economics must proceed on the line of their combination in socialist economics.

Hence our socialist method of industrialisation of the country by means of the **consistent improvement** of the material conditions of the working masses, including the main mass of the peasantry as the chief basis for the progress of the process of industrialisation. I speak of the socialist method of industrialisation in contradistinction to the capitalist method, which industrialises by impoverishing the masses of workers.

What is the chief disadvantage of the capitalist method of industrialisation? It lies in the fact that this method leads to the separation of the interests of industrialisation from the interests of the working masses, to the aggravation of the internal conflicts in the country, to the impoverishment of millions of workers and peasants, to the employment of the profits earned for purposes of capital export, and for the expansion of capitalist exploitation at home and abroad, instead of for the improvement of the material and cultural situation of the broad masses within the country itself.

What is the main advantage of the socialist method of industrialisation? It consists of the fact that it combines the interests of industrialisation with the interests of the main masses of the working population, that it leads, not to the impoverishment of the millions, but to the improvement of their material situation, not to the aggravation of internal conflicts, but to their settlement

and solution. It steadily enlarges home markets, increases the buying powers of these markets, and thus creates a durable basis for the expansion of industrialisation.

Thus the main masses of the peasantry find their interests coinciding with the socialist method of industrialisation.

Further, this method creates the possibility and the necessity of the hegemony of the proletariat over the peasantry in the work of socialist construction in general, and in the industrialisation of our country in particular.

Further, it creates the idea of the alliance of socialised industry with the peasantry, to be accomplished mainly by means of the mass organisation of the peasantry in co-operatives, the idea of the leading rôle of industry in relation to agriculture.

Moreover, the socialist method of industrialisation is the basis of our taxation policy, our policy of reductions in prices for industrial goods, etc. and every point of our policy is directed towards the maintenance of economic co-operation between proletariat and peasantry, and of the alliance between workers and peasants.

The opposition bloc, on the other hand, proceeds from the standpoint of a rivalry between industry and agriculture, and has strayed on to the path leading to a separation of these two factors. It neither grasps nor recognises that industrialisation cannot advance if the interests of agriculture are ignored or brutally violated. It does not recognise that though industry is the leading element in national economics, it is agriculture which forms the basis upon which industry is built up.

This lack of recognition of the joint interests of industry and agriculture gives rise to the view of agriculture as a "colony" to be "exploited" by the proletarian state (Preobraschensky).

It gives rise to the fear of good crops (Trotzky), and the idea that good crops might disorganise our economics.

It gives rise to the remarkable policy of the opposition bloc, tending towards the aggravation of the internal antagonisms between industry and agriculture, and towards the capitalist methods of industrialisation.

What are we to think, for instance, when Comrade Preobraschensky, one of the leaders of the opposition bloc, writes as follows in one of his articles:

"The more backward this or that country is in regard to economics, and the more petty bourgeois or agrarian it is at the time when it proceeds to the socialist organisation of production... then the more socialist accumulation must depend upon the **exploitation of the pre-socialist forms of economics**... and vice versa. The more strongly the country in which the social revolution is victorious, is developed economically and industrially... and the less the proletariat of the country in question has to diminish its non-equivalent exchange of goods with the colonies, that is, to reduce the **exploitation of the colonies**, then the more will the centre of gravity of socialist accumulation tend towards socialist forms of the principles of production, that is, the more socialist accumulation will depend on the surplus products of the industry and agriculture of the country itself." (Preobraschensky: "The fundamental law of socialist accumulation" in the "Periodical published by the Communist Academy". No. 8/1924.)

It is hardly necessary to prove that Comrade Preobraschensky here follows the path of an irreconcilable conflict between the interests of our industry and our agriculture, in other words, the path of the capitalist method of industrialisation.

I believe that Comrade Preobraschensky, in putting agriculture on a par with a "colony", and in attempting to invent relations of **exploitation** between the proletariat and the peasantry, is unconsciously undermining the foundations of all possible industrialisation.

I maintain that this policy has nothing in common with the policy of the Party, which aims at the industrialisation of the country on the basis of **co-operation** between proletariat and peasantry. The same, or almost the same, can be said of Comrade Trotzky, who is alarmed at the idea of a successful harvest, and appears to believe that the good crops represent a danger to the economic development of our country. At the April Plenum, for instance, he stated:

"Under these conditions (of the present disproportion. J. St.) the good crops, that is, the potential increase of the surplus products of agriculture, may become a factor which does not accelerate the role of economic development in the direction of Socialism, but on the contrary tends to disorganise economics, and to aggravate the relations existing between town and country and in the cities between the consumers and the State. Regarded practically, the good harvest, if unaccompanied by a sufficiency of industrial goods, may signify an increase in the amount of grain sold for illegal distilling, and the reappearance of queues before the shops in the towns. Politically, this would mean the flight of the peasantry against socialised industry."

It suffices if we compare this strange declaration of comrade Trotzky with a declaration made by comrade Lenin in the period of the greatest shortage of goods, in which he declares that "a good harvest is the salvation of the country". The extent of comrade Trotzky's error then becomes clear.

Comrade Trotzky is evidently unaware of the fact that in our country industrialisation can only advance by means of the gradual improvement of the material position of the working masses in the village.

Comrade Trotzky evidently thinks that our industrialisation must be achieved by means of a certain, let us say, "not very good harvest".

These ideas give rise to the practical proposals made by the opposition bloc with respect to the increase of factory prices, and to the tightening of the taxation screw on the peasantry, proposals which do not tend to the consolidation of the economic alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, but to its rupture; not to the creation of the prerequisites of the hegemony of the proletariat in constructive economics, but to the destruction of these prerequisites; not to co-operation between industry and peasant undertakings, but to their separation from one another.

A few words on the differentiation of the peasantry. It is generally known that the opposition has raised considerable alarm on the subject of the differentiation in the peasantry, and has fallen into panic. It is generally known that nobody has spread the alarm so extensively as the opposition with respect to the growth of the small private capital in the village. But what are the facts.

In the first place the process of differentiation in the peasantry is proceeding, as comrade Rykov showed in his report, in quite peculiar forms under our present conditions, not by means of "sifting out" the middle peasant, but by increasing his strength by decreasing the distance between the extreme poles, during which process such factors as the nationalisation of the land, the mass co-operative organisation of the peasantry, our taxation policy, etc., are bound to set certain limits to the differentiation.

Secondly — and this is the main point — the growth of small capital in the village is compensated and outweighed by the fact of the development of our industry, the strengthened position of the proletariat, and the socialist forms of economics which form the most powerful antidote to any description of private capital.

All these facts appear to have escaped the eye of the new opposition, which finds it easier to continue its outcries about private capital, and to prepare a panic.

It is perhaps not superfluous to remind the opposition of what Lenin said on this subject:

"Every improvement in the position of big industry, every possibility of setting a few great factories working, strengthens the position of the proletariat to such an extent that there is no reason to fear the petty bourgeois element, even if it should grow. The growth of the petty bourgeoisie and of small capital are not what we have to fear. What we have to fear is that the period in which there is a shortage of products lasts too long, for this has already caused a loss of force in the proletariat, a weakening of its powers of resistance against the petty bourgeois vacillations. When the quantity of products is increased, there is no development of the petty bourgeoisie which can bring any great disadvantage, so long as it leads to the promotion of big industry." (Lenin. Complete works. Russian ed. vol. 18./I. pp. 154/155.)

Will the comrades of the opposition ever understand that this panic about the differentiation of the peasantry, and about private capital in the village, is simply another aspect of their lack of faith in the possibility of the victorious socialist construction in our country?

A few words on the struggle of the opposition against the Party apparatus, and against the inner Party "regime".

What is the real meaning of the contention against the Party apparatus? It is scarcely necessary to say that the ultimate purport of this contention is the attempt to disorganise the Party leadership, and to disarm the Party in its struggle for the improvement of the State apparatus, for the elimination of bureaucratism from this apparatus, and for the leadership of the State apparatus.

Where is the contention against the inner Party "regime" leading? It is leading to the disintegration of the iron discipline within the Party, without which the dictatorship of the proletariat is unthinkable, and ultimately leads to a weakening of the foundations of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Party is therefore right in maintaining that the political and organisatory errors of the opposition represent a reflection of the assault being made on our Party, and on the proletarian dictatorship, by non-proletarian elements.

These, comrades, are the political and organisatory errors of our opposition.

## IV. Some Conclusions.

It is not long since comrade Trotzky declared, at the Plenum of the C. C. that the acceptance of the theses on the opposition bloc by the conference was bound to lead to the expulsion of the leaders of the opposition from the Party. I must declare that there is no foundation whatever for this assertion of comrade Trotzky; it is entirely false. I must declare that the acceptance of the theses on the opposition bloc can have only one object: The energetic combatting of the fundamental errors of the opposition, until these are completely overcome.

It is generally known that the X. Party Congress passed a resolution on the anarcho-syndicalist deviation. But what is an anarcho-syndicalist deviation? It cannot be said that it is any better than a social democratic deviation. But the fact of the acceptance of the resolution on the anarcho-syndicalist deviation has never yet brought anyone to the conclusion that the members of the "workers' opposition" were to be expelled from the Party.

Comrade Trotzky must be aware that our XIII. Party Congress declared Trotzkyism to be a "clearly defined petty bourgeois deviation". But up to the present nobody has concluded that the passing of this resolution necessarily involves the expulsion of the members of the Trotzkyist opposition from the Party. The passage in question in the resolution of the XIII. Party Congress is as follows:

"The present opposition not only represents an attempt at the revision of Bolshevism, not only a direct departure from Leninism, but a clearly defined petty bourgeois deviation. There is no doubt whatever that this "opposition" reflects objectively the pressure exercised by the petty bourgeoisie upon the positions and policy of the proletarian power."

Let comrade Trotzky explain to us in what manner the petty bourgeois deviation is better than the social democratic one. Is it so difficult to understand that the social democratic deviation is a variety of the petty bourgeois deviation? Is it so difficult to understand that we, when speaking of a social democratic deviation, are only stating more precisely that which we already stated in the resolution passed by the XIII. Party Congress? We do not state that the leaders of the opposition are social democrats, we merely state that there is a social democratic deviation in the opposition bloc, and we warn and appeal to the opposition to correct this deviation before it is too late.

The well known resolution passed by the C. C. and the C. C. C. in January 1925 speaks as follows of Trotzkyism:

"The essential character of the present Trotzkyism is a falsification of communism in the spirit of an approach to the European examples of pseudo-Marxism, that is, in reality in the spirit of 'European' social democracy."

I may say that these two resolutions were drawn up mainly by comrade Zinoviev. But neither the Party as a whole, nor even comrade Zinoviev, implied the conclusion that the leaders of the Trotskyist opposition were to be excluded from the Party.

It may also be useful to recall a passage written by comrade Kamenev on Trotskyism, in which he compares Trotskyism to Menshevism:

"Of all the forms of Menshevism", Trotskyism has always been the outwardly most attractive, the best veiled, and the best calculated to deceive precisely the most revolutionary minded workers. (Kamenev: "The Party and Trotskyism.")

All these facts are as well known to comrade Trotsky as to us.

But up to the present no one has thought of raising the question of the expulsion of comrade Trotsky and his followers as the conclusion to be drawn from the resolutions of the XIII. Party Congress.

I am therefore of the opinion that the declaration made by comrade Trotsky at the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. has been insincere and entirely incorrect.

The October Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. in approving in substance the theses on the opposition bloc, had no intention of reprisals, but aimed solely at the necessary ideological fight against the fundamental errors of the opposition, errors which the opposition will not abandon, and which it intends to defend in the future within the confines of the statutes, as it has informed us in its declaration of 16. October. The Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. has proceeded from the standpoint that to combat the fundamental errors of the opposition is the sole means of overcoming these errors, and that to overcome these errors is the sole means of ensuring real unity in the Party.

The Party, in defeating the opposition bloc, and forcing it to abandon its fractional activity, has succeeded in attaining the necessary minimum without which Party unity is impossible. It

is certainly something but not sufficient. If complete unity is to be secured, a further step must be made; the opposition bloc must be induced to give up its fundamental errors, and thereby the Party and Leninism will be protected against attacks and attempts at revision:

This is the first conclusion.

After the principle standpoint of the opposition bloc has been rejected, and the attempts at a fresh discussion on the part of the opposition frustrated, the Party members declared: Now there is no time for talk; we must set to work with all speed and energy for the socialist construction.

Hence the conclusion: **Less talk, more creative and positive work, forward with the work of socialist construction!**

This is the second conclusion.

The third conclusion is that the Party, during the course of the inner Party conflict, and of its defence against the attacks of the opposition, has become more firmly welded together than ever before, on the basis of the socialist prospects of our construction.

This is the third conclusion.

A Party which has mustered its forces on the basis of the socialist prospects of our construction is precisely that lever which we are so greatly in need of at the present time, to promote the socialist construction in our country.

We have forged this lever during our conflict with the opposition bloc.

The conflict has united our Party around its C. C., on the basis of the socialist prospects of our construction.

The conference must give a clear expression to this unity by accepting — I trust unanimously — the draft of the theses proposed by the Central Committee.

I do not doubt that the conference will honourably fulfil this task. (Prolonged and enthusiastic applause.)

## Theses of Comrade Stalin on the Opposition Bloc in the C. P. S. U.

The present period is characterised by the complexity of the struggle between the capitalist States and our country on the one hand, and between the socialist and capitalist elements on the other hand.

If the attempts of international capital to encircle our country economically, to isolate it politically, to establish a concealed blockade against us, and finally also to take direct revenge for our support of the fighting workers of the West and of the suppressed peoples of the East, is causing difficulties in the sphere of foreign politics, on the other hand, the transition of our country from the period of reconstruction to the period of new construction of industry and of the whole economic life upon a higher technical basis, and in connection therewith the complicated struggle between the capitalist and socialist elements of our economy, is evoking inner difficulties.

The Party perceives these difficulties and is capable of overcoming them. The Party, supported by the million masses of the proletariat, is already on the point of overcoming these difficulties and is confidently leading the country forward along the path of socialism. But not all the troops of our Party have faith in the possibility of a further movement forwards. Some — it is true only a very small number — of our Party members, are frightened by the difficulties, are displaying signs of weariness and hesitation, are falling into doubts and are being overcome by the feelings of disintegration, of unbelief in the creative forces of the proletariat, and this is leading them to an ideological capitulation.

In this respect the period of the present turning point reminds one of the period of the turning point in October 1917. Just as at that time, in October 1917, the complicated situation and difficulties of the transition from the bourgeois to the pro-

letarian revolution called forth among a section of the Party (Kamenev, Zinoviev) vacillations, defeatism and unbelief in the possibility of capturing and maintaining power by the proletariat, in the present period of a turning point the difficulties of the transition into a new phase of socialist construction is producing in certain circles of our Party hesitations, lack of faith in the possibility of the victory of the socialist elements of our country over the capitalist elements and disbelief in the possibility of the successful establishment of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The opposition bloc embodies these defeatist and disintegrating moods which prevail in the ranks of a part of our Party. The Party perceives the difficulties and is capable of overcoming them. In order, however, to be able to combat these difficulties it is necessary, in the first place, to overcome the disintegrating moods and the defeatist ideology in the ranks of a portion of the Party.

The Opposition Bloc which in its document of 16th October 1926 abandons fractional activity and breaks with the outspoken menshevist groupings inside and outside of the C. P. S. U., declares at the same time, that it still stands by its principle standpoint, that it does not abandon its errors of principle and will defend this erroneous standpoint within the framework of the Party statutes. It follows from this that the Opposition Bloc means to continue to foster disintegrating moods and capitulation ideology in the Party and that it intends to continue to propagate its erroneous views in the Party.

Therefore, it is the next task of the Party to expose the incorrect principle of the fundamental views of the Opposition Bloc, to make clear the incompatibility of these views with the fundamentals of Leninism and to conduct an energetic ideological struggle against the errors of principle of the Opposition Bloc until they are completely overcome.

## I.

## THE TRANSITION OF THE "NEW OPPOSITION" TO TROTZKYISM AS REGARDS THE BASIC QUESTION OF THE CHARACTER AND THE PROSPECTS OF OUR REVOLUTION.

The Party proceeds from the standpoint that our revolution is a socialist revolution, that the October Revolution constitutes not only the signal, the beginning and the starting point of the socialist revolution in the west, but that it is at the same time 1. a basis for the further development of the world revolution and 2. opens up the transition period from capitalism to socialism in the Soviet Union (the dictatorship of the proletariat), in which the proletariat, provided it carries on a correct policy with regard to the peasantry, can build up and will build up with success the complete socialist society, if of course the power of the international revolutionary movement on the one hand and the power of the proletariat in the Soviet Union on the other prove great enough in order to protect the Soviet Union from military intervention.

Trotskyism represents quite other views regarding the character and the prospects of our Revolution. Although in October 1917 Trotskyism went with the Party, it proceeded and proceeds from the standpoint that our revolution in itself and in its nature is not a socialist revolution, that the October Revolution was only the signal, the starting point of the socialist revolution in the West, that the proletarian power in Russia, if there is a delay in the world revolution and the victorious socialist revolution in the West does not come to its aid in the immediate future, is bound to be overthrown or to degenerate (which is one and the same thing) under the pressure of the inevitable collision between the proletariat and the peasantry.

Whilst the Party, when it organised the October Revolution, proceeded from the standpoint that "a victory of socialism is possible at first in a few or even in a single capitalist country" that "the victorious proletariat of this country after it had expropriated the capitalists and organised its socialist production" can and must proceed to attack the remaining capitalist world by drawing to itself the suppressed classes of the other countries and leading them to the revolt against the capitalists and, if necessary to proceed even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their States" (Lenin "On the slogan of the United States of Europe"). Trotskyism, which co-operated with the Bolsheviks in the period of the October Revolution, proceeded from the standpoint that "it is hopeless to think... that for example revolutionary Russia could maintain itself against the Conservative Europe". (Trotsky: "The Programme of Peace" first published in August 1917.)

Whilst the Party proceeds from the standpoint that in the Soviet Union "there is to be found everything that is necessary and sufficient for the establishment of the complete society" (Lenin: "On the Co-operatives") Trotskyism on the contrary proceeds from the standpoint that "a real advance of socialist economy in Russia is only possible after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe". (Trotsky: "Postscript" to "Programme of Peace" written in the year 1922.)

While the Party holds the standpoint: "ten to twenty years of correct relations to the peasantry and victory on a world scale is assured". (Lenin: Draft of the pamphlet on "Taxation in kind") Trotskyism, on the other hand, adopts the standpoint that before the victory of the world revolution there can be no correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, that the proletariat having seized power "will come into hostile conflict not only with all those groups of the bourgeoisie from which it received support at the commencement of its revolutionary struggle but with the broad masses of the peasantry, with whose help it has come into power" and that "the contradictions in the position of a workers' government in a backward country with a preponderantly peasant population can only find their solution on an international scale in the arena of the proletarian world revolution". (Trotsky: Preface to his "1905". The Preface was written in the year 1922.)

The Conference declares that such views of comrade Trotsky and his adherents in the fundamental question of the character

and the prospects of our revolution has nothing in common with the views of our Party, with Leninism.

The Conference is of the opinion that such views, which belittle the historic role and the importance of our revolution as a basis of a further development of the international revolutionary movement, weakens the will of the proletariat of the Soviet Union to continue to build up socialism and thereby hinder the release of the forces of the international revolution and hence are contrary to the principles of real internationalism and of the fundamental line of the Communist International.

The Conference is of the opinion that these views of Comrade Trotsky and of his adherents constitute a direct approach to the views of the social democracy and of its present leader Otto Bauer, who maintains that

'in Russia where the proletariat represents only a small minority of the nation, the proletariat can only maintain its rule for a temporary period, that it is bound to lose it again, as soon as the peasant masses of the country become culturally mature enough to take over the rule themselves, that the temporary rule of industrial socialism in agrarian Russia is only a beacon summoning the proletariat of the industrial West to the struggle, and that only the conquest of political power by the proletariat of the industrial West can give a basis to the permanent rule of industrial socialism in Russia" (Otto Bauer: "Bolshevism or Social Democracy").

The Conference therefore designates similar views on the part of Trotsky and his adherents as a **social democratic deviation** within our Party in regard to the fundamental question of the character and the prospects of our revolution.

The underlying fact in the development of the inner Party conditions of the C. P. of the Soviet Union since the 14th Party Conference (which condemned the views of the "New Opposition") consists in the fact that the "New Opposition" (Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev) who formerly combated Trotskyism, the social democratic deviation in our Party, have gone over to the ideological standpoint of Trotskyism, that they have abandoned their former position, the position of the whole Party and are now fighting with the same enthusiasm for Trotskyism as they formerly displayed when fighting against Trotskyism.

The going over of the "New Opposition" to the side of Trotskyism was determined by two main facts: a) weariness, vacillations, unproletarian moods of disintegration and defeatism among the adherents of the "New Opposition" in view of the fresh difficulties in the period of the present turning point, whereby the present vacillations and the present defeatism of Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev are not the result of chance but represent a repetition, a relapse into those vacillations and moods of disintegration which these comrades displayed nine years ago in October 1917 in face of the difficulties of the revolutionary period at that time; b) the complete defeat of the "New Opposition" at the 14th Party Conference and the efforts which arose in connection therewith to bring about at all cost an alliance with the Trotskyists in order by the alliance of the two groups, the Trotskyists and the "New Opposition" to compensate for the weakness and the isolation of this group from the proletarian masses, the more so as the ideological standpoint of Trotskyism is fully and entirely in harmony with the present mood of disintegration of the "New Opposition".

This is the explanation of the fact that the Opposition Bloc has become a rallying point for all and every bankrupt tendency inside and outside the C. P. S. U., condemned by the Party and the Comintern, from the "Democratic Centralists" and the "Labour Opposition" in the C. P. S. U. up to the Ultra Left opportunists in Germany and the liquidators of the type of Souvarine in France.

From this there arises that unscrupulousness in the choice of means and that lack of principle in the policy which underlie the existence of the bloc of the Trotskyists in the "New Opposition" and without which it would have been impossible to bring together the various anti-Party tendencies.

It was therefore in accordance with the very nature of things that the Trotskyists and the "New Opposition" found themselves together in the fight against the Party on a common platform of social democratic deviation and of unprincipled alliance of various party hostile elements and in this manner created an Opposition Bloc which represents — in a new form — something similar to a revival of the August Bloc (1912--1914).

## II.

## THE PRACTICAL PLATFORM OF THE OPPOSITION BLOC.

The practical platform of the Opposition Bloc is the direct continuation of the fundamental error of this bloc in the question of the character and the prospects of our Revolution.

The most important peculiarities of the practical platform of the Opposition Bloc can be summed up in the following main points:

a) **Questions of the International movement.** The Party proceeds from the standpoint that the advanced capitalist countries are, generally speaking, in a state of a partial, temporary stabilisation, that the present period represents a period between two revolutions, during which period it is the duty of the Communist Parties to prepare the proletariat for the approaching revolution, that the offensive of capital which is vainly endeavouring to consolidate the stabilisation, must call forth the resistance and the rallying of the forces of the working class against capital, that the Communist Parties must intervene in the intensifying class struggle and convert the attack of capital into a counter-attack of the proletariat for the purpose of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, that the Communist Parties, in order to attain these objects, must win those million masses of the working class which are still in the reformist trade unions and the II. International, and that therefore the united front tactics are necessary and compulsory for the Communist Parties.

The Opposition Bloc proceeds from quite other premises. It does not believe in the inner forces of our revolution, it falls into despair in view of the retarded pace of the world revolution and therefore slips from the basis of the Marxist analysis of the class forces of the revolution down to the basis of the "Ultra Left" self-deception and "revolutionary" adventurism, it denies the existence of a partial capitalist stabilisation and in this manner proceeds along the path of putchism.

From this there arises the demand of the opposition for the revision of the tactics of the united front and the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, and from this also arises their failure to understand the role of the trade unions and their slogan of replacing the trade unions by newly invented "revolutionary" organisations of the proletariat.

This is the explanation for the support by the Opposition Bloc of the Ultra-Left loud-mouths and opportunists in the Communist International, for example in the C. P. G.

The Conference is of the opinion that the international policy of the Opposition Bloc is not in accordance with the interests of the international revolutionary movement.

b) **The proletariat and the peasantry in the Soviet Union.** The Party proceeds from the standpoint that

"the maintenance of the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry represents the supreme principle of the dictatorship, in order that the proletariat can thereby maintain its leading role and the State power". (Lenin: Collected Works, Russian Edition vol. XVIII/1 page 331.)

that the proletariat must be the hegemon (leader) of the main mass of the peasantry in the economic sphere and in the sphere of constructing socialism (just as in October 1917 it was the hegemon of the peasantry in the political field, in the question of the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat), that the industrialisation of the country can only be carried out if it is based upon the gradual improvement of the material situation of the majority of the peasantry (village poor, middle peasants) who represent the chief market for our industry, that therefore such an economic policy (price policy, taxation policy etc.) must be conducted as will strengthen the alliance between industry and peasant undertaking and preserve the alliance of the working class with the main mass of the peasantry.

The Opposition Bloc proceeds from quite other premises. It departs from the fundamental line of Leninism in the peasant question, it does not believe in the hegemony of the proletariat over the peasantry in regard to the socialist construction, it considers the peasantry for the greater part as a hostile en-

vironment and therefore proposes such economic and financial measures as are only calculated to break the bond between town and country, to shatter the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and thereby destroy every possibility of a real industrialisation. Among such proposals are, for instance, a) the proposal of the Opposition on increasing the factory price for industrial articles, which is bound to lead to an increase in the retail prices, to a worsening of the position of the village poor and important strata of the middle peasants, to a reduction of the absorbing power of the home market, to a breach between the proletariat and the peasantry, to the collapse of the Czervonetz and finally to a reduction of the real wages of the workers; b) the proposal of the Opposition on the maximum pressure of taxation on the peasantry which would be bound to create a breach in the alliance of the workers and peasants.

The Conference is of the opinion that the policy of the Opposition Bloc towards the peasantry is not in the interests of the industrialisation of the country and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

c) **Fight against the Party Apparatus under the flag of fight against bureaucracy in the Party.** The Party proceeds from the standpoint that the Party apparatus and the Party masses constitute a united whole, that the Party apparatus (C. C., C. C. C. Provincial organisations, Gouvernement Committees, District Committees, Nuciei Bureaux etc.) embody the leading elements of the whole Party, that the Party apparatus combines in itself the best members of the working class, that they can and must be criticised on account of faults, that they can and must attract new elements, but that they cannot be calumniated without incurring the danger of disintegrating and disarming the Party.

The Opposition Bloc on the other hand, concocts an antagonism between the Party membership and the Party apparatus, it endeavours to belittle the leading role of the Party apparatus, to limit its functions to work of registration and propaganda, it incites the Party masses against the Party apparatus, it discredits in this manner the Party apparatus and weakens its position with regard to the leadership of the State.

The Conference is of the opinion that such a policy of the Opposition Bloc, which has nothing in common with Leninism, is calculated to disarm the Party in its fight against the bureaucracy of the State apparatus and for the real reformation of this apparatus, and thereby for the consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

d) **The fight against the inner-Party "regime" under the flag of the fight for inner-Party democracy.** The Party proceeds from the standpoint that he

"who weakens, if only a little, the iron discipline in the Party of the proletariat, particularly in the time of the proletarian dictatorship, in practice helps the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (Lenin: Collected Works, Vol. XVII, Page 136),

that the inner Party democracy is necessary, not in order to weaken and to undermine the proletarian discipline in the Party, but in order to strengthen it, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without an iron discipline within the Party, without a firm Party leadership, strengthened by the sympathy and by the support of the million masses of the proletariat.

The Opposition Bloc, on the other hand, proceeds by concocting an antagonism between inner Party democracy and Party discipline, confuses inner-Party democracy with freedom to make factions and groupings and endeavours to make use of such democracy in order to destroy Party discipline and to undermine Party unity. It is obvious that the appeal of the Opposition Bloc to fight against the inner-Party "regime", to a fight which in practice leads to defending the freedom of factions and groupings within the Party, is seized upon by the anti-proletarian elements of our country as a means of rescue from the rule of the proletarian dictatorship.

The Conference is of the opinion that the fight of the Opposition Bloc against the inner Party regime, which has nothing in common with the organisatory principles of Leninism, is only calculated to undermine Party unity, to weaken the dictatorship of the proletariat and to let loose the anti-proletarian forces in the country which are endeavouring to weaken and to overthrow the dictatorship.



The Opposition Bloc has chosen, as one means to destroy Party discipline and to intensify the inner Party struggle, the method of a discussion in the whole Union, which it attempted to arouse in October of this year. The Conference is of the opinion that a free discussion of the questions in dispute in the theoretical journals of our Party is indeed necessary, and grants every member of the Party the right to a free criticism of the faults of our Party; it nevertheless at the same time calls attention to the words of Lenin, that our Party is not a discussion club but a fighting organisation of the proletariat. The Conference adopts the standpoint that a discussion in the whole Union can only be recognised as necessary in the event a) if this necessity is recognised at least by some government or provincial organisations of the Party; b) if in the most important questions of Party policy there is not a sufficiently firm majority within the C. C.; c) if, in spite of the existence of a firm majority of the C. C. which adopts a definite standpoint, the C. C. nevertheless considers it necessary to test the correctness of its standpoint by a discussion in the Party. But even in all these cases a discussion in the whole Union can only be commenced and carried out after a decision of the C. C. to this effect.

The Conference declares that at the moment when the Opposition Bloc demanded the opening of a discussion in the whole Union none of these preconditions existed.

The Conference is therefore of the opinion that the C. C. acted quite rightly when it declared that there was no object in opening a discussion and condemned the Opposition Bloc for its attempts to impose a discussion upon the Party on questions already decided by the Party.

As a summary of the analysis of the practical platform of the Opposition Bloc the Conference declares that the platform constitutes a departure of the Opposition Bloc from the class line of the proletarian revolution in the most important questions of international and home politics.

### III.

#### THE REVOLUTIONARY WORDS AND THE OPPORTUNIST DEEDS OF THE OPPOSITION BLOC.

A characteristic peculiarity of the Opposition Bloc is the fact that this Bloc, which embodies a social-democratic deviation in our Party and defends an opportunist policy in practice, is nevertheless endeavouring to conceal its actions by revolutionary phraseology, to criticise the Party from the "Left" and to strut about in a "Left" toga. The explanation for this is to be found in the fact that the Communist proletarians, to whom the Opposition Bloc chiefly appeals, are the most revolutionary proletarians in the world, that these proletarians who have been educated in the spirit of revolutionary traditions, would never listen to open critics from the right. Consequently, the Opposition Bloc, in order to be able to market its opportunist wares, is compelled to stick a revolutionary label on them, as it is aware that only by such baits will it be able to attract the attention of the revolutionary proletarians.

As however, the Opposition Bloc represents in spite of this a social democratic deviation, as it defends what is in practice an opportunist policy, the words and the deeds of the Opposition Bloc unavoidably come into conflict with each other. From this there arises the inner contradiction in the activity of the Opposition Bloc. From this arises the disharmony between words and deeds, between revolutionary phrases and opportunist action.

The Opposition loudly criticises the Party and the Comintern from the "Left" and at the same time proposes the revision of the united front tactics, the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the abandonment of the trade unions and their replacement by new "revolutionary" organisations and believes that it can thereby drive the revolution forward. As a matter of fact, however, these proposals lead to a support of Thomas and Oudegeest, to a separation of the Communist Parties from the trade unions, to a weakening of the position of international communism and consequently to a slowing down of the revolutionary movement. In words, they are revolutionaries, but in practice they are the confederates of Thomas and Oudegeest.

The Opposition loudly criticises the Party from the "Left" and at the same time demands the raising of the factory prices

on industrial products. It thinks it can thereby expedite industrialisation; but in practice this would result in the disorganisation of the home market, the destruction of the alliance between industry and the peasantry, the collapse of the Czervonetz, the sinking of real wages and consequently the undermining of any kind of industrialisation. In words they are in favour of industrialisation, but in practice they are the confederates of the opponents of industrialisation.

The Opposition accuse the Party of not being ready to lead the fight against the bureaucratism of the State apparatus and they propose at the same time the raising of factory prices. They probably believe that the raising of factory prices is not connected with the question of the bureaucratism of the State apparatus; as a matter of fact, however, these measures proposed by the Opposition would lead to the complete bureaucratism of the State economic apparatus, as high factory prices constitute the means best calculated to weaken industry and to bureaucratise the State apparatus. In words they are opposed to bureaucratism, in practice, however, they are defenders and advocates of the bureaucratism of the State apparatus.

The Opposition raves against private capital and at the same time proposes to draw the State capital from circulation for the benefit of industry. They believe they can thereby undermine private capital, but in practice this would result in an all-round strengthening of private capital, as the withdrawal of State capital from circulation which constitutes the main field of activity of private capital, would deliver commerce wholly and entirely into the hands of private capital. In words: fight against private capital, in practice: support of private capital.

The Opposition makes a great outcry about the degeneration of the Party apparatus, but it transpires in practice that when the C. C. raised the question of expelling a really degenerated communist, such as Ossovsky, the Opposition showed the greatest loyalty towards this gentleman and voted against his expulsion. In words they are against degeneration, in practice, however, they promote and defend degeneration.

The Opposition talked a great deal about inner-Party democracy and demanded at the same time a discussion throughout the whole country. They thought that they would thereby realise inner-Party democracy, in reality what happened was that, in the name of a very insignificant minority they forced a discussion on the overwhelming majority of the Party and thereby violated democracy in the most flagrant manner. In words the Opposition is in favour of inner-Party democracy in practice, however, they violate the basic principles of all democracy.

In our period of the intensified class struggle only one of two political lines in the labour movement is possible: either the policy of Menshevism or the policy of Leninism. The attempts of the Opposition Bloc to adopt a middle standpoint between these two opposing lines, to conceal this standpoint in a "left", "revolutionary" phraseology and to increase the criticism of the C. P. S. U., were bound to lead, and have actually led to the slipping down of the Opposition Bloc into the camp of the opponents of Leninism.

The enemies of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern recognise the value of the "revolutionary" phraseology of the Opposition Bloc. They therefore pass over this phraseology as something unessential and unanimously praise the Opposition Bloc on account of its revolutionary actions, while taking up the oppositional slogan of the fight against the main line of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern. One cannot regard as a mere chance the fact that the S. R. and the Cadets, the Russian Mensheviks and the German "Left" social democrats considered it possible to proclaim their sympathy for the fight of the Opposition Bloc against the Party, as they calculated that the fight of the Opposition Bloc leads to a split and that the split would release the anti-proletarian forces in our country, to the joy of the enemies of the revolution.

The Conference is of the opinion that the Party must devote special attention to exposing the "revolutionary" masking and to explaining the opportunist character of the Opposition Bloc.

The Conference is of the opinion that the Party must safeguard the unity of its ranks with the greatest care, as the unity of our Party constitutes the most powerful antidote to all counter-revolutionary intentions of the enemies of the revolution.

## IV.

## SOME CONCLUSIONS.

The XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U., in drawing the balance of the past period of inner-Party struggle, states, that the Party has revealed in this struggle an enormous ideological growth, has without hesitation rejected the views of the Opposition, and achieved a rapid and decisive victory over the Opposition Bloc, by compelling it openly to abandon factional activity and to withdraw from the open opportunist groupings within and outside the C. P. S. U.

The Conference, in approving fully and entirely the policy of the Opposition Bloc to force a discussion on the Party and to undermine its unity, the Party membership has rallied more closely round the C. C. and thereby isolated the Opposition and in this manner assured the real unity of our Party.

The Conference is of the opinion that the C. C. has only been able to achieve such successes thanks to the active support of the broad masses of the Party members, that the activity and the consciousness of the Party membership in the fight against

the disruptive activity of the Opposition Bloc constitutes the best proof that the Party is alive and is developing upon the basis of a real inner-Party democracy.

The Conference, in approving fully and entirely the policy of the C. C. in its fight for securing unity, is of the opinion that the immediate tasks of the Party must be the following:

1. To see to it that the minimum obtained, and which is necessary for Party unity, must be actually put into practice;

2. to conduct an energetic fight against the social-democratic deviation in our Party, to enlighten the masses regarding the incorrectness of the fundamental views of the Opposition Bloc and to expose to the light of day the opportunist content of these views, no matter by what "revolutionary" phrases they may be concealed.

3. to endeavour to get the Opposition Bloc to recognise the erroneous character of its views;

4. to safeguard the unity of the Party by every means and to frustrate every attempt to renew factional activity and to violate discipline.