

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 4

12th January 1927

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

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. *Twenty-First to Twenty-Third Session.*

Full Report.

Twenty-First Session.

Discussion of the Report of Comrade Stalin on the Inner-Party Questions of the C. P. S. U.

(Continuation.)

Moscow, Dec. 10, 1926.

Comrade ROY (Chairman):

The Twenty-First Session is open. Comrade Doriot is the next speaker.

Comrade DORIOT (France):

Comrades, when the members of the Opposition came here I wondered, what would be the results of the speeches of Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev in the Western European countries and in the capitalist world in general?

I must go into this question from five angles.

1. From the angle of the factional struggle.
2. From that of the accusation of revision of Marxism that has been directed against the C. I.
3. The building of Socialism in a single country.
4. The struggle of the Opposition against the Right elements in the C. I. and,
5. The expressions of the bourgeois and Social Democratic press with regard to the Opposition.

Comrades, I believe that in his speech, Comrade Zinoviev forgot just a little to tell us why he gave up factional work on Oct. 16. He declared that he would carry on no more factional work. (His speech of yesterday already shows that he does not attach much weight to the keeping of the pledges he has entered upon.)

Now comrades, the truth is, as you all know, that it was the workers of the Putilov works, the workers in the Moscow factory nuclei, that defeated the members of the Opposition and prevented the continuation of their activities. The defeat suffered by the Opposition in Russia is a great victory for the will

to unity on the part of the Russian workers and of the majority of the Party, which fought for the maintenance of this unity. The same can be said also for the workers of Western Europe.

In France we have had this experience inside as well as outside of our Party. All Communists and sympathetic workers desire at all costs to maintain the unity of the Bolshevik Party, and they are against factional work.

We expected different activity and different tactics from the Opposition than those which they applied here. We expected that the comrades of the Opposition would say: Yes, we were wrong when we entered upon this struggle against our Party, when we carried on our factional work. On many fields the facts have shown that we were wrong. We admit our mistakes, we recognise that our Party was in the right against us, we recognise that our Party was not the Party of the kulaks, the Party of Thermidor. But not a single word did we hear about this, on the contrary, we had a new attack against the Communist Party of the U. S. S. R.

What can be the meaning this activity to us, to our Parties? Obviously nothing but a new beginning of the fight. But we trust to the good sense of our Communists and sympathetic workers. We know that they will not tolerate a renewed attack against the unity of the Bolshevik Party, and of the International, that the second defeat of the Opposition will be even more crushing than the first.

I should like to go into the charges which Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev have directed against the majority of the International. Their whole way of speaking, the entire manner in which Marx and even Lenin were cited, had a tendency to prove that the majority of the Russian Party and of the International had entirely forgotten the teachings of Marx and that they intended to revise them.

I think I even remember that Comrade Zinoviev said the following: "We shall not tolerate the revision of a single word in the Communist Manifesto." Well, comrades, are we faced here with a new accusation against the International? No, this is by no means a new charge. We have often heard them in the past, from Bauer, Adler, Longuet; in our struggle against the Social Democrats in all countries we always heard the following words: "Yes, the Bolsheviks are good fellows, but they know nothing about Marxism." This is the charge brought forward by the German and Austrian Social-Democracy, and Zinoviev got up on this tribune very vigorously and replied: "It is not true, Leninism is the Marxism of the imperialist epoch, there is no other doctrine that can call itself Marxism." And now comrades, he has completely changed his platform; he himself now accuses the International of revising Marxism.

There are two forms of applying Marxism. That of Lenin, which considered Marxism as a method of analysis and struggle, and secondly, the dogmatic method which consists in citing and retouching according to circumstances to suit oneself. If one looks into the speech of Zinoviev one sees that he applies Marxism in a completely dogmatic manner.

Sentences from Marx written in 1848 are applied for the purpose of analysing the situation in 1926, without taking into consideration the rising of the European proletariat and industry; this means the application of Marxism in a completely dogmatic manner, and a failure to analyse the situation concretely.

Lenin always warned us against such a method. But what will be the concrete result of this charge of Zinoviev? As far as the Social Democrats are concerned the result is clear, they will say: "Now Zinoviev himself admits that you do not know how to apply Marxism."

I now want to touch upon another question. The question of Socialism in a single country.

In this question I am in agreement with what Comrade Bukharin said last night, and with the formulation previously put forth by Stalin.

In my opinion we must differentiate in this question at least between two viewpoints: The international viewpoint and that of the internal struggle in Russia.

Comrades, here we can see how Zinoviev applies Marx and Engels. When he passes himself off here as the guardian of the Communist Manifesto, he only forgets to say what Engels meant, in a concrete programme, by the social revolution. Stalin presented these documents to the XV. Conference. I believe that they settle the whole discussion.

Bukharin put the question correctly yesterday:

"Can the Russian proletariat in the present situation, in alliance with the poor and middle peasantry, defeat the bourgeoisie, the Kulaks in Russia, and economically extirpate and conquer them?"

I believe that to put the question in this way is also to solve it. The question is to be answered affirmatively.

What would be the consequences of the Opposition comrades' theories if they were to cast doubt upon this truth, if they were to say: "Our forces are too backward."

We can say here that there exists an objective connection between the Social Democratic theories and those of our comrades of the Opposition. In what does this connection consist?

Since 1917 the Social Democracy has advocated the idea that for the proletariat in Russia, in a backward country, it was not desirable to take over power in Russia, in a backward country, because it could not build up Socialism. The Bolsheviks, they said, will first lead Russia to a state of ruin so that those who follow them will not be able to build up anything whatever.

This was the thesis of the Social Democrats during a whole period. Today Zinoviev confirms this theory of the Social Democrats when he says: "We cannot defeat our bourgeoisie economically in the U. S. S. R., we are incapable of building up Socialism."

And how will these speeches of the Opposition comrades react upon the thought of the proletariat? Comrades, it is clear that if you say: "We cannot build up Socialism, we have factories of a capitalist type", you do not realise what harm you are really doing to the Russian revolution. You are always speaking about the international revolution, about the support of the Western proletariat. But in your tactics, your programme,

your doctrine, you are in reality abstract from the Russian revolution, from the international proletariat.

Comrade Zinoviev has said: "Yes, you are always telling me that we are on the side of the Social Democrats, but we do not interpret the teachings of Marx in the sense that one should not seize power in a single country in which one cannot build up Socialism." If after nine years of the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Zinoviev were to say that one cannot seize power, this would really be a little too strong. And nobody would listen to him.

But, comrades, the Social Democrats always reply: "Why seize power in a backward country if one cannot build up Socialism?"

Zinoviev and Kamenev also said this in 1917 at the moment of the uprising.

Today they cannot say this. But they say: "We cannot build up Socialism in this country." The whole Social Democracy quickly adds: "Then why seize power?"

But the question today is put into a far too general form, comrades. Whither does the theory of Comrade Zinoviev lead us?

In reality it leads us to the following: "The countries which after Russia, must be the first to seize power, must be the developed capitalist countries, and not those which have no developed capitalism and no developed proletariat."

We have nevertheless kept in mind the possibility that the Chinese proletariat will assume the hegemony in the national struggle in China. We have kept in mind in China the possibility of a victory of the workers and peasants under the hegemony of the proletariat. What is at present the relationship of forces in China? Ten million workers, 400 million peasants. Whither does the theory of Zinoviev lead us? To the following: In order not to enlarge the internal difficulties of the Chinese revolution and of the Russian revolution we cannot seize power in China, because we are permitted to seize power only in developed countries. This is the consequence also for all Western Agrarian countries, which cannot be the first to seize power, this is the logic of the theory of Zinoviev.

We know very well that the chain of imperialism can be broken at the place where it is weakest. We can break this chain in China before we can in England.

The proletariat in China must seize power because this makes easier the struggle of the proletariat in the West. But with the pessimistic theory of the Opposition one must come to the opposite conclusion.

Another question on the international field. I believe, comrades, that the international character of the Russian revolution shows itself in the support of the colonial peoples, and in the difficulties which it has created for world capitalism, and also in the considerable aid furnished by the Russian revolution to the other revolutionary forces of the whole world.

In what form, and to what extent will this idea develop? This depends also largely upon whether within your country you are able to intensify the revolutionary forces. Lenin often said that this help to the workers of other countries must express itself not only morally but also militarily. Lenin foresaw situations in which the Russian revolution would support the proletarians in other countries in their revolutionary struggles against their capitalist States. What is the meaning of this hypothesis? That Lenin had faith in the rapid growth of the revolutionary, political and economic forces of the U. S. S. R., and that he foresaw an ever increasingly effective support of the proletariat of other countries.

I believe that if one puts the question: "Can the Russian revolution support the workers of other countries in their struggle against their own bourgeoisie?" Then every Communist must answer affirmatively.

But in the name of what principle must he do this? Can one do it in the name of a Kulak state, of a bourgeois capitalist State? Comrades, I say: No.

If you do this in the name of a bourgeois State, then you will not base yourselves upon the broad masses of the other countries. We can do this only in the name of a State that is building up Socialism, that is disseminating it throughout the whole world.

Only in this case will one be able to have the backing of the masses of workers and peasants in the other countries, and proceed beyond our borders.

What did Trotsky say about the question of an armed struggle between the capitalist world and the U. S. S. R.?

"The superiority of the technical forces of capitalism and of the bourgeoisie is so great that we shall be defeated."

Certainly comrades, it is possible that the industry of capitalist countries is more developed than in Soviet Russia, but Trotsky forgets the proletariat of these countries.

It is very easy to understand what must be the role, the attitude of millions of workers in a war against Russia. One may understand that they will support not imperialism, but the revolutionary army and the Russian revolution in Europe. That is entirely clear. But if one ignores the proletariat and merely sets the Soviet State and the capitalist State against one another, one assumes an entirely false analysis, because the essential revolutionary factor is lost sight of, namely, the proletariat.

I now come to the point that the Opposition has not only objectively supported all the Social Democratic theories in other countries, but that it is also supporting the forces of the Right.

I remember that a couple of months ago Zinoviev characterised Monmoussau and myself as a Right danger, undoubtedly because we came out in opposition to factional politics there. But at the same moment Zinoviev proposed, to Comrade Humbert Droz, that Souvarine be readmitted to L'Humanité and that he be sent to China as a correspondent, and likewise at the same moment Trotsky proposed to Jacob that Souvarine be readmitted into the Party. I believe that if they were attacking such Rightists as Monmoussau and myself they should have avoided giving the Right such an important aide as Souvarine.

At the last Enlarged Executive, Zinoviev said in his speech in the French Commission, in making use of an analogy, "Souvarine will create a Briandist Party. It is even possible that he would bring it to certain success and to the election of some Deputies. We experienced such a situation with the members of the Social Democratic Party who withdrew from the Party in Stolypin's time. And Lenin said at that time: "that is the Stolypin Party."

Zinoviev also said: "Souvarine is a counter-revolutionary".

I also remember that in his concluding speech from the spot where I now stand he used absolutely unequivocal words against Souvarine because he had written positively scandalous things about Frunze's death. A few months later Zinoviev puts the question: "Souvarine has behaved quietly, could we not send him to China?"

The Chinese revolution does not need Souvarine, it needs far different people. But since when, comrades, has Souvarine become a disciplined fellow? Since the time he wrote scandalous things about Frunze's death or since the time Zinoviev is in one opposition bloc with Trotsky?

But Zinoviev spoke here less vigorously against Souvarine than at the last Executive; why did he not tell us what he thinks about the latest article by Souvarine?

Trotsky likewise did not talk about Souvarine, he said not a single word about his article.

I, myself, presented this article to one of the Opposition comrades, Comrade Vuyovitch, and asked him, after he had read it, what he thought about it.

"I don't think anything about it", he replied, "because it is very dangerous to express one's opinion."

Now, Comrade Vuyovitch, if one does not think anything, if one is not able to defend one one's Party against such attacks, then one has sunk very deep.

(Interjection by Vuyovitch: "It is not true".)

Comrades, we have expressed ourselves in favour of the final expulsion of Souvarine. I believe that the Plenum could confirm this without difficulties.

As to the last point: Comrade Zinoviev has said that a Social Democrat wrote the following: "We could unite with a Stalin International?". Comrades, it is true that such things have appeared in the press in Western countries. Especially in France, in certain bourgeois newspapers, at the beginning of the Opposition's struggle against the Central Committee, a part of the bourgeois press said:

"Very well, if it is true that the C. C. is a N. E. P. man C. C., that the C. C. is a Kulak C. C., a C. C. of Thermidor, then we are for the C. C., long live the C. C."

Comrades, there were in the bourgeois press a sort of optical delusions, Zinoviev was looked upon in the same light

as that in which he appeared yesterday, they did not see that a slight change had taken place in Zinoviev and in the other comrades of the Opposition.

We kept careful track of the bourgeois press, and one of our workers told us: "Look, the bourgeois press supports the C. C. in its articles". Comrades, it was a painful situation that one had to carry on the debate on that basis. But we discussed and we convinced most of the comrades with the exception of Jacob and Suzanne Girault.

But how is the situation now? Comrades, to the extent that the struggles developed and the bourgeoisie looked into the various platforms, on the one hand of the Opposition, and the other of the C. C., it suddenly dropped the C. C. and lined up with the Opposition, and supported it in the whole struggle. The reactionary Russians in Paris sounded the keynote. The Opposition has the sad privilege of enjoying a monopoly in the bourgeois press, they alone are being discussed, they alone are supported, you should just have seen the expression of condolences in the bourgeois press when they surrendered! For the bourgeois press put all its hopes on the Oppositional struggle, it had hoped that it would disrupt the Soviet Republic.

Comrades, I am coming to a close. We believe that the activity of the Opposition at this Enlarged Executive, instead of being an act announcing an intention to be disciplined, can result only in the encouragement of factional activity in the West-European countries. Comrades, whenever these factional efforts appear, we shall repudiate them.

We will then say quite objectively that the platform of the Opposition is in support of the Social Democracy, and contributes only to the demoralisation of the masses. It is certain that the masses will not allow themselves to be demoralised, because we shall know how to carry on propaganda against the Opposition theory.

Thirdly, it can only have a good effect in our own ranks that, after the capitulation of October 16th, the Opposition again comes and renews the fight against the C. C. and the International.

Furthermore, comrades, in the name of my Party, of the tremendous majority of my Party, I must tell you that we will rally around the Russian Central Committee, because it is the only power able to maintain the unity of the Party of Lenin, because, under the prevailing conditions, it is the only force that has a clear doctrine and a perspective for the development of the Revolution not only in Russia, but throughout the whole world. Comrades, Comrade Zinoviev closed his speech with a cheer for the united Communist International. No, we only cheer: Long live the Communist International! Down with pessimism! Down with the factionalists! (Applause.)

Comrade RIESE (Wedding Opposition-Germany):

Our view that an appearance of the Russian comrades here, would be interpreted as a new attack and as a breach of the Declaration of October 16th, was absolutely confirmed by the speeches of Comrades Pepper and Bukharin.

It must be noted that when the comrades of the Russian Opposition appeared, the behaviour of the German delegation was certainly neither sensible nor decent.

(Interjection by Geschke: "Riese teaching us deportment!!")

On the basis of the speech made yesterday in the Plenum by Comrade Dengel, I am duty bound to make a clear and precise reply to certain questions that were put to us, the Wedding Opposition. Comrade Dengel stated in his speech that the German Opposition rose out of the weaknesses of the German Party. Comrades, it is absolutely wrong to maintain that the weaknesses of the Party gave rise to the development and activity of an Opposition, we are Bolsheviks enough to liquidate weaknesses in the Central Committee, if they were merely weaknesses. But when we see that mistakes, positive mistakes were made, when we see that a policy is being conducted that runs in a definitely wrong direction — then this means that here are no weaknesses, but a wrong policy. The Opposition a year ago called attention not to weaknesses, but to mistakes, and thereupon the Opposition was flogged as an absolutely ultra-Leftist deviation and confusionism.

Interjection: "That does not justify a faction the less so if the mistakes were immediately corrected."

We are reproached with having interest in creating a unified bloc of all oppositional groups in the German Party. I maintain

that it is a sorry state of affairs for a Party to have to live faced with three groupings of oppositional tendencies.

(Interjection: "Six groups".)

If anyone says that there is a united bloc from Korsch, to Schwartz, some comrades even say from Katz to Weber, that is, all the way to the Wedding Opposition, then I will tell you that no comrade can prove this, and neither can comrade Dengel, who at the close of his speech, was kind enough to say that consistently these groups all belong ideologically to the counter-revolution.

We never had any intention to create principal bloc of opposition groups in Germany. The Wedding Opposition, which is founded on honest worker elements, which has certainly proved its mettle in history, has always stood and today continues to stand true to the Communist International.

We are not concerned with leaders and persons, but with our views. If we were close to certain figures in the Ruth Fischer and Maslow groups, it was for precisely the same reason that here in Russia the Opposition concluded a bloc with the so-called Right reformist Trotsky.

No one can deny that the Wedding comrades, in dealing with the Russian question, were the first to move a resolution in the Berlin-Brandenburg Conference, which Urbahns supported.

(Interjection by Geschke: "Who wrote the resolution of the 700 — who and with whom?")

At all Conferences we acted unitedly in the Russian question. That this was no unprincipled bloc is proven by our action in the Berlin Party functionaries' Conference on October 20th. What did we see there? We saw that the Wedding Opposition did not make common cause with the Ruth people, but that the Wedding Opposition introduced a statement on the declaration of the Russian Opposition of October 16th, while the Ruth supporters introduced a different declaration through Urbahns and Schimansky. Thus, we separated from them the very moment they no longer represented our views.

Our relations to Korsch — this is a question we, the Wedding Opposition, certainly no longer have to answer in Germany: the workers in Germany know how we stand on Korsch, and I believe that in Wedding there is not a single honest worker who follows the ideology and views of Korsch and Schwartz.

Wedding repudiates most decisively such views as those of Giwan, and will fight such a view fundamentally.

We voted against the expulsion of Giwan. It was said that Giwan demanded a new revolution in Russia to overthrow the kulak government, etc., and that Kautsky fights on the same line. He likewise fought the Russian C. C. and the October Revolution. But one must make the following differentiations here: Kautsky utters such things as an absolute counter-revolutionist, whereas Giwan became confused through the false and hostile views of a Schwarz. Our reasons for not expelling Giwan, were that Giwan could be won back to the line of the Party, that he could be converted from this absolutely hostile Schwarz attitude and view towards the Soviet Union.

What judgement did the Russian Opposition receive at the hands of the bourgeois and Social Democratic press? Here it must be said that the bourgeois and Social Democratic press did not solidarise itself in any way with the Russian Opposition.

(Interjection: "And Levi, Theodor Wolff and the 'Vorwärts'?")

I declare, that after we have heard the speeches of Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky, we continue as heretofore our solidarity with the Russian Opposition, despite the fact that they were branded as a Social Democratic deviation.

We are convinced that the presentation of the Russian Opposition as a "Social Democratic deviation" is nothing but a tactical manoeuvre intended to avoid fighting the Opposition as a Left tendency, as a Leninist tendency, in order to be able to defeat it more easily as a Right deviation. This manoeuvre is calculated to catch the deep-rooted sentiment against every Right Party policy among the broadest membership strata in Western Europe. The present Right Party course is therefore masquerading as a Left tendency, as a group which is fighting the "Right opportunist" deviations of the Opposition.

(Interjection: "You are reading your speech, who wrote it?")

We declare and emphasise that we have never doubted the character of the Russian revolution. It was, is, and remains for us the proletarian social revolution. Precisely for this reason we repudiate the demagogy of Comrade Thälmann who declared that if the ultra-Left, viz., the Wedding Left, had won out the German proletariat would have stood hostile to the Soviet Union. For the same reason, we repudiate the statement of Comrade Bukharin that if we do not accept the position of the majority on the Russian question, we shall put ourselves against the Soviet Union. Such arguments can mean nothing but an effort to present the Russian Opposition as enemies of the Soviet Union. I am expressing here not only my personal views...

(Interjection by Neumann: "But the declaration of Radek!")

I have spoken to Radek only once in my life.

This appraisal of the character of the Russian proletarian revolution is nevertheless not identical with the possibility of the victory of Socialism, the complete building of Socialism, in one country, as the Majority maintains. The Revolution, according to its very character, cannot be a 100% Socialist one, and because of various objective causes, Socialism cannot be fully built up in a single country.

(Interjections: "A pretty formulation! Who wrote your speech?")

What are these objective causes? The majority speaks only about intervention, but disregards entirely economic warfare against the Soviet Union. In this age of the world market, it is false to speak of a self-sufficient economic unit.

(Interjection: "How learned!")

We live, said Lenin, not only in a State, but in a system of States, and the existence of the Soviet Republics side by side with the imperialist States is, for any longer period, inconceivable. In the last analysis either one or the other must be victorious.

(Interjection: "Who disputes this?")

Even Stalin at the XIV. Party Conference emphasised more than once that he stood for only the building of Socialism, the "building of a complete Socialist society" in one country, but not the "final victory of Socialism". Comrade Stalin thereby manufactures a distinction between the building of a complete Socialist society and the final victory of Socialism. But what else can the building of a Socialist society mean than the final victory of Socialism? It is well-known that Comrade Stalin, even after 1924, advocated the same standpoint on this question in his book "Lenin and Leninism" as the Opposition does today.

The international proletariat knows the importance of the Soviet Union to its own victory, and on the other hand, knows that only through the victory of the Revolution in other countries is the complete victory of the Revolution in Russia possible. The international proletariat is aroused for the struggle, not by theories about the victory of Socialism in one country... (Interjection: "Of course not by theories, but by the fact of Socialist construction!")... but only by the Marxist and Leninist theory of the necessity of the victory of the proletarian revolution, at least in several countries, as a prerequisite for the complete victory in one country, and of the community of the struggle of the entire international proletariat.

As to the peasant question, we realise fully that the Russian revolution, precisely, in order to hold out until the victory of the Revolution, and in order to be able to develop in the direction of Socialism, needs a firm alliance between the proletariat and the toiling peasantry. We understand the position of the Russian Opposition on the peasant question in the way... (Interjection: "Never mind how you understand it, what counts is what the Opposition does!")... that they do not in the slightest deprecate this alliance, but, on the contrary, want to consolidate it according to the Leninist formulation, according to which the proletariat with the village poor, as the principal prop of proletarian dictatorship in the village, must win over the middle peasantry as an ally in the sharpest struggle against the kulak. We look upon the struggle in the Russian Opposition on the peasant question as a fight against deviations in Party policy from this line, laid down by Lenin. We believe that the Opposition criticism on this question has been confirmed by the very measures taken by the C. C. majority itself recently, especially by the new election regulations. (Interjection: "Who gave you this formulation?")

The Wedding Opposition has always fought Trotskyism. I believe that the comrades who are now in opposition to me will not be able to deny this. It was precisely Wedding which carried on this struggle against Trotskyism in all severity. If the present Opposition bloc with Trotsky had been based upon Trotskyism, which has become a quite definite historical trend in the Russian Labour movement, (Interjection: "Another good formulation"), we should have to fight it. But this is not the case however. It is well-known — from the declaration of Comrade Trotsky delivered here last night — that he corrects himself, that he declares absolutely wrong his views against Lenin (Laughter). This situation will contribute heavily to a clarification of the German discussion.

One word in conclusion, on the question of factionalism. In the German C. C. we put the question of the forming and liquidating of factions absolutely clearly and unequivocally.

In order to settle this question in principle, I say that factions will cease, and in my opinion, must cease in the German Party, if on the other hand the C. C. of the German Party is willing to conduct an honest Bolshevik inner Party course. Comrade Thälmann has already promised us this at a meeting of the Wedding district Executive. He said: "Sure, we will give you the right to express your views in the press and wherever you are invited to appear". (Interjection by Remmele: "And even at the Plenum of the C. I.")

I am of the opinion that once we are given the right to appear, and if we have a supposed "Social Democratic deviation", the German proletarians would repudiate us sooner if they hear what we want, than if an illegal, vicious inner-Party struggle is waged against individual comrades. If we have such an inner Party course in Germany in the future — and I believe that Comrade Thälmann will keep this promise — then I say that there will be an end to factionalism also in Germany. (Interjection: "Your speech must be retranslated from the Russian!")

I close, just as Comrade Zinoviev did, with the call that the unity of the C. I. is one of the weightiest tasks of the future.

Comrade SMITH (Great Britain):

Comrades, the British Delegation was somewhat at a loss, after hearing Comrade Zinoviev's speech, to make up its mind as to the purpose of his remarks. Comrade Zinoviev assured us that his speech was not to be interpreted in the nature of an appeal, and yet as we listened to his words we felt that no other explanation was possible. I just want to draw your attention to Comrade Zinoviev's explanation of his position on the two fundamental questions at issue in the late discussion.

On the question of the possibility of building Socialism in one country — in Russia — we have the following three statements which Comrade Zinoviev made, or approved, at different stages in his speech. He said first of all, towards the beginning of his speech, that it was not possible to build up Socialism in Russia alone. That is a definite statement. There is not much possibility of ambiguity in that. Then, later on, Comrade Zinoviev quoted a statement by Lenin in which he said that it was easy to seize power in Russia, but that it was much more difficult to maintain it; whereas, abroad, it may be more difficult to seize power, but more easy to maintain it. Comrade Zinoviev quoted that with approval — that it would be more difficult, — in other words, he admitted the possibility of maintaining it, with some exceptional effort. That is, we have a departure from the round and definitely clear statement that it is impossible to build up Socialism in one country.

Then, thirdly, Comrade Zinoviev again quoted with approval a statement by Comrade Lenin to the effect that the present generation would never be able to achieve Socialism, but that possibly the next generation would be able to. Here we have actually a period of time indicated in which it might be possible to build up Socialism.

The British Delegation submits that, so far as clearing up his position on the question of the building of Socialism, Comrade Zinoviev has contributed nothing to this discussion.

The most striking thing about that section of Zinoviev's speech in which he dealt with the possibility of building up Socialism in one country was the fact that he did not say a single word about the practical issues, about the practical

campaign that he and his fellow members of the Opposition had been carrying on during the recent months on the basis of the assumption that Socialism could not be built up in one country. We did not hear a word about the development of the U. S. S. R. towards capitalism as against Socialism. We did not hear a word about the failure to industrialise the country. We did not hear a word about the declaration that "in our country, our State is very far from being proletarian". We did not hear a word about the notorious declaration that industry in Russia is very far from being of a Socialist character. On the practical issues of the political campaign which Comrade Zinoviev, with the other members of the Opposition, had been carrying on — on the basis of the assumption, or justifying by the assertion, that Socialism was not being built up in Russia, about that we did not hear a word.

Then again, if we approach it from the standpoint of contribution to the discussion, Comrade Zinoviev might have told us about the importance which this question of constructing Socialism has, not in its direct bearing on Russia, but in its bearing on the other Parties. He might have raised the issue of the fundamental change of the world situation, from the point of view of the proletarian revolution, which has been created by the emergence and consolidation of a Socialist State on one sixth of the globe. Did Comrade Zinoviev give us any practical help there? None at all. But what Comrade Zinoviev did make in the discussion is a statement which the British Delegation regards as extremely dangerous, and which we say must be combated to the utmost. This was the quotation from Comrade Lenin in 1914 to the effect that the order of the day for Russia was a democratic republic, while the order of the day for other countries was a Socialist Republic. And Comrade Zinoviev used that as an argument to justify his thesis. Comrade Zinoviev did not say a word about the fact that Comrade Lenin was issuing that slogan as a practical slogan of the moment, raising the issue as Comrade Zinoviev did, prepares the ground for pure unadulterated Menshevism of the most ordinary variety, which all of us have to combat in our own Communist Parties.

Again, he gave us a list of the countries in which he said there had been Right deviations. So far as the British Delegation are concerned, we are prepared to let the other Parties speak for themselves. We do not admit for a moment that our Party has been guilty of Right deviations. We believe that the Plenum will agree with the resolution which is being prepared, in which the true state of affairs of Great Britain is set out. We admit that the leaders of our Party, at certain moments after the General Strike and during the miners' lock-out, had certain moments of hesitation, and that those hesitations led to mistakes, which we attempted to correct as soon as they were pointed out to us, and in some cases before they were pointed out to us. We believe that, in the study of those mistakes on the various tactical questions which arose during the struggle of the miners, our Party will go forward and that the whole International will derive benefit therefrom.

But what were Comrade Zinoviev's contributions to the corrections of our mistakes during this period? His contributions lay in two directions. First, he was an advocate of that remarkable proposal that the Russian Trade Unions should leave the Anglo-Russian Committee. That was Comrade Zinoviev's contribution. I do not think it is necessary for me to enlarge upon that theme, or to enlarge upon the arguments which show it to be a grotesque suggestion, when, after the General Strike, in their day-by-day actions the reformist leaders of the British trade unions were exposing themselves in the eyes of the masses, and when it was essential to contrast very sharply to them and their tactics, not only the Russian trade union leaders' perfectly justifiable and necessary criticism, but also their positive struggle for unity, and the positive desire of the Russian trade union movement to continue the struggle for world trade union unity.

The other contribution which Comrade Zinoviev made was when he allowed to pass without a word of criticism, without a word of objection, an article in the "Communist International" by Comrade Trotsky, which our Party characterised — very mildly, with very great restraint, — as "differing very little from the standpoint of those who stand for the liquidation of our Party". It is the article in which the phrase was used about the British Party being part of the apparatus which was acting as a brake upon the revolution. But it was not only that

outstanding phrase. There was suggestion after suggestion that our Party did not exist, that it did not count, that it was not a Communist Party. For instance, such phrases as this, that only if a struggle for the exposure of the Left wing, of the deviation and mistakes of the Left wing, is carried out systematically, only then can there be any talk of a real revolutionary (i. e. Communist) Party in Great Britain". That was the article which Comrade Trotsky launched on us after the General Strike, which Comrade Zinoviev allowed to pass without a protest and which was seized upon by the Communist renegades, the sham Left wingers grouped around the "Plebs" and Lansbury, etc., to use in their fight against us. That was Comrade Zinoviev's second practical contribution to the discussion.

In conclusion, we want to say just a few words to Comrade Trotsky. Comrade Trotsky told us, with an air of great frankness, that he admitted his two great errors in the past — his estimate of the motive forces of the revolution, and his attitude of the building up of a Bolshevik Party. He was very persuasive, and apparently he convinced Comrade Riese; but the British Delegation would like to ask Comrade Trotsky — "What about your errors of 1923? Were they not a repetition of those same errors of pre-revolutionary days, the wrong estimate of the power of the peasantry and the wrong attitude on Party unity? And what about your attitude in 1926? Has not the campaign of the last three or four months been a repetition of the same mistakes on the question of the active forces of the revolution, on the question of the unity of the Party?" So far as the British Delegation is concerned, it considers that no comrade can go on year after year saying that he renounces all his previous mistakes and then go ahead and repeat those mistakes, nor can he get off by saying the same thing again in a few months' time.

Trotsky and his supporters have a habit of answering criticism on the part of foreign comrades by reference to the Pioneers, and by suggesting that we join the Pioneers and learn something about Communism. But we think that even within the Pioneers it would be difficult to pass off as a political reply that "we are sorry we made a mistake, and we won't do it again — until next time."

Then again, on the question of construction of Socialism. Trotsky has tried to get out of it in his speech by speaking of the "final" victory of Socialism. And he says now that he never denied that we are building up Socialism. The British Delegation would like to get from Comrade Trotsky, and we think the Plenum should ask Comrade Trotsky, what has become of all the talk that "our industry is not of a Socialist character", that "our State is not proletarian", and so on?

The British Party had a special interest in the two fundamental questions which have been raised by the Opposition — our attitude to the peasantry (which in our circumstances is the attitude on the Empire), and the question of the Party. On these two issues we find ourselves up against the whole sham Left group in Great Britain which I have described already, whose only purpose in life is to fight for the liquidation of the Communist Party. Just as their attitude towards our Party as exploiters of the backward masses is on a par with Trotsky's remarks in the old days about Lenin being an exploiter of everything backward in the masses, and of banditism, adventurism in the Party; so this group of liquidators, of renegade Communists, of sham Left elements in the labour movement, seize with joy on every attack which Trotsky makes upon the leaders of the Party and of the Communist International.

Comrade Trotsky's policy is objectively helping these liquidators, while the attitude to which I referred was of direct assistance to them. We want to say that, while we have an immense admiration for Comrade Trotsky's literary abilities, and while we do not under-estimate in any degree his services since the revolution, we will not tolerate any action, any attempt on the part of Comrade Trotsky to carry on against the British Party the same tactics of disintegration and demoralisation which he carried on against the Russian Party for twenty years. We are not prepared to sit silently and allow him to do that; nor are we prepared to allow him to play into the hands of the liquidators and the reformists by undermining the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. That is the reply which the British Delegation has to make to Comrade Trotsky.

Comrade ERCOLI (Italy):

After the appearance of Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky our delegation decided that it had nothing to change in the position it took on the Russian question, in the declaration which we read here the day before yesterday. But it will be necessary to touch upon some points with regard to the significance which this discussion has now taken on after the appearance of the Russian Opposition. Comrades, I am still of the opinion that the leaders of the Russian Opposition had the right, as members or candidates of the Executive, to take part in our debate, but I believe that this right is one thing, and the use that they have made of this right is quite another.

Zinoviev has experience on this field.

To be sure, we have the statutes of the International which guarantee certain comrades certain rights, but there is something that is not contained in these statutes.

That is the position of the Russian Party in the International, its leading functions; this transcends the statutes.

Consequently, I believe that the appearance organised by the leading Opposition comrades here must be condemned, because in it is contained an attempt to disorganise the leading role which the Russian Party holds in the International.

And upon this appearance, the foreign Communist Parties must reply:

"Well, against your attempts we rally around the Russian Party, we again emphasise before the whole world proletariat that the Russian Party shall lead the Communist International, and that this function is in our eyes the surest guarantee of the victory of the Revolution."

On the problems that come into question here, Zinoviev comes with a series of citations, which he himself divided into three categories.

In the first category are those citations which prove nothing.

In the second category are those citations which prove too much.

And in the third category are those that have been applied in a stupid manner (to employ an expression used here by Comrade Trotsky himself yesterday).

In the first category belong the citations of Marx, Engels and Lenin which emphasise the international character of the Communist Revolution. What do these citations prove? They contain universal axioms which no one ever thought of doubting. But Zinoviev today presents these general citations in order to defend a false policy and ideology with them, and I should like to remind you that already in October 1917, Zinoviev and Kamenev had recourse to general statements, e. g. that the struggle of the workers alone could not bring the revolution to a victorious termination, in order to defend thereby their defeatist attitude in opposition to the decisions of the C. C. which had come out in favour of the uprising. The citations which prove too much are those with which one would like to defend, with Marx, Engels and Lenin, viewpoints that have already been outstripped by facts. Thus, e. g. they cite the views of Marx and Engels "that a revolution without England would be only a storm in a tea cup". The Russian revolution has taken place, and it is not a storm in a tea cup.

Now, as to the third category of citations, which were applied in a stupid manner. This includes all those citations resorted to in order to prove which were the revolutionary perspectives of Marx and Engels in a given epoch. And they make use of the citations which deal with the perspective of the revolution in two countries. Does Zinoviev intend to manufacture a theory of the building of Socialism in two countries? But these perspectives were those which confronted Marx and Engels as concrete immediate perspectives for the development of the Revolution in their epoch. Should we today work with identical perspectives? I think not. I believe that if we study the work of Marx and Engels we can observe their continuous effort to revise, to adapt themselves to new situations that arose.

One might cite as an example also Lenin's "State and Revolution". Lenin tries there to show how Marx and Engels came to define the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the conquest of the State, the destruction of the bourgeois State apparatus through the proletarian revolution, and Lenin showed how, step by step, thanks to the experiences of the revolution of 1848 and the Commune of 1871, Marx and Engels came to define and delimit their position, and also to change their theoretical formulation. The same is true with regard to the sections on the

peasantry in the Communist Manifesto. The question of the relations between workers and peasants are not dealt with there in the manner in which they are handled in later writings of Marx and Engels. After the Communist Manifesto, Marx looked into this problem and made more precise his train of thought concerning the relations between proletariat and peasantry. I believe that we can very easily settle with all these citations.

Now as to the object of the discussion, the most important problem that stands between us and the comrades of the Russian Opposition in the discussion — the question of building Socialism in a single country. This problem will attain the same importance as the discussion we had on the III. Congress on the revolutionary perspectives did. By our discussion on the perspectives of the Russian Revolution, we are deciding the perspectives of the world revolution.

But does anyone imagine that the viewpoint defended by the C.C. of the Russian Party permits the forgetting or eliminating of the international character of the Russian revolution? I do not think a single comrade has any doubt on this point.

Everything done for the Russian revolution serves equally the world revolution in Italy, in Germany, in France. Is there a single one of us who doubts that the Red Army is the Army of the Russian revolution? Is there a single one in the ranks of the Russian Party who harbours doubt as to the complete identity of the Russian Revolution and the world revolution? I say that if anyone has these doubts, he has no place among us, about this I need not speak at length. (Applause.)

One must go somewhat deeper into the problem. In passing I shall deal with the problem that was touched on by Zinoviev. He said: If you raise the perspective of the possibility of building Socialism in a single country, in Russia, you are sowing pessimism and defeatism in the ranks of the Parties and proletariat of the West. When Comrade Lein maintained that the revolution could be victorious in a single country, did he intend thereby to found a defeatist theory? No, certainly not. The problem must be considered from a different viewpoint. It must be considered from the viewpoint of the influence which the Russian Revolution and the activity of the Russian Communist Party have upon the forces of the world revolution. If we consider this problem from this viewpoint, we must admit that the deeds of the Russian Party, of the Russian revolution, have been after the war the most powerful organising factor, the strongest impetus for the revolutionary forces of the world.

But is this fact still effective upon the working class of the whole world? Obviously it is still effective. But in order that it be effective, another element must be at work on the consciousness of the working class of the world, this is the conviction that in Russia, after seizing power, the proletariat can build up Socialism, and that today it is actually building up Socialism. (Applause.) To the extent that this element is ideologically and politically effective in the working class of all countries, the Russian Revolution is influential. The argument of Comrade Zinoviev must be viewed in this way, and not as he presented it.

Let us again take the subject under discussion. Permit me to enter upon what Trotsky said.

He proceeded from the statement that there is a close connection between the economy of all countries at the present moment, and between Russian economy and capitalist world economy.

"I will now submit three hypothesis to you" said Comrade Trotsky.

The first is the hypothesis of a revolution in the near future in the West. In this hypothesis he says:

"We all agree that this shows one way out of the situation."

"The second hypothesis is the revolution after 50 years."

"The third hypothesis is that there will be no revolution even after 50 years." So this is the viewpoint of Trotsky.

The second and the third hypothesis reduce themselves to one, because in both cases Trotsky tells us: "If we have to resist for 50 years it is all the same whether it comes or not, Soviet Russia will become an integral part of capitalist world economy, viz. the perspectives of our revolution are not the perspectives of a Socialist development."

If this is not the "permanent revolution", what is it? It is the theory of the permanent revolution in the classic form in which Trotsky always defended it.

Now a few words about the consequences of this attitude. I believe a few words are necessary here about the Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc.

I look upon this bloc from the following viewpoint: obviously one can always form a bloc with comrades with whom one had fights over immediate aims. But Zinoviev in 1923-24 had not only a momentary transitory fight with Trotsky. Zinoviev himself said: "No, Trotsky, that is not a momentary political position, Trotsky, that is a consistent doctrine, that is Trotskyism!"

That is why we cannot comprehend the bloc as it is today practised by Zinoviev. That is not a bloc, comrades. A word as to the consequences of this attitude of Zinoviev and Trotsky on the international question.

I believe that the thing is now quite clear, that we have all seen this, and after I have heard Trotsky speak I can better explain to myself everything that he says on the international field and in the Russian Party. What is it that they lack? perspective for the development and success of the Russian revolution. We must therefore say openly what Trotsky has not said, but what he thinks, on the problem that confronts the Russian revolution: with a complete surrender we can make no progress.

This lack of faith which you have towards the possibility of building Socialism, causes you to seek feverishly for direct perspectives in all events that occur abroad (British strike, etc.).

This led to all the mistakes that were made, such as for example, the proposal to dissolve the Anglo-Russian Committee. On the basis upon which you put the Russian question, you cannot get ahead. With this third hypothesis, Trotsky gives no perspective for our work in the West, in that he combines the work in Russia with the preparations for work in the West. That is the source of all mistakes, this transition from the Right to the ultra-Left, this is the source of the mistake, the doubt, the source of all mistakes made on an international field. That is why Zinoviev can no longer come to us and talk about the necessity to fight the Right, while we at the same time fight the Left. Comrade Zinoviev, when we are fighting you, we are also fighting the Right. (Applause.)

I always thought that the Left deviation was an exaggeration of the view that leads to too high an appraisal of the effectiveness of revolutionary work among the masses, I thought the Left were comrades who were marching too rapidly, who furnished perspectives and proposed slogans that contained the danger of separating us from the masses.

The standpoint defended by Trotsky is not a Right standpoint. It leads us to under-estimate the effectiveness of the work among the masses. On the national field, that is in the problems that affect the Russian Party, the Opposition, which has lost the viewpoint of a general perspective of the revolution, falls into the most serious deviations, it goes so far as to recognise and defend no longer the general interests of the Revolution, but to subordinate them to the partial interests of certain strata of the population and corporations. It has entered upon a by-way that leads to a repetition of the mistakes of syndicalism and reformism. For this reason it must be ideologically and politically defeated in the Russian Party and in the International.

Comrades, I will close by reminding you of something that Trotsky said here. He spoke about biographies, and about what is being said regarding his biography. He told us; Mehring was a petty-bourgeois who died as a good Communist, and he told us that Kautsky and Bauer, who were loyal disciples of Marx and Engels, still live today as the lackeys of capitalism. Comrades, there are no words that are devoid of political meaning. Therefore, comrades, I wish Comrade Trotsky a long life with his Social Democratic deviations, but I am convinced that the comrades who are leading the Russian Party will not live as lackeys of capitalism.

Until today, it was only the Opposition leaders who have refused to vote for the expulsion of Ossovsky who has solidarised with the "lackeys of capitalism". (Applause.)

(Close of Session.)

Twenty-Second Session.

Moscow, December 10, 1926.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

The 22nd Session is opened. The first speaker will be Comrade Manuilsky.

Comrade MANUILSKY (C. P. S. U.):

Comrades, I should like to enter upon a question that is of extraordinary principal importance, namely, upon the question of building Socialism in one country. I want to do this, first, because practically the whole fire of the Opposition speakers has been directed against the manner in which the reporter, Comrade Stalin, dealt with this question; and, secondly, because it is of essential importance for the C. P. S. U. As long as our October Revolution and its leading Party, the C. P. S. U. remain the foundation of the whole international Communist movement, the problems of our Socialist Revolution must perforce be problems of an international nature. And thirdly, the manner of formulating the question is after all dictated by the fact that it involves a solution, the aim of which is the activation of the Parties in the various countries. In my opinion the question of the building of Socialism is of no less importance in our brother Parties' struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie in their countries, than it is in the C. P. S. U.

I would be very glad to avoid all polemics, especially such polemical methods as were applied here by the Opposition, especially by Comrade Trotsky, which threaten to envelop the gist of the disputed question with a lot of trash that has no immediate connection with the question itself. But since we are not in the Academy of Science, and since I am no devotee of that Christian morality which commends meekness and non-resistance, I am forced to reply to the attack with a few blows of my own. Before I deal with the gist of the question, I should like to make a few preliminary remarks in regard to Trotsky's speech.

First a remark of a personal nature. Comrade Trotsky cited a section from an article I wrote in the "Pravda" towards the end of 1917. A series of articles was published in 1918 by the Party Publishing House "Privoi", and it contains a false appraisal of Bolshevism as well as of the theory of permanent revolution. When in the course of political struggle one drags out of the literary archives all erroneous views, then the person who made these mistakes tries to explain them by the condition under which they were made, tries to show that they are distorted by the opponents, offers other citations from the same series of articles for the purpose of awakening the impression with the listener that the writer was badly understood, etc. etc.

In this respect in the course of the last few months of Party discussion our Opposition has established a whole school. I consider such methods dishonest. I declare here openly that those views I advocated represent a political mistake of a theoretical nature. In the course of my political life, when I still belonged to the "Otsovist" fraction, I have made even far worse mistakes. The Party knows my mistakes. And when necessary it drew the correct conclusions from them. But the Party also knows that I have made no effort to foist my mistakes upon it. I wish that Comrade Trotsky would take the same attitude towards his mistakes that I do towards mine.

The second remark refers to the attack indulged in by Comrade Trotsky against Smeral. Trotsky waxed ironical on Smeral's speech, and hinted at his Social Democratic past. Smeral was not called upon to give lessons in revolutionary enthusiasm to Trotsky, the leader of the October Revolution. Comrade Smeral has never denied that he, like many other old leaders of the international labour movement, has come out of the II. International. He has never denied that in the past he has made political mistakes.

But has Comrade Trotsky himself perhaps no Social Democratic past? Can he permit himself to parade here as a judge who brooks no contradiction? I remind you only of the episode of the liquidatory slogan of the freedom of coalition, which just occurs to me. It was at the time when our Party was waging a life and death struggle against the Menshevik

liquidators, who wanted to legalise the Russian labour movement at any price by adapting themselves to tsarist conditions. At that time, Trotsky went along with the Right Mensheviks not only against the Bolshevik Party, but even against the Left Mensheviks, against the supporters of Plekhanov.

In this same hall here we had to combat certain mistakes of Comrade Smeral, but Comrade Smeral undertook certain pledges towards the Communist International and there cannot be one single person who can claim that Smeral did not fulfil these pledges. With other Czech comrades, Smeral in 1920 led the Czech Party into the III International, without splitting it into old and young generations, and this is the same Party which at the present time forms one of the strongest Sections of the Communist International. After the crisis which is identified by the name of Bubnik, Smeral, like a disciplined soldier, saluted and carried out all the decisions of his Party and of the Communist International.

Can Trotsky say the same about himself? Let us make only a short enumeration of the most important episodes in the Party career of Comrade Trotsky. It was in 1921, on the eve of the Kronstadt uprising, at a time when petty-bourgeois anarchy threatened the proletarian dictatorship in our country, that Comrade Trotsky opened up a discussion on the trade unions. He advocated that the trade unions must be "ingrown" into the State, he proposed that we should carry War Communism still further, and thereby seriously menaced the alliance between proletariat and peasantry, the "smytchka".

In 1923, Trotsky, during our first economic difficulties, delivered a new blow against the Party, by opening the discussion on inner-Party democracy. This inner Party democracy — to use an expression of Comrade Kamenev, the present ally of Trotsky — knocked at the door of the Party with the knuckles of Trotsky.

In 1924, there was a new discussion on the question of the "Lessons of October" which Trotsky now gives up. First frivolously setting into motion the whole Party and the whole country, only, after two years, to throw overboard the former views on the Lessons of October — this is the "lesson" of this discussion.

In October, 1926, there is the discussion in the "Aviopribor". And finally, on December 9th, 1926, we see the hopeless attempt to bring before the forum of the International the discussion which was given up by the Opposition in its declaration of October 16th.

Smeral never acted this way. Smeral came to Communism after he had bought a ticket to the end of the line. The others seem inclined to buy a round-trip ticket, good coming and going: I believe that I am expressing the general consensus of opinion when I say that I prefer the people who come toward Communism to those who leave it. (Applause). Why was Trotsky ironical about Smeral yet having not a single word to say about Souvarine? Because Souvarine stands closer to Trotsky than Smeral.

The third remark I should like to make concerns the manner of the declaration which Trotsky made to this Enlarged Executive in regard to the errors bound up with the theory of the permanent revolution. Trotsky flung into the meeting a sentence to the effect that while in the question of the permanent revolution, Lenin and our Party had been right, this was not the case with all members of the Enlarged Executive, because many of them had themselves come into the Communist movement later. What is the idea behind such a method of talk to this Plenum? In old Tsarist Russia, run-down nobles were wont, when in the company of simpler folks, to make the latter unmistakably conscious of inferiority. However illustrious may have been Comrade Trotsky's chapter in the past, it has already been dissipated in the present. He has absolutely no reason to act this way towards the members of the Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

It is not the fault of the young revolutionary generation that it has only entered the Communist movement after the war. It sounds like pure sarcasm when Trotsky, after having taken such a tone, appeals to this "high body". The participants in the Enlarged Executive are plain folk, they consider themselves,

in the present difficult situation in the international Communist movement, to be ordinary workers in the social revolution. They are least of all inclined to be caught by such parliamentary methods as the declamation about the "high body". Such kind of oratorical tricks may be fitting for a bourgeois parliament, but not for a Communist meeting.

CONCERNING THE MANNER IN WHICH CITATIONS SHOULD NOT BE USED.

I am now proceeding to the gist of the question. In order to prove the impossibility of building Socialism in one country, Comrade Zinoviev furnished a whole pile of citations from Marx, Engels and Lenin. It is of great importance for us to learn what was the stand of the great leaders of Communism on the weightiest questions of the international labour movement, and this is particularly important, I think, in regard to this question which is new to us, and which must be solved by the Communist International in such a peculiar situation.

Yet the methods of Comrade Zinoviev in collecting his citations without taking into consideration the concrete situation and tasks which confronted the proletariat at the time the cited sentences were written, was absolutely false, harmful and unconvincing.

By way of illustration let us take only the example of the Engels citation. In 1847 Friedrich Engels wrote the original draft of the Communist Manifesto, which later appeared under the title "The Fundamentals of Communism". In § 19 of this project, Engels raised the question: "Will the revolution be able to proceed in one country alone?" And Engels answered this question:

"The Communist Revolution will therefore not be merely a national revolution, it will be a revolution which proceeds in all civilised countries, i. e. at least in England, America, France and Germany, simultaneously."

What is the meaning of this citation? It does not speak only of the impossibility of building Socialism in a single country, but of the impossibility of a temporarily isolated proletarian revolution as such. From this it follows that Comrade Zinoviev was not only right in this question of the building of Socialism, but that he was also right on the eve of October 1917. In October, not Zinoviev, but the Russian proletariat was wrong when it dared to seize power without the simultaneous revolution in at least "four civilised countries". (Applause).

Our October Revolution is the historic fact which rendered Engels' position no longer valid. And if Engels had lived in our epoch, it is absolutely clear that he would have differentiated himself from Comrade Zinoviev on this question, for Engels was never an idolator of Marxism, he was its creative genius. We know how later on the whole Social Democracy exploited this citation against our October Revolution. It is obvious that in order to prove his thesis, Comrade Zinoviev had to follow in the footsteps of the Social Democracy, which had nothing in common with the spirit of Marxism.

A still worse method is resorted to by Comrade Zinoviev when he cites Lenin. The development of the Russian Revolution reveals three consequent stages, and, according to these three stages, different tasks were set to the proletariat and the C. P. S. U.:

1) The first stage — on the eve of October. The Party and the proletariat of our country were at that time confronted with the following question: can the proletariat in an economically backward country, seize power, exploiting the imperialist conflicts between the largest capitalist powers in a war period, if it is supported by the land-hungry peasantry, and by the peace-thirsty army? The October Revolution gave an affirmative reply to this question.

2) The second period, which lasted from October to the Kronstadt uprising inclusive, was the period in which the Revolution had to fight for its life. In this period, the revolution was forced to turn back the raging attacks of the domestic and foreign counter-revolution. We had no time then to think about building Socialism, because the chief task that at that time confronted the Russian proletariat was to maintain itself until the reserves of the international labour movement could come to its aid. The German Revolution of 1918 facilitated this task.

3) the third stage finally sees the questions of economic building of Socialism in the centre of the attention of Party and proletariat. By means of an evasive manoeuvre, we seek to

solve the task of finally conquering capitalism in our country, and erecting a Socialist society. Shortly before his death, Lenin, with shaking hand, wrote his testament to the Party:

"Twenty years of correct relations to the peasantry — and the victory of the revolution is assured."

From this third period of our revolution's development we can furnish dozens of citations that would throw into discard Comrade Zinoviev's manner of putting the question. And he knows it. He knows that immediately after we had beaten the counter-revolutionary forces it became clear that history had willed us a whole number of years of Socialist construction, and it was none other than Lenin who prescribed for our Party during this series of years, that policy which our Central Committee is now carrying out.

Neither in 1918 nor in 1919, were we confronted with the question of building Socialism. Our weightiest task at that time consisted in getting the support in some form or other of the European proletariat, so that we might avoid defeat in the civil war. If, without taking these conditions into consideration, one now piles up citations from the works of Lenin, supplying them with conjunctions or exclamation points, or arbitrary conclusions, then one arrives at that "Leninism" which Comrade Zinoviev presented to the Party in his book, three-fourths of which, however, he himself sacrificed after his bloc with Trotsky. For this reason, we consider that such a method of citation is an insult to the memory of Lenin, Engels and Marx.

ON A PESSIMISTIC DEVIATION AND ITS ORIGIN.

Comrades, If you study the deviations in our Party in connection with these three stages in the development of the Russian Revolution, then you will be convinced that, despite its outward appearance, the Opposition is tainted with lack of faith and pessimism, that 1) it reflects the pressure of our own petty-bourgeois elements, 2) that it expresses the influence of international Social Democracy which filters in from abroad.

When, on the eve of October, Lenin raised the question of whether the proletariat can take and keep power in Russia, the Social Democrats rose as one man against this Leninist formulation. According to their views this meant a violation of history for the proletariat of a backward country, without passing through the stage of the Democratic revolution, to seize power. Our Party was not the Party of revolutionary Marxism, it was a Party of adventurers who were treading underfoot the Marxist heritage. Our revolution was no proletarian revolution. It was the revolution of a declassed soldiery, it was the revolution of mass plunder and unrestrained land division. This was the leitmotif of the Social Democratic press' attitude towards the October.

Did this appraisal of our revolution find an echo in the ranks of our Party? Undoubtedly. It reflected itself in the mistakes of those who shrank back in the decisive moment of the October struggles. Not for polemical reasons do we point out that the background of the present mistakes of Zinoviev and Kamenev is to be found in their mistakes on the eve of October.

We see, in the heroic period of the Russian Revolution, the same pessimistic deviations. The whole Social Democracy accused us during the period of the Brest-Litovsk peace, that we were not radical, not consistent enough, that we had made a compromise with German imperialism. Otto Bauer and Kautsky prophesied that our revolution would degenerate into a purely bourgeois one, that our country must inevitably come back to the re-establishment of capitalism. And again, we see how these conceptions found an echo in our Party and in certain Communist groups of the West. In the camp of "Left" Communism, as well as in the "Workers' Opposition" which followed it, we encounter elements with the same ideology.

Even an organisation like the Spartakus Bund, which laid the foundations of the Communist Party of Germany, occasionally slipped up on these questions. Thus, in an article of the Spartakus Bund in September 1918, it was written:

"To carry out the proletarian dictatorship and the Socialist Revolution in a single country which is surrounded by old imperialist reactionary rule, and around which there rages the bloodiest world war in human history, is to square the circle. Every Socialist Party would have to fail and go down to ruin on this task — regardless of whether it took as the guiding star of its policy the will to victory and faith in international Socialism or else its own resignation".

And further, it is stated:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, unless the international proletarian revolution comes to its aid in time, is condemned to so terrible a defeat, that the fate of the Paris Commune will be child's play in comparison".

(Not quite exact text).

Even if this conception of the German comrades was dictated by the necessity of coming to the immediate aid of the Russian proletariat, even though it at the same time expressed the international feeling of the pioneers of the German Communist movement, yet an appraisal of this kind, at the present time in Russia, reflects nothing other than a hopelessness and lack of faith in the forces of the Russian Revolution.

At this very time, the proletariat of our country, the C. P. S. U., is no less subjected to the most bitter assaults of the international Social Democracy. From the present period of our Revolution, the entire international proletariat is learning how Socialism can be built up, and the Social Democracy of all countries is striving with all means to weaken the growing sympathy of the workers for our Socialist construction. The Social Democracy declared long ago that we have entered upon our Thermidor phase, that our Socialist big industry is nothing else than a fiscal monopoly, that our working class does not create and dominate the new Social relations, that our working class is composed of exploited slaves, that the bourgeoisie in town and village, inundates both upper and lower storeys, that our Party is in a process of degeneration.

It is enough to remind you of what the well-known Menshevik Dalin, wrote in his book: "After wars and revolutions", in order to recognise whence blows this pessimism that has seized upon certain oppositional groups in the C. P. S. U. and in the German Communist Party. Our Opposition has not dared to characterise our industry, our relations to the working class, as it did at the XIV Party Congress. It has made an apparently harmless attack upon the question of building of Socialism in a single country.

THE INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE QUESTION OF BUILDING SOCIALISM IN A SINGLE COUNTRY.

This Thermidorist ideology refers not only to our revolution, but to the entire Communist labour movement. This ideology not only undermines faith in our Socialist construction, but in Socialism as such. It is therefore much more dangerous for the European proletariat which lives outside our boundaries and does not have the opportunity to witness daily the successes of our daily construction. If, for the proletariat of our Union the question of whether the working class can take and maintain power is already settled, while the question of building Socialism is of more practical importance, matters are otherwise for the West-European Communist Parties. In the consciousness of the European proletariat these problems are inextricably bound up with one another, they represent a uniform whole of Socialistic conception. If one member is torn from this concept, the whole Socialist programme is open to question.

How can one come to the proletariat and tell them: "We believe that the Russian proletariat acted correctly in October when it seized power, we believe that the victorious revolution is able to vanquish the internal and external forces of counter-revolution; but our doubts begin at a moment in which the proletariat proceeds to the building of Socialism. This is exactly how our Opposition puts the question. Will not every worker, who is unskilled in the science of citation and who does not understand the fine points of polemics, raise the question: "Well, in that case, am I not engaged in a Syssibus task if I now make sacrifices for Communism?" Every class-conscious worker must consider, on the day after the capture of power, he must ask himself whether he will succeed in overcoming the economic difficulties, whether he will prove stronger and more capable of resistance in Socialist economy than the capitalist surroundings.

These are the questions which the European workers put themselves in every revolutionary situation, and these are no idle questions. Through the whole course of events in recent years, these questions have been put on the agenda. The British coal strike and the Chinese revolution put the questions, the German Revolution of 1923 raised them.

Let us take a country like England. The difficulties confronting the British Revolution on the day after the conquest of

power by the proletariat are much greater than the difficulties which confronted the Russian proletariat. In Russia, we had no Pacific possessions. The territory of the Soviet Union stretches unbrokenly for thousands of versts. We have a gigantic unsatisfied domestic market, we have tremendous reserves of raw materials and food supplies. Matters stand otherwise in England. Already today the British bourgeoisie, allied with the British reformists, frightens the proletariat with the spectre of a collapse in Great Britain. The Dominions will secede, the colonies fall away, a European bloc will be formed against England, America will menace the victorious British proletariat with a military intervention.

Comrade Bell already raised this question in this Enlarged Executive. How shall we answer it? In his book on "Europe and America", Comrade Trotsky gives a reply to this question. He sees in the creation of a United Socialist States of Europe, a guarantee for the victory of the British proletariat. Yet the arising of such a United States of Socialist Europe has as its pre-requisite the revolution in all Europe, and this is undoubtedly the more probable perspective. Great Britain is too much in the centre of European economics for a revolution in England like the Revolution of 1848, to fail to find an immediate echo on the Continent.

Yet if the revolutionary activity of the European proletariat should be temporarily held up, if the establishment of the United States of Socialist Europe should be delayed, what reply would we then give the British proletariat? Can the British proletariat resist simultaneously American and European capitalism? And the manner in which we put the question of building Socialism in a single country dictates for us the reply: Yes, we answer this question in the affirmative exactly as did Comrade Bell in the name of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

Let us take, furthermore, China. Chinese economy is more backward than was the Russian before the revolution. Chinese dependence upon international imperialism is much greater than the dependence in which we found ourselves prior to the war. For this reason the struggle of international imperialism against the Chinese revolution will take even far sharper forms than did its struggle against the Russian Revolution. For the Chinese Revolution is a powerful factor which menaces the partial stabilisation of capitalist economy, and this will mean a severe defeat for international capital. Yet in view of all of the international difficulties of the Chinese Revolution in the present situation, can it be switched on to a Socialist track, if we have any doubts about Socialist construction in the Soviet Union?

In 1923 the German revolution confronted the Communist International with a similar problem. During the occupation of the Ruhr, revolutionary Germany was held in the grip of a tighter ring of imperialist powers than was Russia on the eve of October. Germany was without coal, its industry was disintegrating, it did not have the vast Russian areas on which it could manoeuvre, the German peasant masses were not in so close an alliance with the proletariat as were the Russian peasants in October 1917. Should the German proletariat under these circumstances, supported by the alliance with the Soviet proletariat, rise up for the struggle against the whole imperialist world; or should it not succumb to apprehension for the coming day? And only the way we put the question permits us to answer affirmatively.

The same applies to Italy in 1920. After their capitulation the Italian reformists used the economic difficulties as their justification. Italy has neither its own coal nor its own iron. Italy's dependence upon European capitalist economy is much greater than the dependence in which czarist Russia found itself towards West European capitalism. And it must be said that all doubts and hesitation of the Italian reformists seem to be ideologically justified by the position which Comrade Trotsky took in our last Session. The Italian reformists over-estimated the forces of European capitalism with respect to revolutionary Italy in precisely the same manner as did Comrade Trotsky in his speech with respect to the Soviet Union.

Trotsky's whole theory of the dependence of our Socialist economy upon international capitalism is an overestimation of capitalist stabilisation. We believe in the victory of Socialist construction precisely because we know that the Socialist elements will overpower the capitalist elements, and that the Soviet Union, its economy, is a factor which shatters the solidity of capitalist economy. Trotsky's new theory is the theory of a lasting and solid stabilisation of capitalist economy. In one of

the Sessions of this Plenum, Comrade **Zinoviev** said that the over-estimation of the forces of our enemy and the under-estimation of our own strength is a characteristic feature of opportunism. His colleague, Comrade **Trotsky**, has fully condemned this characterisation.

Even such small countries as **Bulgaria** and **Estonia**, in view of the very peculiarity of their international position, have confronted the International with this question.

If we draw the balance of all these examples, we must say that the problem of building Socialism in a single country is most closely bound up with the question of the possibility of a partial breach in the imperialist front against the world revolution. In our Communist circles the opinion is widespread that new, victorious battles can be the result only of a new world war. It will probably be true that a new world war will lead to revolutionary uprisings of the proletariat in a whole number of capitalist countries. Yet it would be a fatalistic conception if one were to assume that such a world war is the only road to the social revolution.

The epoch in which we now find ourselves may be featured by isolated wars which precede the general capitalist clash. Furthermore, what is even still more probable, in connection with the assault of the capitalist world, upon the **Soviet Union** and upon **China**, and finally also the revolts of the colonial peoples, we shall have at our disposal also revolutionary troops. Every new partial breach in the capitalist front in one of the capitalist countries will inevitably lead to armed clashes between this country and the rest of the capitalist world.

In view of differences of conditions it is exceptionally dangerous to give as a uniform scheme of development of the international revolution, that of a simultaneous process based on the law of a levelling of the development of capitalist countries laid down by **Trotsky** and **Zinoviev**. In this situation what is the meaning of the slogan of Socialist construction in a single country? It means a revolutionary initiative, because in reality each Section of the Communist International says to itself: Go forward, do not be afraid of the difficulties which are bound up not only with the conquest and maintenance of power, but also with the building of Socialist economy. Do not justify your passivity with the excuse that other Sections of the international labour movement are not yet ripe for action; release the fire of the revolutionary initiative of the proletarians of other countries and you will win!"

Was it not **Lenin** who raised this question during the imperialist war? He taught the then young revolutionary generations that it was the duty of the proletariat first of all to defeat their own bourgeoisie. Only the united efforts of the proletariat on this road will create an actual international programme of revolutionary action. Genuine internationalism consists in two different tasks, confronting our proletariat and the West European proletariat. The Communist International says to the workers of Western Europe: Overthrow the power of your bourgeoisie, pick out the weakest and most vulnerable spots in the imperialist front. Support with all your power the first country of Socialism — the **Soviet Union**, for its cause is the cause of the international proletariat.

From the proletariat of our Union, the Comintern demands the greatest sacrifices in the building of Socialism, for the establishment and consolidation of a stronghold of world revolution. The Comintern demands that the achievements of the proletariat of the Soviet Union shall serve the interests of the world revolution.

PASSIVITY UNDER THE MASK OF THE LEFT PHRASE.

The whole "internationalism" of Comrades **Trotsky** and **Zinoviev** remind us, on the contrary, of how the international Social Democracy dealt with the question of war shortly prior to 1914. By falling back upon the necessity of a simultaneous and equally strong anti-war campaign in all countries, the Social Democracy sacrificed in fact a partial breach of the capitalist front. The French Socialists made their struggle against war dependent upon a simultaneous similar action of the German Social Democracy. The latter, however, made their action dependent upon an equally powerful and equally active opposition by the Russian Socialists, etc. etc. But since history never permits such a complete equalisation of proletarian activity, such a completely uniform action, it turned out that this method of putting the question was a camouflage for international im-

perialism. Anyone who did not recognise that the law of uneven capitalist development was most closely bound up with the "unevenness" of the revolutionary activity of the international proletariat, had comprehended nothing of Leninism. One can not make up a revolutionary situation out of one's head, it must be taken as it really is. Our task consists in making it our business to see that every revolutionary action proceeds simultaneously. But from this it does not follow that the Opposition is justified, under the cloak of internationalism, in discrediting the achievements gathered in by that proletariat which was the first to break through the capitalist front.

The internationalism of Comrade **Trotsky**, which during the war was expressed by his slogan "Neither war nor peace", was in reality only a reflection of the Social Democratic conception of the "evenness" of the activity on the part of the international proletariat. The formula of modified internationalism appears to me unfitted also because it completely ignores the living reality with all its contradictions. Did not Comrade **Trotsky**, from the heights of his "internationalist" attitude, at that time accuse **Lenin** of national limitation because of the way in which he put the question involved in the slogan: "Smash first your own bourgeoisie and your own ruling classes"?

But this will be no complete victory of Socialism, the Opposition tells us. May be. Yet will this victory be complete even immediately after the success of the proletarian uprisings in all capitalist countries? Even if the proletariat were victorious in **Europe** and **America**, we could not say that we had a complete victory of Socialism. The complete victory of Socialism presupposes the destruction of classes and the dying out of the State. But the classes and the State, which arose long before the capitalist method of production, will remain in existence also after the victory of the proletariat in open struggle against its bourgeoisie. Classes and State will remain in existence until all economic forms are completely socialised.

All countries will have to go through the N.E.P. stage after the victory of the proletarian revolution. How long will it last? That depends upon a whole series of circumstances. First, upon the degree of economic maturity for Socialist forms of production and distribution in the given country. Second, upon the time at which the respective country is gripped by the revolutionary process. It is clear that those countries in which the revolution takes place after it has already been finished in the larger capitalist countries will go through the N.E.P. period far more rapidly than those countries which were first to break through the imperialist front.

All this is well known and we have often written about it in our Communist press. But why do Comrades **Trotsky** and **Zinoviev** want to prove, once, more an undisputed truth? It is clear that this is for the purpose of diverting our discussion into a direction favourable to them, and to awaken an impression among our hearers that somebody or other had questioned this undisputed truth.

AS TO THE DEPENDENCE OF SOCIALIST ECONOMY UPON INTERNATIONAL CAPITALIST ECONOMY.

I now proceed, comrades, to the manner in which Comrade **Trotsky** yesterday dealt with the question of the dependence of our Socialist economy upon world capitalism. Nobody disputes that on the fields of foreign trade, of credit relations, of concessions, policy, our economy to a certain degree is dependent upon international capitalist economy. If Comrade **Trotsky** had confined himself to the establishment of these facts, all debate on this question would have been superfluous. But Comrade **Trotsky** went further. He tried to establish a historical continuity between our Socialist economy and the economy of Czarist Russia.

In his argumentation, Comrade **Trotsky** starts from the point that the economy of Czarist Russia prior to the war, represented an organic part of capitalist world economy and that our own native imperialism was a part of world imperialism. The October Revolution could not eliminate pre-revolutionary economy from the whole system of capitalist relationship as simply as we can turn off the light by means of an electric switch. In what lies the error in this law of historical continuity laid down by Comrade **Trotsky**?

1. In that it raises this question formally, without concretely determining the links in the chain that brought pre-

revolutionary Russian economy into dependence upon world imperialism.

2. It completely misses the point of the class struggle, which stands behind the clash between elements of our Socialist order and those of the international capitalist order.

Prior to the war, the connections of czarism with European capitalist economy and the big imperialist powers was expressed in four chief forms: 1. in the form of financial dependence upon the West European capitalists, especially the French, who in the course of years supplied Russian Czarism with milliards, in the form of loans. Thereby the West European capitalists were put in a position to exploit large working masses of this country from whom they squeezed out interest on the sums loaned; 2. by holding the czarist bureaucracy in complete subservience on the field of international policy. Does this form of connection still prevail? You know that it was annulled by the October Revolution. The new credits that our country has received are too insignificant to play any kind of role in the "historical continuity", in this form of dependency; 3. foreign capital subjugated czarist Russia by taking big industry into its hands. The participation of French, Belgian, and German capital in various branches of our industry is a well-known fact. The first step of our October Revolution was the nationalisation of all enterprises, including also those owned by foreign capitalists. And how do matters stand now? The concessions are on a very minor scale. Comrade Trotsky, who is at the head of the Concessions' Committee, cannot boast of any particularly fruitful activity on this field. Furthermore, the connection between the czarist Government and the big imperialist powers was expressed on the field of foreign diplomacy in such international treaties as the Dardenelles Treaty, in which Russian Czarism appeared as the agent of allied imperialism. This connection also was severed by the October Revolution. Only such as Korsch can maintain that our international policy is in any manner a tool of the West-European States. Thus far at least our Opposition has not dared to charge us with this form of historical continuity. 4. This dependence appeared in the form of czarist militarism. The czarist army was the reservoir of human cannon fodder employed by the West European imperialists in their conflicts. As you know, thus far no lunatic has as yet been found to compare the role of our Red army with the imperialist forces of one or the other West European coalitions of capitalist States.

That is why Comrade Trotsky said lamely that the law of historical continuity is to some extent overdrawn. He errs here along the line of the international Social Democracy, which recognises no difference in either our economy or our policy from the economy and the policy of Capitalist States. On the basis of this theory of historical continuity, long advocated by the Social Democracy, our policy in China is nothing else than the historically continued form of Russian expansion towards the Far East.

Comrade Trotsky's law of historical continuity is for this reason dangerous because it claims to give economic causes for our political attitude. If the economic side of the question is examined it must also be admitted that Comrade Trotsky has injected confusion. Certainly, with regard to the world market, prices and the perspectives of industrialisation we are to a certain degree dependent upon international capitalist economy. But we must not make a fetish of this dependency. It must not be over-estimated. One must not fall into a panicky mood and try to frighten the Enlarged Executive with the possibility of defeat on this line.

We are first of all of the view that our dependence upon international capitalist economy is much less than the dependence of that economy upon us. Let us take so weighty a form of the inter-relationships of the modern capitalist world as the question of reserve raw material sources. On this field our position is very favourable. Our reserves of all kinds of raw materials are greater, the field supplied by our developing socialist industry is more vast than in any other country in the world. That over which a bitter struggle wages between capitalist countries, that which leads to wars, that which forms the chief nerve of their military defence — of this we have a surplus. And this fact gives into our hands a tremendous weapon for the overcoming of our dependence upon the capitalist world.

Let us take, furthermore, the question of markets. Markets constitute the vulnerable Achilles' heel of modern capitalism.

The capitalist world is choking for lack of these markets. With the aid of wars it is dividing up the already divided up areas, wrests them from one or from the other, and brings a Balkanised Europe into complete dependence. At the same time our Socialist economy finds itself in an extremely favourable situation. Our difficulties are not the result of an over-production, but a consequence of an inadequate production. We have a market at our disposal such as cannot be offered by any other country in the world.

In this respect our situation recalls the position which America has until recently occupied. Comrade Trotsky was pleased to be satirical over the problem of Socialism in one country and to compare it with the Monroe Doctrine. But Comrade Trotsky does not want to recognise that the Monroe Doctrine brought to expression the privileged position of American capitalism in the whole system of world economy. This privileged position of the United States of North America, having at its disposal tremendous sources of raw material, as well as tremendous domestic markets, this position became a decisive point in the boom of American capitalism. One must be truly steeped in distrust of the creative forces of Socialist construction, one must believe that on this field we will be weaker than the capitalist world, which exploits its privileged position.

According to Comrade Trotsky, it would appear as if the capitalist world can do anything with its forces while we are only a small branch of the capitalist system confronted with danger of degeneration. If Comrade Trotsky conceives of our economic system as an organic part of the capitalist world he thereby drifts into the channel of economic reformism, which permeates the Opposition policy with lack of faith in the cause of Socialist construction. Comrade Trotsky does not see that living classes stand behind the materialised economic categories, that the question of a greater dependence of our economy upon capitalist world economy represents a question of class struggle and inter-relationship between the Socialist sector of our economy and the private sector. He does not see that our victory is certain precisely because capitalist stabilisation is weak and unreliable, and because it will be blasted by capitalist contradictions.

Our optimism is no temperamental optimism. It is founded upon the knowledge that the capitalist world is already disintegrating, that we have already crossed over into a phase of international social revolution.

How can Trotsky in all seriousness try to bring proofs that the capitalist world has outlived its time and at the same time threaten us with the degeneration of our economy? Where is any logic, any connection to be seen here? On the one hand, Zinoviev's speeches about the partial capitalist stabilisation already inclining towards its end, and on the other hand, such a tremendous over-estimation of the forces of capitalism. With one hand they write "faith in the world revolution", and with the other hand, "the commencing degeneration in the economy of the Soviet Union". It is you who are robbing the Soviet Union of the perspective of a world revolution, it is the Opposition which views these two processes as phenomena not connected with one another.

If in the Soviet Union matters actually come to a Thermidor, what would this mean for the international Communist movement? It would mean that the International Communist movement would be unable either effectively to support the Russian proletariat, or to sound the alarm at the proper time. It would mean that "Thermidor had arrived not only for the C. P. S. U., but for the entire international Communist movement. And if Radek speaks in the Communist Academy about the August 4 of the Comintern, it means that he has burnt all bridges behind him. He has uttered that which you are thinking, but about which you shame facedly remain silent. The Enlarged Executive will know how to judge this Thermidorist philosophy. You appealed to the Russian Party and you were whipped. You wanted to carry over the discussion to the Comintern, but this card will also be beaten by the unanimous vote of the Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. (Applause.)

Comrade NEUMANN (Germany):

Comrades, I shall try to throw some light upon certain specific international problems in this discussion, but first I should like to make a few preliminary remarks.

1. With respect to the speech of Comrade Riese, this was entirely built up upon the idea that the Opposition bloc in the Russian Party came into existence not because Comrade Zinoviev

went over to the Trotsky viewpoint, but because Comrade Trotsky accepted the position of Comrade Zinoviev.

I should like to cite from a document from which we can clearly see the position of Comrade Trotsky on Trotskyism. This is a declaration by Comrade Trotsky on the question of permanent revolution. In this pamphlet "The New Course", 1924, Trotsky writes:

"As far as the theory of permanent revolution is concerned, I most decidedly see no reason to retreat from what I wrote in 1904, 1905 and 1906 and later. I believe also now that the fundamental trend of thought which I developed at that time stands incomparably closer to the real essence of Leninism than that which a number of Bolsheviks are writing at the present time." (Trotsky, "The New Course", Russian, pp. 50—51.)

It does not seem to me that this contains any expression of revision of his viewpoint on the question of permanent revolution, but on the contrary that this is the re-assertion, the complete maintenance of Trotskyism, not in 1917, but in 1924.

Matters stand otherwise in the position of Comrade Zinoviev. At the July Plenum this year, he declared the following with respect to his position on Trotskyism, his stand on the Trotskyist opposition of 1923:

"We say that to-day in view of the alteration of the policy of the leading fraction (viz., the majority of the C. C. H. N.) there can be no doubt that the main gist of the 1923 Opposition, by its warning of the danger of a deviation from the proletarian line in connection with the menacing growth of the bureaucratic regime, now clearly shows they were right."

This declaration of Comrade Zinoviev this year does not refer to the inner Party demands of the Opposition, but to the theory of the "deviation from the proletarian line", viz., the political gist, the ideological content of the Trotskyist Opposition.

From these two citations it is very evident that the view of Comrade Riese is false, that Zinoviev has not drawn Trotsky to him, but on the contrary, that Zinoviev has fully and completely gone over to the basis of Trotskyism which he combated in the past jointly with the other Parties.

2. The representatives of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. have not spoken here with full frankness, they have not uttered that which they said at the Russian Party Conference, what they said everywhere in the Soviet Union. They did not speak here about the degeneration in the C. P. S. U., about the kulakisation of the Soviet Government, about the Thermidor of the revolution, about the suppression of all ideological life in the Party, about the estrangement of the Party from the masses of workers — they have not repeated a word about what they have said at all meetings. Instead, they have confined themselves to the, so to speak, innocent, broad and most general problems: They spoke about Socialist construction and did not dare to present fully and completely the slogans of the Opposition bloc. They have preferred to conceal their real platform in practical politics. It must be added that the Opposition, especially in the speech of Comrade Trotsky, has shown the depth of its contradiction to Leninism, the unbridgeability of its conflict with the Bolshevik Party.

In his speech yesterday, Trotsky said verbatim, according to the stenogram, on the question of building Socialism in a single country:

"The more this theme is developed, the more do the heralds of the new theory fall into contradiction with the fundamental tenets of our doctrine."

And he adds to this, speaking of the Opposition,

"that the tradition of Marxism and Leninism is completely on our side".

Thus speak the representatives of that Opposition which signed the document of October 16, where they formally declared: "We recognise all decisions of the C. P. S. U., we submit to all decisions of the Party Congress". To-day, when the ink is hardly dry on that document, they declare that the policy of the C. P. S. U., and even more — the policy of the XIV. Party Congress and the XV. Party Conference — contravenes the fundamental principles of Marxism and Leninism.

"Marx and Lenin are upon our side and against the Bolshevik Party."

I believe that this expression of Comrade Trotsky proves that this struggle cannot be bridged over by concessions, but that the ideological struggle must be waged with all means to its conclusion. Here there can be no compromise, it must be that either the Opposition or the Party are at odds with the fundamental principles of Leninism.

I should like to proceed with the first question which plays a very mighty role in our differences with the Opposition at this Session. Comrade Trotsky dealt with the law of unevenness of capitalist development especially in his polemic against Comrade Stalin. Already at the XV. Party Conference he took a special viewpoint on this question in his polemic against the C. C. reporters. Against the teaching of the Bolshevik Party that the unevenness of capitalist development takes on specially strong and sharp forms in the imperialist epoch, Comrade Trotsky advocated a different viewpoint. What was the viewpoint of Comrade Trotsky at the XV. Party Conference? He said:

"The law of the unevenness of development is older than imperialism. Capitalism develops extremely unevenly even to-day, in the various countries but in the nineteenth century this unevenness was greater than in the twentieth... Precisely because finance capital is the oldest form of capitalism, imperialism develops more powerful "levelling" tendencies than did pre-imperialist capitalism." (Speech of Trotsky at the XV. Conference.)

What is the consequence of this sentence? It follows inevitably that the contradictions of capitalist development in the 19th century, viz., in the century of free capitalist competition, were smaller than in the 20th century, that the development of industrial capitalism in the epoch of finance capitalism was bound up with the weakening of the unevenness of capitalist development, with the lessening of the contradictions of capitalist development.

In his speech yesterday, Comrade Trotsky renewed this statement, although in a milder form.

"Imperialist development, that is, the newest phase of capitalism, did not enlarge these differences, but on the contrary, has led to a rather extensive levelling." (Speech of Trotsky at the VII. Enlarged Executive.)

Comrade Zinoviev expressed himself similarly. I believe that this disputed question is of decisive importance for the perspectives of the proletarian revolution as well as for the analysis which the C. I. must furnish for the present world situation.

Comrade Lenin held an opposite view from that of Trotsky: Yesterday Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev said, to be sure, that Lenin had never worked out a special formula for the law of the unevenness of development in the imperialist epoch. It was Comrade Zinoviev who pointed out that Comrade Lenin, in his pamphlet "Imperialism", devoted no special chapter to the law of the unevenness of development. Comrade Zinoviev surely knows this book better than most others, and he has probably read with special attention that seventh chapter which is headed: "Imperialism as a Special State of Capitalism." Here it is stated:

"Finance capital and the trusts do not weaken the differences in tempo of growth in the various parts of world economy, but strengthen them. But as soon as the relationship of forces has shifted — how else can, under capitalism, the conflicts be resolved than through force..."

What does Lenin say in contrast to the present theory of Trotsky? In his polemic against Kautsky, Lenin says:

"Kautsky's talk of ultra-imperialism among other things feeds the fundamentally false thought which carries water to the mills of the imperialist apologists, that the rule of finance capital weakens the unevenness and contradiction within world economy, whereas in reality it strengthens them." (Lenin: "Imperialism, the Last Stage of Capitalism", Chapter 7.)

It is easy to judge who advocates the fundamental principles of Marxism and Leninism in this question, and who combats them. Marx and Lenin are being fought on this question by Trotsky. A similar deviation had severe consequences in the dispute in which Lenin wrote these sentences, and in which he, for the first time systematically summarised this theory. This dispute was waged against Kautsky and those who denied the intensified unevenness of imperialist development.

Undoubtedly there is also a "levelling" tendency in the sense of a relative approximation in the concentration of the means of production, and in the Socialisation of labour. But this single tendency, which Lenin characterised as an abstract tendency towards the formation of a single world trust, developed along the very line of the unevenness, the disproportion, the sharpest, craziest clashes — as Lenin said —, the sporadic development, the outstripping of the standard of a given country by another country. According to Trotsky the levelling tendency, constantly minimising the unevenness, should have to have the effect of crystallising a perfectly spherical harmony. How does this explain that imperialism leads to constantly greater conflicts? Lenin fought Kautsky — yet if one considers the explanations of Trotsky, one might very well draw similar consequences to those of Kautsky at that time. He wrote in 1915:

"One must consider whether the present imperialist policy will be displaced by a new, ultra-imperialist one, which in the place of the struggle among the national finance capitals will establish a joint exploitation of the world through internationally allied finance capital." (Neue Zeit, April 30, 1915, p. 144.)

If it is true that the unevenness is becoming less, then why cannot the whole world be exploited by international finance capital? If the contradictions are becoming smaller, why cannot the League of Nations become the all-embracing organisation of the capitalist world?

How should one understand that the international cartels did not result in a rapprochement, but in an intensified conflict between imperialist States? Comrades, let us take an example from the present: the Franco-German Iron Trust. Is it not a result of the levelling tendency? Unquestionably it is. Does it mean a lessening of the unevenness? The German Party in its analysis of the concentration process has constantly stated that by the more powerful and rapid development of Germany this cartel will be split in the long run, that the scramble over quotas will become sharper and that the unevenness will lead to an explosion. I believe that on this point Trotsky as well as Zinoviev, who embraces unreservedly the Trotsky view, have not defended Lenin against the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., but they have embarked upon a deviation towards the theory of ultra-imperialism. As a result this is an obscuring and weakening of imperialist contradictions, instead of a revelation of their sharpness. The result is not a defence of Marxism, but a retrogression into bourgeois reformism, a Social Democratic deviation.

I now proceed to the second question which has played, a leading role in the debate, the question of socialist construction. In this point also the whole Opposition is in open antagonism to the views of the C. P. S. U.

It is peculiar that the formulation concerning the building of Socialism in a single country was brought to the foreground of the differences only after the XIV. Party Congress. At this Congress, the policy of the Opposition was the denial of the Socialist character of the economy of the Soviet Union, the denial of the Socialist character of State industry, banks, State finance and credit, co-operatives, etc. But after the XV. Party Congress, after the views of the Opposition were rejected by the XV. Party Congress, the Opposition did not revise its conceptions, but even went further, it extended and generalised its views, built up a system from them and launched a new war against the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress. The Opposition wages this struggle not only against the Party, but against the conceptions of Lenin. Most clearly can this be seen in the perspective which, while not openly expressed here by Comrade Trotsky, he nevertheless, on one occasion counterposed to the perspective of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union as a possible result of the evolution of the proletarian dictatorship.

Most clearly did Comrade Trotsky show this perspective in 1922 in the postscript to his book "War and Revolution". There Comrade Trotsky delineated the future result of the evolution of the proletarian dictatorship as follows:

"To heal these or the other economic wounds, to make this or the other step forward... but that a real advance of Socialist industry in Russia will be possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries in Europe." ("Krieg und Revolution", Vol. II, 1915, postscript page 481).

Thus he denies not only the possibility of Socialist construction, but even the possibility of a real advance of Socialist economy. He offers the victorious proletariat the "magnificent" aim of healing this or the other wound, of making this or the other step forward. This expression of Comrade Trotsky in 1922 contains the real perspective of the Opposition on the economic development of the Soviet Union, a perspective that at best involves only an aimless building, and at worst a restoration of capitalism. Trotsky offers to the proletariat which has captured power, expropriated the capitalists and is striding forward on the road of the development of Socialist construction — the task of healing its own wounds, etc. It is clear that this conception cannot meet the views of the proletariat in the first country of proletarian dictatorship. I believe that it is also clear that this viewpoint cannot be accepted by the international proletariat, by the Comintern, but instead it must be smashed.

In this connection, the other formulation of the question by Comrade Trotsky is also interesting. In the same book he speaks about the impossibility of an isolated socialist construction within national borders. That he speaks here at the Enlarged Executive about the impossibility of Socialist construction involves no contradictions with his other views. Comrade Trotsky does not speak of the impossibility of Socialist construction in one country, yet with specific emphasis, he mentions the impossibility of an "isolated" Socialist construction and repeatedly introduces this word "isolated". This reveals one of the fundamental errors in the Opposition view on the question of Socialist construction. It considers the proletarian State, the Soviet Union, as an "isolated" country, not as one country as stated by the Majority and by Lenin, but beyond this, as an isolated country. I believe that the building of Socialism in one country is identical with the building of Socialism in an isolated country. The Soviet Union is not an isolated country. Comrade Trotsky takes great pains to prove that the Soviet Union is in capitalist surroundings and dependent upon them, or, as he said yesterday, that it is a portion of the system of capitalist world economy. He therefore maintains that the Soviet Union is inseparably bound up with capitalist world economy, but that it is isolated from the standpoint of the proletarian revolution.

Here I believe is to be found the basic error of the Opposition theory regarding Socialist construction. Here we find clearly what the Opposition seeks to cover up by its attacks: viz., the Opposition considers the Soviet Union not as a sector of the international revolution, connected up with the advancing revolution in the capitalist countries, not in relationship with the proletariat of the capitalist countries, but solely as a section of capitalist world economy which is isolated from the forces of the international proletariat that can oppose capitalism.

The Soviet power, said Comrade Lenin, could not have maintained itself two months without the support of the international proletariat. Comrade Trotsky only sees the State aid. The whole task of the Comintern, the whole historical work of the revolutionary process which the Comintern and the Communist Parties influence and accelerate — all this has no existence for Comrade Trotsky. For him the Soviet power is completely isolated. Only after there is State aid — he does not distinguish proletarian support in general from its special State form, he does not distinguish between the efforts of the Western proletariat which can be made even before the seizure of power, before taking over State power, from the efforts that can be made with the aid of the captured State power.

Could the Soviet power have existed if e. g. West European imperialism in 1918 had not been disturbed by the German revolution which tore up the Brest Peace Treaty? Was the German revolution a support of the international proletariat or not? Yes, the German revolution broke through the isolation. Had the Polish war of 1920 not probably gone worse without the help of the British proletariat that threatened a general strike and instituted the Committee of Action? Does not the situation depend upon the movement of the international proletariat? Why do the imperialists hesitate to-day to carry out the intervention? Why is Poland holding back? Not only because of the Red Army, but also for fear of the international proletariat which has learned from the first imperialist war and which now has its Communist Parties. Why did the British bour-

geoisie after the British General Strike hesitate to attack Russia? Why did it have to retreat in China? Because of various reasons of imperialist rivalry, and also because it feared the intervention of the international proletariat.

The fact which Trotsky does not see is that the isolation is broken through by the intervention, the support of the West European, the international proletariat even before it can render State aid. The mistake of Comrade Trotsky consists in that on the one hand he over-estimates the influence of capitalist world economy, of imperialism, and on the other hand, he under-estimates the power of the proletariat, the revolutionary strength of the working class and of the Comintern. He views everything from the standpoint of the national State, which is isolated. A classic illustration of this is furnished by his remark, his simile of the Monroe Doctrine. I do not know whether this was only an oratorical flourish of Comrade Trotsky, or whether it is the explanation of his idea. The Monroe Doctrine in its origin was the symbol of the young rising capitalism of America. It is to-day the cloak of the piratical imperialism of the United States which is enslaving and plundering South America. This doctrine is good enough for Comrade Trotsky to discredit, by comparison, the theory of Socialist construction in a single country.

What lurks behind this discrediting is again the nationalist limitation. Precisely in view of the comparison of the Monroe Doctrine, precisely with the ignoring of the international revolution I should like to say: there is not only national limitation, but there is actually a national narrow-mindedness in the platform of the Opposition.

I now come to another question, to the question of the building of Socialism in other countries, because after all, the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union is only a special case of Socialist construction in a single country as such. For example, in Germany, despite the relative stabilisation, we count upon coming to power in the not too distant future. What sort of a situation will then arise? We will have two Soviet Republics. Trotsky already in 1922 made a prophesy for such a case. It is the well-known sentence:

"Without waiting for others we begin the struggle and wage it on national soil in the firm belief that our initiative will give a new impetus to the struggle in other countries"...

That is all very well. But suppose that this does not happen?

"But if this did not take place it would be hopeless to believe — theoretical reasons as well as history are a proof of this — that e.g. revolutionary Russia faced with conservative Europe"...

This sentence has been sufficiently dealt with in the discussion. But very interesting is the second part which now follows:

"... Or that a socialist Germany could remain in existence isolated in the capitalist world." (Trotsky 1922, Postscript to "War and Revolution".)

The consequence therefore is: it is hopeless for the isolated Soviet Union to remain in existence. It is hopeless that in Germany the proletarian dictatorship can exist isolated in the capitalist world. If Germany should become a country of the proletarian dictatorship it would surely make it easier for the Soviet Union. But has there been any principal change in the formulation of the question? No. A strengthening of the proletarian power in Soviet Russia would take place, but the difficulties for Germany would also become greater. Germany will be subject to far greater military and political dangers from the standpoint of intervention than the Soviet Union. The question thereby becomes more complicated, and the theory of Comrade Trotsky for this complicated question opens up only the perspective of complicated hopelessness.

From this second viewpoint there is likewise revealed in the Opposition theory, in the theory of Comrade Trotsky, a liquidatory perspective with regard to the Socialist revolution not only for the Soviet Union, but also for all other countries, for all other Communist Parties. Therefore, it is necessary that here at this Plenum we settle sharply with this theory not only for reasons of solidarity with the C.P. of the Soviet Union, but also in the name of a revolutionary perspective for Western Europe and for the whole world. Just as the question was for-

mulated in Soviet Russia it applies also to Germany, and in the last analysis also on an international scale. The theory of Comrade Trotsky is the theory of absolute hopelessness. His speech yesterday offered clear proof of this. He said:

"What is involved is the building up of the isolated Socialist State in capitalist world economy. This can be done only in that the productive forces of this isolated State (again isolated!) become stronger and more powerful than the productive forces of capitalism, for in the long run, not for one or ten years, but for a half century, for a century even, only that State, that new social form can consolidate itself whose productive forces become more powerful than the productive forces of the whole system."

Where, in this "hypothesis" of international revolution, in this "hypothesis" which speaks of a perspective for not only from one to ten years, but from a half to even a whole century in reckoning with the victory of the West European revolution, where is there even so much as a breath of internationalism, of revolutionism? Nowhere!

An additional question that plays a role particularly with Comrade Zinoviev is the question of two Parties. Comrade Zinoviev disputed most vehemently that even the germ of an idea of two parties is contained in the views of the Opposition.

I believe that the theoretical formulation of Comrade Trotsky that the policy of the C. P. S. U. deviates from the most fundamental principles of Marxism, already contains the ideology of a second party. How can one make peace with a party which one says deviates from the most fundamental principles of Marxism — this is stated after a declaration of peace — how can one submit to its decisions? How can one pledge oneself to carry out its decisions without committing self-treason, if not against the fundamental principles of Marxism then at least against the foundations of the Opposition ideology?

If we take Ossovsky who frankly goes further and not only speaks about fundamental principles of Marxism in a circumspect manner, but demands the legalisation of the Mensheviks and S. R. s.; if we take Shliapnikov and Medvediev who demand the liquidation of our Parties in the West, if we take the whole Opposition bloc, we shall see that it bears within it the germs of a second party.

More than that, not only the idea of two parties is contained therein, but also the idea of two internationals. Suppose we take Comrade Radek, whom our Party knows especially from 1923 and from his alliance with the Right wing of the C. P. G., with Brandler and Thalheimer. In September this year in a speech at the Communist Academy he said the following:

"If one must mobilise the Russian proletariat and the Russian peasantry for the solution of the question on an international scale, then beware lest this idea become the August 4th of the Communist Party of Russia, lest you say to yourselves: We ourselves can build up Socialism in our country alone, we don't need any international adventures."

We must say to this sentence, that it is not even original with Comrade Radek, but that this sentence has sprung from the brain of Korsch — or rather — as Comrade Zinoviev, despite his agreement on many points said: From MR. Korsch. The decisive thing here is that after "August 4th" more follows. 1914 was not only the August 4th of one party, but of the II. International, and Lenin replied with Zimmerwald, with the slogan of the split, with a new International.

If Comrade Radek in the Communist Academy speaks of the August 4th of the C. P. S. U., he thereby speaks, perhaps without himself drawing the consequences, about the August 4th of the Comintern, exactly like Korsch and the others. He thereby raises the question of the split, and of the founding of a new International. Perhaps this International will look like the new Spartakus organisation founded by Katz in Germany, to which Katz, Schwarz, Pfempfert belong, and at the foundation congress of which telegrams of greeting were read from the Social Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. If Comrade Trotsky maintained here that nowhere in the expressions and views of the Opposition is there the idea of forming a second Party and a second International, then I believe that this claim falls apart of itself if we consider the standpoint of Ossovsky and Shliapnikov, and the speeches of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Radek.

A few more words about the **objective significance of this whole struggle**. It is probably clear to everyone that what is involved here is not a literary debate, that there is no dispute over this or that theses, but that the struggle at this Enlarged Executive of the Communist International has a deep historical and a great practical-political significance. This significance results from the present world situation. Not long ago in the British Government press an interesting article appeared under the pseudonym of **Augur**. In this article Augur speaks about the **necessity of intervention against the Soviet Union**. He states that it is time to gather all forces together and reckons above all on a German-Polish combination and upon a unification of all European powers under British leadership for armed intervention against the U. S. S. R. It is clear that in Germany a shift has taken place in the bourgeoisie, in the sense of a definitely determined policy of hostility to the Soviet Union, in the sense of a war orientation, since its entrance into the League of Nations and the acceptance of the free thoroughfare paragraph (durchmarsch). This change in the attitude of the German bourgeoisie towards Soviet Russia has its effect in Berlin as well as in the German working class. The German Social Democracy is to-day more hostile to Soviet Russia than a year ago.

This attitude finds a certain reflection among the so-called "ultra-Lefts". It is quite clear that this German Opposition is in part a conscious, in part a sub-conscious champion of the anti-Soviet mood in Germany. This applies not only to **Korsch** and **Katz**, but especially also to a group which of all the shading of the German Opposition was probably the closest to the Russian Opposition bloc, which was, so to say, the favourite child of the Russian Opposition. I mean the **Maslow-Ruth-Fischer** group. Even in the declaration of October 16th in which the Russian Opposition bloc was forced to divorce itself from the views of **Shliapnikov** and **Medvediev**, it differentiated itself only from the factionalism, but not from the **Political** slogans of the Maslow group. In the last few days this Maslow-Ruth-Fischer group has evolved further on the road of imperialist views, on the path of agency for German imperialism. After its expulsion from the Party this group took the path which we predicted for it. It worked out a new memorandum which contains the basest of counter-revolutionary slogans. It says in part:

"These signs of crisis in the whole Comintern have become permanent. Since 1923 these crisis phenomena have in their character become **definite signs of disintegration and decay**, but not signs of a crisis of growth".

This is a complete Social Democratic liquidatorism against the Comintern. And more than that. With respect to the Soviet State, **Ruth Fischer**, **Maslow** and **Scholem** say:

"Should they (the Communists are meant) consider and deport themselves solely as propagandists of the Soviet Union, of the State of U. S. S. with all its shortcomings and mistakes, or while exercising most active solidarity with Soviet Russia, should they consider the **fundamentals of Communism** as their guiding star and beautify and idealise neither the N. E. P. nor the shortcomings of the present Soviet State?"

This is an imperialist formulation of the question. This is how the imperialists and their agents, the Social Democracy, shout against all revolutionary workers: Are you going to be the propagandists of the Soviet Russian State, or will you defend the fundamentals of "Marxism" or if worst comes to worst, the fundamentals of "Communism" as distinct from the U. S. S. R. This formulation is the most shameless social treason, it is genuine social patriotism. The German Opposition has to-day already arrived at this standpoint.

Another section from the latest memorandum of this Opposition:

"Not only active organisational support of the Soviet Union (already!), and resistance and counter-attack against possible imperialist interventions, but also focusing the insistent attention of the proletariat upon the necessity of overthrowing our own bourgeoisie, including also that which is 'friendly' to Soviet Russia".

Thus the policy of this group is:

1. To present the bourgeoisie of its own country, the German bourgeoisie, at the very moment when it enters the League of Nations and takes the sharpest attitude against Soviet Russia, when it passively prepares for interventions, to present this as "friendly to Soviet Russia" is treason, is conscious betrayal of the workers, it is throwing sand in the eyes of the revolutionary and also of the Social Democratic workers. They say that the active support of the struggle against intervention is not the chief task. This attitude is an extremely insistent one among the expelled ultra-Left group. Likewise assiduous is their struggle against Soviet power by sabotaging the struggle against intervention, through the slogan: "not for the Russian State, but for 'Communist principles'" (i. e. the principles formulated by **Maslow!**).

With this group the Russian Opposition has formed a bloc. Comrade **Zinoviev** said not a single word about this group except for a few statements about the impermissibility of factional struggles, etc. I will not say that the Russian Opposition is identical with the German ultra-Left trend and tendencies. But a bloc exists. And this bloc has an objective significance. The Russian Opposition sacrifices revolutionary conceptions when it capitulates before the attack of the urban and rural bourgeoisie, before the capitalist elements in the economy and politics of the Soviet Union. On the basis of this capitulation the Russian Opposition makes a bloc with the German ultra-Left whose moderate section has capitulated before the growing German imperialism and whose determined section openly and shamelessly supports German imperialism. This bloc of the Russian Opposition has arisen out of a mood of panic, out of vacillations, out of the collapse of ideological firmness against the dangers which they themselves exaggerate. But this international bloc reflects — this must be objectively stated — a bloc between the imperialists of the West who are preparing for intervention, with the N. E. P. men and kulaks, with the anti-proletarian elements in the Soviet Union itself. That is the objective significance of this bloc. It is the task of the C. I. and of the C. P. S. U. to blow up this bloc, and to separate and tear away those sections which have come out of the Bolshevik Party and which do not belong in those political spheres from which **Maslow** and **Ruth Fischer** originate, from the bloc which reflects the counter-revolutionary forces in their own ranks.

In conclusion, I should like to say a few words about the significance of these disputes for the C. I. Everything that we have heard from the Opposition was transparently the language of pessimism, the gospel of defeat, the funeral march of a vain attempt at Socialist construction. The sense of their appearance is entirely clear. To use **Trotsky's** words: the Opposition appeared upon this tribune for the purpose of finding on the international arena a solution for their conflict with the Bolshevik Party. We must tell the Opposition clearly that the international arena is closed against their views and attacks. Again and again the Opposition cites **Lenin**, again and again the Opposition makes confessions of **Leninism**. Our German Party has its own experiences on this field, for example, with the group of **Maslow** and **Ruth Fischer** just mentioned. In its most important document, in the notorious "Memorandum of the 700" it writes literally the following:

"We repudiate most decidedly every revision of Leninism. Back to Lenin, to real, genuine, unfalsified Leninism! That must be the slogan of this discussion." (Laughter.)

I believe that this acknowledgement of Leninism is worth very little more than some other confessions of Leninism. The appearance of the Opposition is — to use the words of Comrade **Zinoviev** — the most thoroughly considered, most ambitious retreat movement away from Leninism, the liquidation of the views of Leninism on the unevenness of imperialist development, the liquidation of the Leninist view of the building of Socialism in one country, the liquidation of the Leninist view of the revolutionary perspective of the international proletarian movement, the liquidation of the trust in the forces of the proletariat of the Soviet Union.

I believe that upon this we must give the Opposition an absolutely clear reply. The Plenum must show the Russian Opposition, and above all the proletariat, that the views of the Opposition clash with the determined and coalesced force of the Communist Parties of the whole world. The Comintern will no longer tolerate that the Party of Lenin be traduced as a degenerated kulak organisation. The Communists of the whole world

must rally around the C. P. S. U. We must beat back this opposition attack under the slogan: The C. P. S. U. is and remains the historical international Party, and the revolutionary Party of the world. Leninism is and remains the sole world-embracing proletarian doctrine of our time. (Applause.)

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

A telegram from the C. C. of the Communist Party of Italy to the Presidium of the VII. Enlarged Executive of the Communist International has just been received. Its contents are as follows:

"The new wave of terror with which Italian Fascism has inundated the workers, peasants, Communist Party and all opposition parties, finds us at our posts ready for battle.

We send to the representatives of the brother Parties of all countries who have gathered in Moscow to discuss and decide weighty questions, our warmest greetings. The Italian workers, the thousands of comrades in prison, are with you to-day in spirit.

Long live our world Party, the Party of Lenin!

Down with the hangmen of the working class!

Long live the proletarian world revolution!

The Italian Communists."

Comrade THÄLMANN:

Three cheers for the illegal Italian Party which is now engaged in battle! Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah!

Comrade KUUSINEN:

Comrades, you know how unitedly and firmly our Parties in all countries reacted towards the Russian Opposition, far more determinedly than e. g. in autumn of 1923. How can we explain this? I think that it would not be idle for us to make clear to ourselves how we could have come to such a united attitude. How did this come to pass?

First, our Sections in the various countries learned that Comrade Zinoviev, with some of his colleagues in Leningrad had opposed the policy of the C. C. What was involved? We learned that among other things the question involved the building of Socialism in one country, in this case whether or not it was possible in the Socialist Soviet Union, before such time as the proletariat in various other countries should be victorious. That Comrade Zinoviev should have denied this possibility seemed strange to us. In addition the demagoguery of the wage question, the question of Party democracy, etc. seemed somewhat suspicious to us.

Secondly, our comrades learned that the XIV. Party Conference had decided against the Opposition by an overwhelming majority and that it had adopted a resolution against which the Opposition could have very little to say.

Thirdly, the Leningrad organisation was very quickly and completely, and without difficulty, won over to the standpoint of the C. C., it was convinced of the correctness of the same.

Fourthly, contrary to all our expectations, we found that after the close of the Russian Party Conference Comrade Zinoviev and his group wanted to continue the factional struggle. This already appeared to us as rather a blind factional spirit which might menace the unity of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union if this factional struggle should have any success whatever. But the unity of the C. P. S. U. is already something which all our Communist Parties are instinctively ready to protect. And the expressions of Social Democratic foes immediately showed us that they actually built up their hopes for the split of the Russian Communist Party upon the Opposition. We hoped that these expressions by our foes would be a sufficient warning for the leaders of the Russian Opposition to persuade them to desist from further struggle.

But unfortunately, it already became evident at the last Enlarged Executive, that this hope was a very weak one. Yet we continued to hope, but after the Enlarged Executive came the greatest surprise: the factional bloc which Comrade Zinoviev entered into with Comrade Trotsky, and Trotskyism. This step was astonishing to us, because of — its unprincipledness. We had been in earnest in the struggle against Trotskyism, we had been defending the foundations of Leninism. Comrade Zinoviev

had stood at the head of this struggle, he was most ruthless in fighting Trotskyism. You will remember, e. g. the V. Congress. And even at the beginning of last year, he said in a speech in Leningrad that anyone who seeks to form a bloc with Trotskyism, revises the foundations of Leninism. Even at the Enlarged Executive last year, Comrade Trotsky took an equally clear stand in this question — and now suddenly a bloc with Trotskyism. We were in earnest in the fight against Trotskyism. But Comrade Zinoviev now suddenly declares that he has entered upon a bloc with Trotsky "in earnest and for a long time".

Now the rapprochement between Comrade Zinoviev and Trotskyism seems to have gone still further. We heard in a speech, the day before yesterday, in which he expressly stated his attitude towards Trotskyism, that on present day questions there was not a single point on which there was any differences of opinion between himself and Trotsky. As to questions of the past, he said that if we still wanted to occupy ourselves with them, there might be serious differences of opinion. The theory of the permanent revolution he could not accept, it is wrong, but — he immediately added — Comrade Trotsky is also against this theory. On the questions of the present, he has found not a single point on which there are still differences of opinion — at least he did not mention any. This proves that what is involved here is his ideological capitulation to Trotskyism.

Simultaneously the bloc with Trotsky was extended to include well-known ultra-Right leaders of the former so-called "left" Workers' Opposition. It seemed — to me at least, comrades — that this was a terrible ideological collapse not on the part of Trotsky or Medvediev or Shliapnikov, but of Comrade Zinoviev. We then also immediately saw similar attempts abroad at unprincipled bloc building between ultra-Left and ultra-Right elements. And finally, the enemies of the labour movement, by their jubilation, made the question entirely clear for all of us. By the effect of the work of the Russian Opposition, it became absolutely clear to us, that what was involved, was no petty difference, but that everywhere the enemies of the proletarian revolution were waging a struggle against the leadership of the U. S. S. R., the leadership of the Russian Revolution, by quoting from the Russian Opposition.

This made the thing quite clear for our Party; in July, August, September it became entirely clear, and when in October the Opposition launched its vigorous attack first in Moscow, and then in Leningrad, our Communist front, reacted in complete unanimity, with the exception only of the ultra-Left Opposition in Germany and a few quite isolated voices in France, Czecho-Slovakia and perhaps in some other countries. The Communist workers felt instinctively that the defence of Socialism itself was involved here.

In the past there were differences between Comrade Zinoviev and Comrade Trotsky in various questions, as you know on important and practical questions. We have not yet forgotten these differences. For example, in the peasant question — how sharp did those differences appear, e. g. in Comrade Zinoviev's book on Leninism. But today one must say that on this question Comrade Zinoviev toppled into Trotskyism. The same holds good in the questions of democracy and bureaucratism. You will remember how vehemently Comrade Trotsky in the autumn of 1923 criticised the Party apparatus and bureaucratism in the Party and how Comrade Zinoviev at that time fought him. Comrade Trotsky's criticism at that time seemed absolutely unfounded to him. But as soon as Comrade Zinoviev went into Opposition, he immediately began to demand a broad inner-Party democracy; together with Comrade Trotsky, he developed a campaign against "bureaucratism". Well, Comrade Trotsky also in his time did not always champion a "democratic" standpoint. You know that e. g. in the trade union discussion in 1920—1921, and often in his practice also, he championed a standpoint by no means democratic, but rather bureaucratic. Trotskyism is not a simple deviation towards formal democracy, nor is it a simple deviation towards bureaucratism; it is a deviation which mechanically combines bureaucratism and formal democracy. The real synthesis of proletarian democracy, and the centralism necessary in a revolutionary organisation, Comrade Trotsky never understood.

And the formula "dictatorship of the Party" upon which Comrade Zinoviev lays such great stress? He stressed this formula especially in his book on Leninism. Of course he grants that it is non-Communist to contrast the dictatorship

of the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat against one another. But precisely in that he himself so stubbornly wants to stress and emphasise the one-sided formula "dictatorship of the Party" in this very way, he sets this formula against that of the "dictatorship of the proletariat". He counterposes the Party to the workers who are outside of the Party. And now Comrade Zinoviev appears here with some Lenin citations, which while in themselves good citations, do not completely express the idea of Lenin. But he does not say a single word in reply to what has been said on this question in Comrade Stalin's book. Just as if he had never read the explanation on this disputed question by Comrade Stalin!

Of course he has read it, but he does not mention it by so much as a word. He pretends that no one has ever discussed this disputed question. He merely tears certain citations from their context, reads them here, — and that is supposed to settle the question. In my opinion, one of the services of Comrade Stalin is that he has clarified our conception on this point in a real Leninist sense. He has made clear the concept of Party leadership, of Communist leadership. In explaining this conception Lenin often emphasised how the Party must teach the proletariat, how it must direct and lead it in revolutionary activity. But Lenin did not emphasise a dictatorial relationship between Party and proletariat. Of course there are times of open class war when the Party must maintain a very firm, even military discipline in its own ranks and in the ranks of the proletariat. But this does not exhaust the concept of correct Communist leadership, just as little as does the formula of the dictatorship of the Party.

Comrades, the leaders of the Russian Opposition bloc feel highly insulted at being accused of a Social Democratic deviation, and especially Comrade Trotsky appears with a contemptuous gesture and says: Even though I may have made mistakes, I do not consider myself responsible to you here. We, on our part, also feel our humbleness. We have often shown how highly we value the services, and abilities of Comrade Zinoviev and Comrade Trotsky. But we must remind them that what is involved here primarily is not the person, but the cause. In the past also there were revolutionists who had rendered very great services, whom Comrade Lenin had to combat, e. g. Plekhanov. When the struggle against deviations from the correct line is involved, criticism cannot be parried by pointing to old services. In the interest of the Leninist policy, we are duty bound to combat the Russian Opposition. We do not say that these comrades are Social Democrats. No they are Communists, but they are Communists — who are preaching the impossibility of Socialism in Soviet Russian.

And how do these Communists now fight against the Party and against Leninist teachings? Comrades, one can very easily conceive of Comrades in Russia with Right deviations, for example those who raise exaggerated democratic partial demands, or Right demands on various other questions, but in any case concrete limited demands. We would designate them as comrades with Right deviations. There are such. But how have the leaders of the Russian Opposition bloc fought in recent months, when they demanded the broadening of democracy inside of the Party, as well as in the Soviet State, when they preached against bureaucratism in the Party and in the State, when they were demagogically demanding wage increases? Have they put any definite limits to their demands? No. They left the boundaries open. Thereby their slogans, their whole agitation, took on the same character as the partial demands or agitation of the concealed Social Democrats. They showed a marked disinclination to differentiate themselves from the open foes of Communism; only gradually and by constant pressure could they be brought or forced to differentiate themselves somewhat. We have frequently called their attention to the fact that the foes of Communism were using their statements, but very seldom did this result in any clear differentiation on their part. Subjectively, all that was involved was a difference of opinion among Communists, but objectively, so far as the effect of their activity is concerned — so far as they had any influence whatever — it is basically the same as the effect of the agitation of the Social Democracy; disorganisation in the ranks of our movement and consolidation in the ranks of our enemies.

Comrade Zinoviev has said: A perspective of Socialist construction is necessary, but why on a national scale, why not on an international scale? That sounds all very well, but it sounds almost as well when the Social Democrats say the same

thing; they also say that Socialism is possible only on an international scale, it will come some day, but on an international scale in all countries at the same time. In this, they of course go much further than do the leaders of the Russian Opposition, but the trend and effect of such an "internationalism" is in both cases equally false and harmful. And, comrades, even though it may have appeared that all these questions raised by the Russian Opposition were correctly understood at least by our foreign Sections, at least in the main; and that for the foreign Parties at first glance the question of the possibility of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. appeared as more than a theoretical question, and a weighty practical question only for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union — this is nevertheless not so. We should on no account underestimate the harmful effect of the Trotskyist agitation on this question. I am firmly convinced that this agitation will be quite harmless within our Parties; I am convinced that no important oppositional group will crystallise in any of the Communist Parties in capitalist countries on the basis of this discussion. Even in the German Party the Opposition will soon be liquidated. But even though not inside of our Party, this agitation will nevertheless have a very harmful and a restrictive effect among the non-Party and Social Democratic masses.

It is therefore our task to clarify this question for the broadest masses of workers. Disbelief in Socialism is what we must overcome primarily among the masses. The belief in the possibility of building Socialism in Soviet Russia is the corner stone of belief in Socialism in Western Europe, in the whole capitalist world. The U. S. S. R., by its very existence has a revolutionising effect upon the proletariat of the whole world. But now, the Social Democrats come to these workers and tell them, that not only they, the Social Democrats, but even such Communists as Zinoviev and Trotsky maintain that Socialism is impossible in the Soviet Union. Even if in case of an eventual intervention the Soviet Union should be defeated — this will not come to pass, we shall see to it in the struggle that it does not happen — but even if it should happen, this would not signify a collapse of belief in Socialism. But if it should really prove that the building of Socialism in Soviet Russia is impossible, even though it is hindered by no interventions whatever, this would be a collapse of Socialist ideas as such.

By the action of the Russian Opposition, a dividing line has been drawn far beyond the limits of the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries. How? — who in the labour movement is for, and who is against the Russian Opposition? That is very characteristic! All workers who in the international labour movement are honest friends of the Soviet Union, instinctively take the side of the Russian Party. And those who are enemies of the Soviet Union take the side of the Russian Opposition. Not only in the Right, but also the so-called "Left" Social Democratic leaders have almost without exception taken the side of the Opposition. So runs the great dividing line. Of course in such a case, we find on the side of the Russian Party not only the pure Leninists, but far bigger masses, including also many workers with Right and Left deviations and old traditions. But all these workers have one thing in common, they love the Russian Revolution and hope for Socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

Comrade Zinoviev said in his speech: we are telling our supporters that it is a crime to agitate against the Soviet Union, etc. It is very good, that you say this now, but can you prevent that nevertheless a Giwan or a Korsch stands up and uses your arguments as an incitement against Soviet Russia? You cannot prevent this any more than you can stop their use by the Social Democracy. Subjectively this may be all very nice, but objectively Korsch has shown most clearly how things stand. It shows no lack of logic that Korsch somewhat earlier accused Soviet Russia of "Red Imperialism" while at present he rages against our peaceful policy. In both cases he spoke as an agent of the interventionists. And he gets his weapons from the arsenal of the Russian Opposition bloc.

The Russian proletariat has already shown by deeds, by its revolutionary energy that the building up of Socialism is possible here. (Applause.)

I have said that the Russian proletariat, by the very existence of its revolutionary State, exerts a revolutionising effect upon the proletarian world in other countries. What follows from this? It follows that the first international duty of the Russian Revolu-

tion is to become more and more powerful, to develop its Socialist construction more powerfully. The Russian proletariat must now show, as it did in October, that the things which seem impossible to many, even to some comrades, is nevertheless possible and is being realised. And we, with our modest forces in the various capitalist countries, in the whole capitalist world, we at the same time have the duty of building up our movement more and more powerfully. This is also a task which seems impossible for certain "Socialists".

Comrade Zinoviev hinted at indefinite moods of passivity in the ranks of some of our Parties. Well, if there were only moods of passivity, it would not be so bad. Unfortunately, in our practice there is still a great deal of passivity. And if Comrade Zinoviev wants to warn us against passivity, we accept this warning just as in the past we have very often given consideration to correct advice on his part. We must really increase the activity of our Parties, but especially at present — so that by an intensive clarification, not only in one country — but in every country, we will make impossible the dissemination of Trotskyism, and every sort of "impossible Socialism" (Applause.)

Comrade VUYOVITCH:

I shall first touch upon the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee. On this our attitude can best be studied in connection with what occurred in England during the General Strike and coal strike. And here I raise the following questions:

- a) Is there an Anglo-Russian Committee?
- b) Is it doing anything?
- c) What is the demeanour of the British participants in the Anglo-Russian Committee?

I believe that the first question can be answered in the negative. The second question must receive a similar reply whereas on the third, finally, an affirmative reply can be given, not with respect to positive activity on the British side of this Committee but with respect to the continuation of the betrayal of the British working class which was begun by the leaders of the General Council of Trade Unions at the outbreak of the General Strike.

Let us see how this question stands. The British side of the Anglo-Russian Committee betrayed the General Strike and in exactly the same manner it betrayed also the miners' strike.

(Interjection by Manuilsky: "That is correct".)

Since the General Strike, and especially since the last month, has the Anglo-Russian Committee helped us to reach the masses? Could it serve us as a tribune from which we could speak to the masses?

In reply to this question, comrades, we must again say no! The Anglo-Russian Committee has not made it possible for us to speak to the masses, and only to the extent to which we have combatted the British side, to the extent that we have fought the reformist leaders, have we succeeded in making contact with the masses of the British workers, with the miners and the others.

In recent months we were forced by developments to apply the tactic of united front from below, and only to the extent that we applied this tactic of the united front from below did we succeed in establishing closer contact with the British working masses.

At present, comrades, when the defeat of the British miners is an accomplished fact, it is very readily possible that Thomas and the other reformist leaders will permit Purcell and the so-called Left elements to engage in new "activity" in the Anglo-Russian Committee since this committee can now no longer stand in the way of a betrayal, as was the case at the time of the Paris and Berlin conferences.

And if the Anglo-Russian Committee develops a new activity this will not be a confirmation of a correct policy on the part of the majority, but on the contrary, a proof that our viewpoint on this question is correct.

The Anglo-Russian Committee will be able to regain a real vitality only when the workers have got rid of these leaders now at the head of the trade unions, who represent the British side of the Committee.

Then I raise this question: Do we better support the British workers in freeing themselves from these leaders by remaining in the Anglo-Russian Committee, by upholding this Committee, which in reality no longer exists, or would we help them better by leaving this Committee?

If we had called this question to the attention of the British proletariat the moment the General Strike and coal strike were betrayed, we would have helped the British workers to comprehend the real importance and weightiness of this despicable betrayal, so that they could draw the consequences from it.

We did not do this, and I believe that thereby we made it harder for our British Party to explain to the British workers the real import of this betrayal, and even today we continue to defend the evil consequences of these tactics which we applied in this question.

So much for England. But if we consider the conditions we had in Russia, then I believe, comrades, that our tactics towards the Anglo-Russian Committee could only result in nourishing certain absolutely dangerous illusions.

I shall furnish just one single citation.

In the material compiled by the Moscow Committee of our Party to aid our members in the study of the results of the C. C. Plenum of July 1926, we find the following:

"The Anglo-Russian Committee can and will play a tremendous role in the struggle against every intervention directed against the U. S. S. R. It will become the organisational centre of the proletariat in the struggle against every effort of the international bourgeoisie to concoct a new war."

And what does this mean? That we must remain in the Anglo-Russian Committee, because, first, in case of an intervention this Committee would fight against it and second, because it would become an organisational centre for a struggle against an eventual war against the U. S. S. R., or a world war.

Comrades, I believe that the attitude of the British leaders on the Anglo-Russian Committee during the General Strike and miners' strike, has shown adequately what kind of a role these self-same leaders would play in the case of an intervention against the U. S. S. R., or in the case of a world war. Their role would be exactly the same as that which they played during the British General Strike.

Secondly, the Anglo-Russian Committee might play a certain role, and even a great role, in case of an intervention against Soviet Russia, but under what conditions? Upon the condition that the British working class, supported by us, changes the leaders who still represent it in the Anglo-Russian Committee.

And even in this case there would not be involved here an organisational centre. This centre for a struggle against intervention in Russia, or a struggle against war, can and will be only the Communist International.

I shall proceed to the question of stabilisation. A great deal has been said about this question and even yesterday Bukharin raised this query and demanded a reply.

In order to prove, comrades, that the Opposition denies any capitalist stabilisation a speech of Zinoviev is cited in which he says in one sentence that the facts contradict the existence of a stabilisation of capitalism, instead of saying correctly that the facts contradict a solid capitalist stabilisation.

But, comrades, it seems to us that to judge the views of Zinoviev and of our Opposition on such an important question one should not resort to a single sentence in a single speech in which, as Comrade Bukharin correctly showed, the correctly formulated viewpoint of Zinoviev, found in several places, completely corresponds to the decisions of the last Plenum of the E. C. C. I. If you want the exact viewpoint of Zinoviev you should look for it in the resolutions of the last Enlarged Executive written by him, you should look for it in the letter to the British Party written by him, on March 8th 1926, you should look for it in the letter to the Communist Party of France on the occasion of the British General Strike and in the draft thesis on the lessons of the British general strike drawn up by Zinoviev — after the speech cited.

In these documents you will very clearly find the expression of our views on the stabilisation of capitalism, and if it is true that we underlined the word "relative" more emphatically than the word "stabilisation", this by no means signifies that we deny the existence of the relative stabilisation of capitalism. This says only that we believe that the factors which contribute to a constant weakening of this relativity are now beginning to become stronger and stronger, as has been proven by recent revolutionary events in all countries, all the way from England to China.

I believe that if tomorrow the situation were to change, and we were to have a directly revolutionary situation, then we just as little as you would look around for citations, but we would

do our utmost to exploit the situation in order to bring about the victory of the world revolution. Bukharin may rest perfectly at ease on this point.

But if we have comrades in our ranks who cry about stabilisation the way Comrade Sten does, of whom the Social Democratic newspapers write that they can share his viewpoint fully, when Lozovsky says that the Social-Democracy and the Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy constitute a stabilisation factor which extends the stabilisation for decades, then we believe that there is a real danger here because it is very possible that these comrades expressed that which many others are only thinking.

I will now reply to the question that Doriot raised this morning. I believe I protested against this manner and means of dragging private conversations into the discussion, especially when such conversations are presented in an absolutely distorted manner.

1. I did not reply that I did not think anything about the article of Souvarine.

I likewise did not reply that it was very dangerous to have any views. What I did answer was that momentarily I could say nothing, and this in general on any question.

2. What Doriot forgot to say was that despite the first sentence of our conversation we continued and I told him that I condemned, formally, the Souvarine article.

That is what Doriot forgot to say, and likewise that I said to him and also to many other comrades present here — in any case I believe that my attitude since these differences of opinion have arisen in the Russian Party certainly does not show that I am afraid to hold or express an opinion of my own on the question under discussion.

(Interjection by Codovill: "But is this a counter-revolutionary article or not?")

Vuyovitch wants to continue his speech... (The chairman rings for time.)

I ask another three minutes.

Comrade BIRCH (Chairman) puts to the meeting the question of extending the speaker's time. The proposal is rejected.

Comrade SCHATZKIN (Y. C. I.):

First of all I should like to say a few words about the attitude of the Young Communist International on the discussion in the Communist Party in the Soviet Union. In all Sections of the Y. C. I., with the exception of a very small minority in certain German districts, there is complete unanimity on this question. The Y. C. I. in all countries supports the viewpoint of the Russian Party and remains true to the fundamentals of Leninism.

Now Comrade Vuyovitch, who at the Youth Executive did not state his position on political questions despite the permission of the C. P. S. U., here follows the examples of the big leaders of the Opposition, and takes the floor to speak on certain important political questions. I should like to reply briefly to some of his arguments.

He raised the question here whether, since the British General Strike, time had justified the standpoint of the Opposition or that of the Russian Party majority on the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee. He believes that experiences has shown that the Opposition was right when it demanded the break up of the Anglo-Russian Committee. That is not true. We had an opportunity after the General Strike, in two meetings in Paris and Berlin, to present our attitude on the British General Strike and coal strike with complete clarity, and to brand the leaders of the British trade unions with their treason. These meetings have helped us to show the British workers that their leaders betrayed the strike, that they are incapable of leading a labour struggle. The debates at these meetings are known to the workers of Russia and England, and to the international proletariat.

Comrade Vuyovitch also told us here that the Anglo-Russian Committee had not made good as an instrument of the struggle against intervention. Comrade Vuyovitch believes that the Anglo-Russian Committee under no circumstances can be an instrument of the struggle because he has a false conception about the very essence of the Anglo-Russian Committee. He has been talking the whole time here about the British side, about the British portion of this Committee, as if this British portion consisted only of the reformist leaders. The Russian Party and the Russian working class believe however that the British portion of the Anglo-Russian Committee does not consist of Purcell and others, they are only the heads; in reality the British side of the Anglo-Russian

Committee is the British proletariat, the fighting masses of workers in England. And for the very reason that these masses of workers see in the Anglo-Russian Committee the expression of the alliance between the British and Russian proletariat, precisely from this viewpoint the Committee really gives an impetus for closer ties between the British and Russian workers, for a greater interest of the British workers in the struggle against intervention.

But the chief question of the Anglo-Russian Committee was not touched by Comrade Vuyovitch. It is possible that this Committee will break down entirely — our Party never maintained that it would last for ever. But the question is: — who is to bear the responsibility for the break down of the Anglo-Russian Committee in the eyes of the working class. The tactics of the Opposition consist in that at any price they want to load us with the responsibility, while the tactics of the majority consisted and still consist in that the responsibility in the eyes of the masses of workers, the real guilt for the possible collapse of the Anglo-Russian Committee — if it should come to this — will be borne by the reformists.

On the question of stabilisation, Comrade Vuyovitch spoke as though there existed only a single sentence in which Comrade Zinoviev ever disputed any stabilisation whatever, while everywhere else, in all his other works, he had put the question correctly. The matter does not appear to be quite as harmless. The sentence from the speech of Comrade Zinoviev is taken from a speech on the British General Strike that was to have presented the results of that strike. This speech was edited by Comrade Zinoviev himself before being printed in the papers. Therefore Comrade Zinoviev had the full opportunity to think over whether he should write this sentence or something different. But besides Comrade Zinoviev, Comrade Vuyovitch has another leader about whom he very modestly remains silent, a leader whom he himself has opposed very vigorously, Comrade Trotsky. Even before the British General Strike, in January 1926, Comrade Trotsky said in his speech at the Textile Workers' Conference, that the stabilisation is over, that it did not last as long as we had thought, etc. To come here after all this and to declare: "We only wanted to underline the relativity more emphatically", as Comrade Vuyovitch has done, is ridiculous. The relativity was so emphatically underlined that the whole stabilisation disappeared from a number of writings of both of these most prominent leaders of the Opposition. If Comrade Vuyovitch wants to show that in other writings of these comrades the stabilisation is nevertheless recognised, he only proves thereby that Comrade Zinoviev, the leader of the Opposition, has a very contradictory position on this problem which is one of the weightiest questions, since the appraisal of the international situation is the basis of our entire tactics.

Now I come to the real questions about which I wanted to speak. In his speech Comrade Zinoviev accused the whole Comintern and its leading Section, the C. P. S. U., that the whole policy of the Comintern since the time Comrade Zinoviev no longer actually leads it, has been wrong in one of the weightiest tactical questions, the question of the attitude towards Right and left deviations. The Comintern is supposed to have deserted the fundamentals of Leninism, and Comrade Zinoviev has tried to prove this accusation by citing that Comrade Lenin was of the opinion that the Right danger is always the chief danger in the Communist movement. In order to prove this thesis, Comrade Zinoviev brought out two citations from Lenin, which in order not to lose time I shall not repeat, but which say about the following: 1. That Russian Bolshevism has developed in a struggle against Right and Left and that the chief foe always stood to the Right. But in this connection Comrade Zinoviev forgot to report that up to 1912, the Russian Bolsheviki were in one Party with the Mensheviks. It is a matter of course that if such a party existed abroad, in which Social Democratic and Communists were united, in such a party the chief danger would always be towards the Right. 2. In his report at the II. World Congress, Comrade Lenin speaks about the chief foes standing towards the Right, that it is easier to deal with Left mistakes in the Communist Party. But Comrade Zinoviev has done a thing here that I know not how to characterise. He has omitted several sentences that present the whole idea differently. Comrade Lenin says after the words cited: "Opportunism is our chief foe" among other things, the following: "This is proven not only by the Kerensky regime in Russia, but it is also proven

in Germany by the democratic republic headed by its Social Democratic Government, it is proven by the behaviour of Albert Thomas towards his bourgeois government". These sentences Comrade Zinoviev simply omitted and then continued to cite: "In comparison with this task it is easy to deal with the Left 'mistakes' in Communism. So here Lenin certainly spoke about the chief foe in the labour movement standing towards the Right, that is the **social democratic party**; he was not speaking about the Communist Party, about the Communist movement. It is therefore impossible to base this thesis of Comrade Zinoviev upon Lenin.

If we consider this question **historically** we have many examples in our Parties in which the chief foe in our movement stood towards the Left. Take the III. World Congress, Against whom did Lenin fight chiefly at this Congress? Against the Left danger. Despite Levi, despite Right deviations, at the III. World Congress Lenin saw the chief danger among those comrades who advocated the offensive theory, who rejected the winning over of the majority of the working class. In different situations the chief danger in the Communist Parties may be either to the Left or to the Right. Therefore the history of the Communist movement also refutes this thesis of Comrade Zinoviev.

What is his demand upon the Communist International? That the ultra-left deviations and the right mistakes which occurred in Poland and England shall be treated the same. I believe that that is entirely incorrect. Why incorrect? Because we cannot put upon one political level these two mistakes, Right and Left deviations mentioned, they are different things. Why? Comrade Bukharin has already pointed out that the comrades in Poland and England have already recognised their mistakes, but on the contrary the ultra-left from day to day, speaking politically, are becoming bolder and more stupid. But another circumstance is decisive. Neither the Polish nor the British comrades are conducting a factional struggle against their Party and against the Communist International. But the ultra-left in Germany are building their fractions, trying to split the Party, and in part are already outside of our ranks for the reason that they have carried on factional and splitting activity. Can one compare those who behave loyally towards the Comintern and Party, who recognise their mistakes and carry on no factional and no splitting activity, with those who do not recognise their mistakes and who are carrying on factional and splitting activity? I think not.

It is also incorrect to consider the German ultra-Left as left elements in a revolutionary sense. In Germany we have a classic example of how an **ultra-left deviation can transform itself into a right deviation**, as is the case with the petty bourgeois, sham revolutionists, the German ultra-Left who have come to take a Social Democratic position against the first proletarian republic, the Soviet Union. These elements are not so Left as Comrade Zinoviev thinks.

A few words on another question that also strikes me as very important. Was the Russian Opposition objectively for two parties in Russia or not? Comrade Zinoviev tried here, very ingeniously, to prove that he could not possibly be for two parties. He said that anyone who is for the necessity of the dictatorship of the Communist Party, cannot be for two parties. But this is theoretically quite incorrect. If, e. g. this Party which is wielding the dictatorship has become opportunist, then according to the thesis of Lenin one must break with such a Party and form a new one, because one cannot remain in one Party with reformists and opportunists. But we do not at all need such a complicated theoretical view as has been presented here by Zinoviev. Let us take the practical activity of the Opposition which, side by side with the legal Moscow Committee, had its illegal Moscow Committee, which side by side with the legal Leningrad Committee had its illegal Leningrad Committee, which side by side with the legal district committees in Leningrad and Moscow had its own district committees, which had its own print shops, which in some places even published its own literature and in a few spots even collected dues. Trotsky once attempted to deny that they had a faction. He said: In Moscow and other towns there are no factions, but only "factional elements". A very fine distinction. In reality there are not only factions and factional elements, but the elements of a whole Party. And if the Opposition does not proceed with the actual founding of the second party, it is not because the theory of the Opposition is irreconcilable with the creation of a second

Party — as Comrade Zinoviev tries to prove — but because the Russian Communist workers did not tolerate it.

Now as to the question of the building of Socialism in a single country. The programme of the Russian Young Communist League has been mentioned, and an attempt has been made to use one passage against us. I should like to say briefly that first of all it is false to maintain — as has been spread in the lobbies — that Comrade Bukharin wrote this; this was written by my humble self. Secondly I should like to say that the exploitation of this section by the Opposition is out of place because the question at the time that this sentence was written was an entirely different one from that which we have today.

Now as to the actual arguments of the Opposition on the question of the building of Socialism. Many citations from Lenin have been offered here. These citations can be divided into four categories:

1. Citations which speak of the final victory of Socialism. Bukharin has already said that there is no dispute on this question — the final victory of Socialism is possible only internationally.

2. Citations about the difficulties in the building of Socialism in our country. To build Socialism in a backward country is really difficult, so difficult that even such noted leaders as Zinoviev and Trotsky have become frightened in the face of these difficulties.

3. Citations which speak about the necessity of joint efforts of the Proletariat of several countries, in order to be able to build Socialism in our country. That is clear. Here at this Plenum we see the embodiment of these efforts of the proletarians of various countries who want to help us to build up Socialism here in the Soviet Union.

4. Citations that speak for the possibility of building socialism in our country but which Comrade Zinoviev tries to present as if they spoke against this building in a single country.

The latter, for example, was the case with the citation from the article "Concerning the Slogan of the United States of Europe" written in 1915, about which Comrade Zinoviev spoke here at great length. He asked: What is the meaning of these words of Lenin, that after the proletariat has "organised socialist production" it will fight against the capitalist States? And Comrade Zinoviev replied: This only means that the proletariat takes over the factories and that these factories are beginning to work. The result here is surely a very comical affair. Does not the fact that the old factories are beginning to work also allow of work in new factories established by the Socialist State? According to Leninism, as Comrade Zinoviev understands it, can this be done or not? The way Comrade Zinoviev presents this Lenin citation is entirely incorrect.

Comrade Zinoviev also applied the following argument: He said that on a world scale Socialism could be built up, but in Russia alone it could not. Why not? For proof he again offers a Lenin citation that on a world scale there is an industry capable of supplying the peasantry, but that in Russia we have no such industry.

But here arises a new question: Can Russia, prior to the victory of the proletariat in another country, create such an industry or not? Can the Soviet Union become so industrialised that it can satisfy the requirements of the peasantry or is the carrying out of industrialisation impossible. Only in this way can the arguments of Comrade Zinoviev be made clear. This argument was directed not only against the possibility of building a complete socialist society, but against the possibility of industrialising the country. And the possibility of industrialising the country is surely the central question in the building of socialism.

With Comrade Trotsky we find partly the same formulation of the question. He said: We have no machines, we must import them from abroad. Therefore without the State aid of the international proletariat we cannot build up Socialism. But can we not organise the manufacture of machinery in our country? The last Party Conference has decided that it is the special task of the Party to create a native machine-building industry in our country. Is this possible or not? This is how the question stands.

I believe that theoretically as well as practically it has been proven that Russia can industrialise itself, more slowly to be sure than with the aid of the foreign proletariat, but it can industrialise itself.

(Interjection by Bukharin "And is industrialising itself?")

It has been proven that the means-of-production industry is growing, it has been proven that the role of industry in economy

as a whole is growing, it has been proven that the socialist elements in our whole economy are growing. Can history be so presented as if the building of Socialism is a spectacular leap through a vacuum, from our present social order to the socialist society? We have a long road of heavy labour upon which we will have to gradually, slowly, create the basis of Socialism. We have begun it, we are doing it, and no one can prove that we shall be unable to go further.

It is interesting that Trotsky in his book "Capitalism or Socialism", which he wrote prior to the XIV. Party Congress, still considered it possible that Soviet Russia will not only catch up with the economic level of the advanced countries but that it will outstrip them. Comrade Kamenev said the same in his speech at the XIV. Party Conference. If it is possible for us to outstrip the capitalist countries will our industrialisation then also be insufficient to satisfy the requirements of the peasantry, viz: according to Zinoviev himself — to build up Socialism?

The next main argument of the Opposition is about world economy. Trotsky developed here a giant theory of the dependence of the Soviet Union upon world economy. Certainly, we are dependent, but to what extent? Are we so dependent that the building of a socialist society is thereby made impossible, or are we dependent only insofar that notwithstanding this dependency we can build Socialism in our country?

Trotsky only spoke about our dependence. I should like to give you two short citations from the same book of Trotsky: "Capitalism or Socialism", which was written before he entered into the opposition bloc with Zinoviev. There Trotsky wrote something entirely different from that which we heard from him yesterday about our relationship to the world market. At that time he saw that we could protect ourselves from the devastating effects of the world markets:

"The foreign trade monopoly and the concessions policy are powerful instruments of economic policy and of the workers' State. If thereby the laws and methods of the socialist State cannot be forced upon the world market nevertheless the relation of socialist economy to the world market depends to a high degree upon the will of the workers' state". (Pages 76—77 of the German edition.)

Quite correct: "depends to a high degree upon the will of the workers' State." But in yesterday's speech of Comrade Trotsky — what happened to the workers' State? Yesterday we saw only a powerful world capitalism of which we — like a tiny island — are only an impotent appendage.

In another place in the same book Trotsky says:

"In any event we must give the following reply to the question of whether the world market is able to subordinate us merely by its economic preponderance: **We are by no means defenceless against the world market: our economy is guarded by definite State institutions which apply a many-sided system of socialist protectionism. But how great is their effectiveness? The history of capitalist development can enlighten us on this. For long periods Germany, or the United States lagged such a distance behind England with respect to industry, that it might have appeared impossible to catch up. The utilisation of natural and historical conditions later permitted these backward countries, under the wing of protective tariffs, to catch up with the advanced country, and even to outstrip it. State boundaries, State power and the customs system were powerful factors in the history of capitalist development. This applies on an even greater scale to a socialist country.**"

Socialist protectionism disappeared completely in Trotsky's speech yesterday, yet surely it is an important part of the whole question.

The next important argument of the Opposition consists in whether one can even raise the question of the possibility of Socialism in one country, unless one has lost faith in the world revolution. If the world revolution must be victorious in the present period, Trotsky argues, then why raise the question of building Socialism? The building of Socialism will take quite a long time, e. g. 10, 20—30 years and the world revolution we are convinced must be victorious in the immediate future. If you are for the building of Socialism, you are, consequently, liquidators. So says the Opposition.

Let us investigate this question very briefly. First, in another connection comrade Bukharin has already said that the world revolution is a long epoch with various periods, victories, defeats,

civil wars, international wars, etc. etc. As you know, Marx spoke of the world revolution as an epoch of 15, 20 to 50 years. This period even if it does not last 50 years will nevertheless constitute a whole epoch in the history of mankind. For this reason already it is impossible to say that if one speaks about the building of Socialism in our country after 20 years, and therefore prior to the final victory of the world revolution, that one thereby liquidates the world revolution.

Secondly, we do not entertain the viewpoint that the relative stabilisation will be a lengthy one. But I should like to put one question: **Is here any guarantee that in the next immediate revolutionary situation we absolutely must win?** We had an immediate revolutionary situation in 1919. Unfortunately it brought us a defeat. Then several years passed before the next, in Germany in 1923. Unfortunately it also did not lead to a proletarian victory. And if now a new immediate revolutionary situation comes is there any guarantee that it absolutely must bring victory? No, it is a question of struggle and practice whether we shall win or not. I should merely like to remind you that at the II. World Congress Lenin stated, as against the view that in a revolutionary crisis capitalism has no way out: "That is a mistake. Situations from which there is absolutely no escape do not exist".

According to Lenin the question of victory consists in that we must exploit the immediate revolutionary situation and the outcome of the struggle will show whether we will win. Can we guarantee the victory? Have we got it in our pocket? And if it should happen — it is a slightly probable prospective — that we shall have a defeat, Zinoviev will say that those who speak about the building of Socialism in Russia alone are liquidators. But this question will nevertheless remain.

I should like to present a final citation, again by Trotsky, that will prove that Trotsky is the liquidator, which he himself painted so horribly at our last Party Conference, the same Trotsky who thought out the idea that anyone who speaks about building Socialism in one country liquidates the world revolution. This citation is also from the already mentioned book which was written before Trotsky had decided upon the union with Zinoviev.

In this book Comrade Trotsky speaks about the variants, the perspectives which we might encounter in the development of world capitalism. The first variant:

"The question of the victory of Socialism is easiest solved on the premise that the proletarian revolution will develop in the very next few years in Europe. This variant is by no means the least probable."

This variant is not the least probable, says Comrade Trotsky. Here he speaks cautiously, perhaps too cautiously. Then comes another variant:

"The question becomes considerably complicated if one assumes the premise that the surrounding capitalist world will maintain itself for another several decades. Such a premise by itself would remain completely barren if we did not make it concrete with a number of other premises. Given such a variant, what becomes of the European, and also of the American proletariat? What becomes of the productive forces of capitalism? If the decades we have assumed, reservedly, will contain such a turbulent ebb and flood, such horrible civil war, or economic stagnation and even decay, i. e., simply a long-drawn course of socialist birth pangs, then it is clear that our economy even alone would achieve preponderance during the transition period, thanks to the incomparably greater firmness of our economic foundations" (German edition, 83).

Thus in this citation, Comrade Trotsky himself presented a perspective of a delay in the victory of the world revolution, and examined the destiny of Russia in such a case. Thereby, with him, Socialist Russia did not die out, it won preponderance over capitalist world economy, which is possible only in creating the basis of Socialism, high technique, industrialisation. And this without any State aid from the victorious proletariat of other countries! If we are liquidators when we say such a thing then the original liquidator was Comrade Trotsky himself.

Still a third remark on the question of pessimism towards the world revolution. If we are soon victorious in Germany does anyone believe that proletarian Germany will be able to help us practically, economically, already in the first years following the overthrow of its bourgeoisie? I do not think so. In establishing proletarian dictatorship in Germany we shall

have an internal civil war and most probably a foreign war, so that it will take a long time (perhaps much longer than in Russia, because we had various advantages in this respect) until the period of reconstruction up to the former level comes to a close. It took almost ten years in Russia, how long it will take in Germany one cannot say. From this standpoint also, in dealing with the questions of construction in Russia, we must also reckon with a longer period than 2—3 years, because in the first years of the victorious revolution in Germany or England they will certainly not help us as much as we shall help them. (Applause.)

Now comrades, the very last argument of Comrade Zinoviev. He said: Can anyone assume that the capitalists will wait ten or twenty years until we shall have built up socialism? He said this in connection with a Lenin citation. Can such a stupid idea be ascribed to Lenin — asks Zinoviev. Well, the capitalists will not wait, they have already in the past waged war against us for years. But if one thereby seeks to prove that we cannot build up Socialism one must consider our defeat in this struggle

a foregone conclusion. There was an intervention and it will probably come again. But nobody has said that we must be vanquished. This depends upon our economic condition, upon the support of the international proletariat, etc. We already had an intervention once and we were victorious. Even if a new intervention comes, and if we defeat it, there will again be the question of building Socialism in a single country.

Therefore, comrades, we must not make our perspectives for only one or two years, not only for today or tomorrow. No, unless there is a successful intervention we can build up a socialist society, although slowly and painfully and labouriously, but we can build it. That is the conviction of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that is the conviction of the working class of the Soviet Union. Even though all possible former leaders may say that it is impossible, even though they sow panic, though they propagate pessimism — Socialism will be built and the Russian working class will go forward along this road (great applause). (Close of the Session.)

Twenty-Third Session.

Moscow, December 11, 1926.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

The next speaker in the discussion of Comrade Stalin's report will be Comrade Kamenev.

Comrade KAMENEV:

Comrades, the fundamental question confronting the Comintern, with regard to this item of the agenda, is the question of the existence or non-existence in our Party of a Right tendency, and the manner in which this tendency expresses itself.

Without a moment's hesitation I say that a Right tendency does exist in our Party. It can even be asserted that it would be strange if there were no Right tendencies aiming at the revision of the theory and practice of Leninism. Very serious factors comprise the material foundations of the Right tendencies in our Party. There is first of all the fact that the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. exercises its dictatorship and constructs Socialism in a peasant country. A second condition favourable to the development of these tendencies is the slowing down of the tempo of the development of the world revolution. The third of the most important factors is the pressure which is brought to bear on the separate links of our Party by N. E. P. conditions, by the development and political activity of bourgeois groups and by the pressure of the State apparatus. I am not going to enumerate the other sources of the opportunist tendencies in the Party — those I have already named will suffice.

The pressure of these influences on the various links of our Party, and the Right tendencies which certainly make their appearance from time to time in the Party, are by no means an indication that we witness in our country a "Thermidor", i. e., the transference of power from the proletariat to some other class; they are not an indication that the Party is abandoning its class policy; nor are they an indication that the hope of the ideologists of the new bourgeoisie, of the type of Ustrialov, are coming true, the hope for an evolution of Bolshevism in the direction of bourgeois democracy. These and similar declarations must be categorically rejected. We have nothing in common with them. Those who insist on such declarations constitute themselves opponents of our Party and its tasks.

It is now perfectly clear to us — to me and also to Comrades Zinoviev, Trotsky and others, that, for instance, — I will give you a very vivid example, one very near to us — among those who were expelled from the Communist Party of Germany there are people who refuse to comply with the certainly harsh conditions of the Comintern and are therefore not doing their utmost to re-enter the ranks of their Communist Party. Needless to say that we consider this a very serious error. A Bolshevik can work and struggle for the advantage of his class only in the ranks of the Comintern, only in the same ranks with the first and thus far only Workers' State. One should be able to submit to even the harshest demands of one's Party. Whoever endeavours to form his own separate "Party" or group against the Communist Party will find himself inevitably in opposition to the Comintern and the U. S. S. R., and will very quickly land in the camp of their enemies, regardless of his subjective intentions and desires.

There is no gainsaying that every bona fide revolutionist is in duty bound to stand up for the view which he considers im-

portant for the cause of the proletarian revolution, even if this will keep him a long time in the ranks of a minority and will compel him to swim against the stream of the then prevailing tendency. Otherwise, he is not a revolutionary, he is a miserable bureaucrat. But I declare that anyone who makes of our ideas a caricature on Bolshevism is a person who fails to understand the real meaning of our declaration of October 16th, the purport of which was to give every worker, every Party member, the assurance that Party unity is as dear to us as to any Bolshevik, that we will pursue our path only together with the Party, that there are no and can be no other paths.

At this juncture, however, I must protest against the assertion that our criticism — perhaps a very rigorous criticism at times as is always the case with Bolsheviks, but always directed against the opinions of this or the other comrade — be declared a criticism of the Party, a criticism of its proletarian kernel. We repudiate such a distortion, such an accusation, as political nonsense. Our Party is at the head of the proletarian world movement and it alone is capable of leading this movement to new victories. But one should also be able to see the real dangers with which the Party is confronted. One should be able to see the Right tendency within it and struggle against it quite openly. This is what Lenin taught us and this is what we have carried out.

We consider as the most important phenomenon or at least as one of the most important and natural phenomena of this Right opportunist tendency which is directly bound up with the present situation, with the stabilisation of capitalist relations, with the peasant and bourgeois pressure, this Right tendency — which is at the same time hostile to all the traditions of our Party and which lulls to sleep the revolutionary watchfulness of the proletariat — is first and foremost the embellishment of the N. E. P., the slurring over of the internal antagonisms and the class struggles which go on under the surface of N. E. P., and the inevitability of which Lenin warned us from the very first day of the introduction of N. E. P. Such an attempt to embellish N. E. P. and to slur over difficulties is an endeavour to minimise the significance of the growth of the new bourgeoisie and of its capital within the country, an endeavour to brush aside and to refuse to attach due importance to the growth of kulakdom in the villages. Such embellishment impairs the fighting capacity of the proletariat and gives it a wrong orientation in the course of its revolutionary struggle which is still in process. Just as harmful is the failure to pay sufficient attention to the factor of the technical and economic backwardness of the country as compared with the capitalist countries, which finds its expression first and foremost in the difference between world and Soviet prices. It is only by concentrating the attention of the Party on these phenomena that they can be successfully overcome — of this we are convinced. The slurring-over process does not stimulate the energy of the proletariat, it sows harmful illusions which are bound to have their effect on the revolutionary watchfulness in and the character of the struggle of the proletariat, on the capacity of the latter to withstand bourgeois and petty bourgeois influence.

Another feature of the Right tendency is an incorrect appreciation of the role and importance of the peasantry in our country, which found its expression in the slogan "Enrich yourselves"

addressed to all the sections of the peasantry, or in a formula such as this — (I quote word for word) — “Widen the scope of the well-to-do and kulak economy”, or in the theory of the peaceful submergence of the kulak into Socialism, etc.

These slogans, these formula, these theories not only represent an erroneous anti-Leninist appreciation of the role of the peasantry in the trend of the proletarian struggle and of the Socialist revolution, — they drive the Party onto an erroneous class path, they disarm it in the face of the enormous and inevitable influence of the overwhelming majority of the population of the country — the peasantry — an influence which Lenin never ceased to remind us of.

Another equally characteristic feature of the Right tendency is the attempt to minimise the acuteness of the struggle in our country. Under proletarian dictatorship, the class struggle assumes, of course, peculiar new forms, but it does exist and a slurring over can only be harmful to the proletariat.

We have nevertheless witnessed lately a number of attempts to slur over and minimise the extent of the class struggle going on among the peasantry, as well as a disinclination to understand — and to make the basis of our policy the fact — that the present epoch of Soviet Construction is characterised by a strenuous struggle of various classes and groups over the distribution of the national revenue. More than that, there were a series of facts which show that some Party elements are inclined to solve this question of struggle for a share of the national revenue at the expense of the working class. Such are for instance the monstrous misinterpretations of the economy regime which have already been condemned by our Central Committee, misinterpretations which amount to an attempt to carry out this regime at the expense of the working class. And this is not something casual, it is one of the inevitable, characteristic and natural signs of a Rightist, non-proletarian tendency in our Party.

We also have a number of facts and declarations which evidence an utterly wrong interpretation of the wage policy. Such are the elements of the truly Right tendency in our Party! Add to this the attempt to question one of the cardinal ideas of Leninism, confirmed by the XII Congress — the idea of the dictatorship of the Party and also the tendency in the Party which was especially prevalent at the very time I have just described, namely, at the XIV Congress, when instructions were issued that the ideological struggle must direct its fire towards the Left, one obtains a clear picture of views which cannot be called anything other than a Right tendency. This tendency was bound to make itself felt also on the international arena.

I cannot deal very fully with one of the most important questions of our tactics, namely, the question of our attitude to the Anglo-Russian Committee, and I will limit myself to the following statement which must be of direct interest to every member of the Comintern, and to you, the leaders of the world proletarian movement. One of the documents issued by one of the biggest Communist organisations contains the following statement: “The Anglo-Russian Committee can and must, and no doubt will, play an enormous role in the struggle against all interventions directed against the U.S.S.R. It will become the organising centre of the international forces of the proletariat in the struggle against all the attempts of the international bourgeoisie to instigate a new war”. This was said at a time when the British Section of this Committee was engaged in betraying the proletarian struggle in Great Britain. But even apart from this, it would be difficult to find a document more contrary to the foundations of Leninism than the words which I have just read. No one doubts that the Russian Section of the Committee, which consists of members of our Party, will fulfil all the tasks which the Anglo-Russian Committee set itself and which are expressed in the words I have just quoted. But there is also no doubt whatever that the British Section of this Committee will not only fail to fulfil these obligations but will even betray the cause of the world revolution just as it betrayed the miners' lockout.

Until quite recently no Bolshevik would have questioned this. It is only from the moment when, in spite of our warnings, a fundamental mistake was made in the definition of our relations with the Anglo-Russian Committee — that such an unheard of anti-Leninist estimation of a whole sector of the international labour movement, as the document just quoted, was accepted and indiscriminately spread throughout our Party.

Lenin had also occasion to express himself concerning the people whom the quotation just mentioned considers as “the

organising centre of the international forces of the proletariat in the struggle against any attempts of the international bourgeoisie to instigate a new war”, i. e. concerning the British trade unionists. In one of his latest works, on the question of the Hague Conference, when laying down the tactics of the representatives of the Communist Party towards the British trade unionists in connection with the prevention of interventions and war, Lenin wrote:

“It seems to me that if, at the Hague Conference, we shall have a few people capable of delivering in this or that language, a speech against war, the most important thing will be to refute the conception that those present (the same people on whom the quotation just cited by me relies as anti-war champions) are opponents of war, that they realise that war can and must overtake them at the most unexpected moment, that they have any idea as to what methods should be used to prevent war, that they are in any way capable of adopting reasonable and effective means of struggle against war”.

This is what we were taught by the proletarian revolutionist Lenin, and the other is what we found in the document quoted. This document is of the utmost importance. I think that one should apply to this document the following words used by Lenin on the same question and in the same article:

“I think that in the face of such declarations, if they were already made after the war, one should act with the utmost decision, ruthlessly giving the names of everyone of these speakers. Remarks concerning such speakers can be as mild as one likes, but one cannot keep silent on a single one of these cases, for a careless attitude on this question is an evil which outweighs everything else and can certainly not be treated with any indulgence”.

It is quite enough to set this appreciation by Lenin against the characterisation of the Anglo-Russian Committee just quoted, in order to understand what comprises the Right tendency and what is the extent of its deviation from Leninism also with respect to questions of the International working class struggle. The document which I have quoted emanates from the Moscow Committee of our Party and is in the nature of a declaration to the Moscow proletariat, to explain the position of the majority of the Central Committee on the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee*).

I have enumerated the various features of the Right tendency.

This or that quotation cannot give an exhaustive definition of this Right tendency — it is bound up with definite tendencies in the sphere of our international and home politics at the present historical moment and in the present stage of capitalist stabilisation.

The theory which links up these separate errors into one whole, which crowns them and thereby endeavours to create a definite line of policy not only on a national but also on an international scale, is at the present moment the theory of socialism in one country.

With respect to the substance of this question we still maintain Lenin's viewpoint and we see no reason whatever to depart from this viewpoint. In one of his latest works, relating to 1922, Lenin wrote:

“We have not even finished laying the foundation of Soviet economy” — I will come back to these words later on — “it is still possible that this may be taken away from us by the forces of declining capitalism which are hostile to us. This must be fully realised and openly admitted, for there is nothing more dangerous than illusions (and attacks of giddiness, particularly on very high places) — and there is absolutely nothing ‘terrible’, nothing which constitutes a justifiable reason for downheartedness in the admission of this bitter truth, for, we always confessed and reiterated that ABC truth of Marxism: that joint efforts by the workers of several advanced countries are necessary for the victory of socialism!”

We always stood and still stand by this, we do not propose anything new, we only oppose throwing overboard this formula of Lenin. We assert that there are no other declarations by Lenin which rescind these words, words which he himself called “the ABC truth of Marxism.” That Lenin does not speak here of the

*) This quotation is taken by us from the “Material for the elaboration of the results of the July Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.”, Agitprop of the M. C.

seizure of power by the proletariat but of the victory of Socialism in the sense of victory of Socialist economy and society, is obvious and needs no further comment.

We reject as an unheard of libel the assertion that we do not consider the construction carried on by the Soviet Power in the U. S. S. R. as socialist construction.

No one will dare assert that during the nine years of Soviet Power, either I or those who share my views have spent less energy than others with respect to socialist construction, and precisely on the economic front. The construction which is going on at present in the U. S. S. R. is socialist construction — no one can deny this.

If you, Comintern comrades, will take the trouble to study the practical differences which divide the Opposition from the Majority, you realise that in these differences there is not the least allusion to disputes concerning the possibility or impossibility of the construction of Socialism (Zinoviev: "Hear, hear"). This is common ground for us all. The disputes only concerned the selection of ways and means capable of guaranteeing a reasonable pace to socialist construction, and to us the main question and the fundamental criterion in the selection of this or that practical proposal is **the question of measures guarantying a definite pre-dominance of socialist economic elements in the development of the country.** It is precisely our deep conviction of further success in Socialist construction which enables us to contemplate calmly and frankly all the difficulties of the transition period which severely affect the working class — particularly the questions of wages, unemployment, housing construction, all of which are exceptionally acute at present in spite of the considerable economic successes achieved by the heroic efforts of the proletariat under the leadership of our Party during the last years. It is this deep conviction that we hold in the success of Socialist construction which enables us, on all other questions such as those of the peasantry, private capital and its role, etc., not to flinch in the face of all difficulties but to lay them bare to the working class. And it is just with respect to the practical proposals intended to overcome these fundamental difficulties as rapidly as possible that pessimism and lack of faith made their appearance in the ranks of our opponents and our critic. (Zinoviev: "Hear, hear!") (Voices: "What are your proposals?")

It is not a question of what unscrupulous or badly informed opponents endeavour to saddle us with, but rather a question of **the conditions under which the construction of a socialist society in the U. S. S. R. can be achieved.** Our opponents assert that in our country, where a few million proletarians have to lead a hundred million strong peasantry and this on a N. E. P. basis and in capitalist surroundings, Socialist society can be definitely constructed **independent of the proletarian revolution, even only in a few advanced countries.** This point of view which places such sanguine hopes in the socialist capacities of the peasantry is called "optimism". We assert that the construction of a socialist economy in the U. S. S. R. will be accomplished with the collaboration of proletarian revolutions in other countries. (Disorder, cries: "That is enough!") And this is for some reason or other called "pessimism". We assert that the optimism concerning the Socialistic capacities of the peasantry which prevails among our opponents is only the reverse side of their **pessimism concerning the international proletarian revolution.** (Disorder, cries: "That is enough"). This "optimism" rests entirely on the anti-Leninist theory of the submergence of the kulak into socialism, of the "socialist" character of the small employer which I described earlier in my speech. (Cries and disorder).

But what is the foremost and most characteristic sign of the final victory of socialism of which we are speaking here? If we are not to depart from Marx and Lenin we cannot find any other sign than the **abolition of classes.** This is what Lenin wrote on the question of relations between the proletariat and the peasantry with respect to socialist construction:

"What does 'leading the peasantry' mean? It means first of all to take a course towards the abolition of classes and not towards the small producers. If we are to abandon this fundamental course we would cease to be Socialists, and we would find ourselves in the camp of the petty bourgeoisie, the camp of the social-revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who are at present the worst enemies of the proletariat."

Thus final victory of Socialism cannot mean anything but at the very least the abolition of classes. The victory of Socialism

means, consequently, the conversion of the peasantry into workers in a united socialised and systematically conducted economy. But our opponents profess that "optimism" consists in declaring that in the U. S. S. R. this task can and will be fulfilled even before the proletarians of the foremost countries of the capitalist world have overthrown their bourgeoisie! You call this optimism, but we call it darkest pessimism. The erroneousness of this viewpoint has already led several comrades to make statements, the meaning of which is: that here in the U. S. S. R. nine-tenths of the programme proposed in the Communist Manifesto of Engels has already been carried out. If one considers the question from the viewpoint of the transference of power to the proletariat, of declaring industry the property of the proletarian State, of the nationalisation of land, the banks, transport, etc. (Skrypnik interjects: "Just a trifle") then these nine-tenths were carried out not by 1926 but by the middle of 1918. Lenin was fully aware of this when he wrote four years later: "We have not yet finished laying the foundation of socialist economy."

But if we consider these nine-tenths not from the viewpoint of the transference of power and ownership to the proletarian State, but from the viewpoint of the actual construction of a truly socialist society — the regeneration of the peasant masses which will transform them from small producers and private employers even if it be on nationalised land, into workers in a united socialist economy in which classes have been abolished — to declare now that nine-tenths of the task have been carried out is tantamount to sowing illusions, harmful to the course of the Russian proletariat as well as to the course of the international revolution. In order to declare this one must skip over all the doctrines of Marxism and Leninism, and over the following statement by Lenin which is only too frequently forgotten in our days.

Lenin wrote:

"As long as private ownership of the means of production (for instance, of agricultural implements and cattle, even if private ownership of land be repealed) and freedom of trade exist, the economic foundation of capitalism also exists."

In our country, close on 25 million peasant farms carry on their work under these very conditions — private ownership of the means of production accompanied by the repeal of the private property of land. And at present it could not be otherwise. We have achieved enormous successes, we have astounded the world by the creative economic capacity of the proletariat and we will continue to astound the world by the enormous pace of our achievements in the construction of a socialist economy. But the position of the peasantry remains the same, whilst a victorious socialism pre-supposes that all this will be digested and altered: through the co-operative movement, through industrialisation and electrification.

In 1922 Lenin said: "we have not even finished laying the foundation of socialist economy" and in 1925 we are told that nine-tenths of the programme of the Communist Manifesto has been carried out.

And yet Lenin was neither a pessimist nor an unbeliever when he said this. His declaration was not intended to engender pessimism and could not contribute to the lowering of the fighting morale and energy of proletarian construction in the U. S. S. R. On the contrary, it was a call to more energetic activity with respect to the transformation of a N. E. P. Russia into a Socialist Russia. But Lenin deemed it necessary to tell the proletariat the truth and nothing but the truth about our position, and by this truth to imbue the proletariat with the spirit of construction and the spirit of class struggle.

On the other hand, sowing illusions and skipping over facts are tantamount to laying in store disillusion for the Russian and the international proletariat.

The Party did not make such declarations the symbol of its faith. The adoption of this theory would require the withdrawal of a whole series of Party declarations which hitherto no one has questioned. It is simply because the Party did not make these declarations of individual comrades its symbol of faith, because it did not enter them into its table of commandments, that we have the right to criticise and to protest against these opinions held by some comrades or by some groups of comrades. We cannot but protest against this tendency, for if no one in the Party and in the Comintern protested against it, it would in the course of time lead inevitably to that against which we not only protest now, but against which we hope to protest in

unison with the overwhelming majority of our Party and of the Comintern (laughter), viz. against the substitution for the international revolutionary perspective, on which Lenin carried on the entire practical work from the moment of the October Revolution, by the national-reformist perspective which is being offered us. And we assume that the Comintern, as the revolutionary organisation of the proletariat, can and must help our Party to resist this tendency. Such are the practical and theoretical elements which constitute the Right tendency.

Some comrades have tried to declare that our struggle against this truly Right tendency is welcomed by the bourgeois press and by Social Democracy. I declare that this is absolutely untrue (disorder) that on the contrary — as was only to be expected — it is precisely this Right tendency on which the world bourgeoisie bestows its compliments and on the further development of which Social Democracy places its hopes. In order that complete clarity be established with respect to this important matter, I propose to the Presidium of the Comintern to instruct any kind of commission to collect and publish in several languages all the comments of the bourgeois and Social Democratic press, without eliminations (a voice: "Do you really imagine that the Comintern will waste time on this!") and then the workers will see who gets the applause of this press (disorder). I am prepared to assist this commission and to hand over to it the enormous amount of material which I possess. I will give just one example. If Miliukov was quoted here in order to show that the bourgeoisie is applauding us, I will refer to the most perspicacious enemy of proletarian dictatorship who was considered and as such repeatedly quoted by no other than Lenin. This is what the real representative of the new bourgeoisie, Ustrialov, writes with respect to and after the XV. Conference. He writes in his article "Crisis in the C. P. S. U." in the organ of "Novosti Zhizni" No. 232 of October 19th 1926 (the italics are Ustrialov's):

"The need now is for a new manoeuvre, a new impulse, to speak figurately, for Neo-NEP. From this point of view one must admit that a number of actual concessions which the Party deemed it necessary to make to the Zinovievists cannot but fill one with serious apprehensions."

And then again:

"Glory be to the Polit. Bureau if the mea culpa declaration of the Opposition leaders is the result of their one-sided and unconditional capitulation. But woe to the Polit. Bureau if it be the fruit of compromise with them. In the latter case there is sure to be struggle... The victorious Central Committee must obtain internal immunity against the disintegrating virus of the Opposition. It must make all the necessary deductions from its defeat... Otherwise it will be a misfortune for the country. It is in this manner that this matter must be approached by the intelligentsia in Russia, by the business expert milieu, by the ideologists of evolution and not of revolution."

Ustrialov's deduction is:

"That is why we are at present not only against Zinoviev but also decidedly for Stalin" (Disorder).

Let the comrades who will quote Miliukov remember also to quote this conception of Mr. Ustrialov, the most perspicacious of the enemies of proletarian dictatorship (a voice from the audience: "When was this written?"). This was written after the XV. Conference. Of course some of our class enemies like Miliukov are not at all averse to using our "criticism", but to make up for this they, like Ustrialov, approve of the policy adopted against our views.

One must say, comrades, that Mr. Ustrialov, the perspicacious enemy who recommends to the Central Committee to make the necessary deductions from the defeat of the opposition and to give it the quietus, does not abstain from giving advice to the Central Committee. For instance, he reminds them of old Plato and his advice concerning people who might be harmful to the State, and he repeats Plato's advice: "Pay personal homage to these people, crown them with laurel wreaths, but send them out of the country, and as far as possible (laughter)."

Comrades, we consider it our duty to fight against the Right tendency I have described and we consider it our right to defend our views within the framework of the Party, within the framework of its statutes. More than that, we hold that this struggle of ours will not remain without influence on the policy of the Party and that it has already exercised its influence, as I already said at the XV. Party Conference. In spite of the sharpness of the discussions which have taken place at this Plenum

on the basis of the lessons of the past year, and with the good will of the majority we could find a common line for practical work. However, for the purposes of this struggle we were charged with crimes of all sorts. No attempt was made to approximate these charges to our actual views, — their main object was to discredit us as much as possible.

I will not go into all these charges but will only deal briefly with three of them which are now given special prominence.

The first charge is that of the hegemony of Trotskyism. The second charge — promotion of or support for the idea of two parties. And the third concerns the practical policy of prices.

As to the hegemony of Trotskyism, I must declare that all of you who are experienced politicians must be aware that when attempts are made to substitute for an examination of the political and practical declarations which we have made in common with Trotsky — a hue and cry about the hegemony of Trotskyism, this can only be described as a strategical move. It is a false assertion. We have never defended, we are not defending now, nor do we intend to defend in the future that which separated historical Trotskyism from Leninism — permanent revolution, the question of the peasantry as raised by Trotsky, etc. (Disorder; interjections.)

But just now it is not these erroneous ideas of Comrade Trotsky which are attacked, but precisely those ideas of Trotsky which led him to Lenin. The ideas which are being attacked at present are not our ideas, and not Trotsky's ideas but the ideas of Lenin. Our opponents are attacking the fundamental ideas of Leninism, for instance the idea of closest connection between our revolution and the international revolution — calling these ideas "Trotskyism". This is not an isolated case in the history of Communism. More than once, Marx' ideas were attacked and were called Blanquist. The present ideologist of the Comintern, the fearless champion against Trotskyism, Comrade Martinov, has wasted plenty of paper and has spilled much ink in opposing Lenin's ideas, calling them Blanquist and Bakuninist ideas. We reject everything which separated Trotsky from Lenin, but together with him we will defend the true ideas of Marxism and Leninism against the attacks of those who are at present distorting them.

Here is a simple but very clear example which should suffice to throw light on the true state of affairs, even if all other circumstances had by some geological cause disappeared. Comrade Trotsky has quoted here the programme of the Young Communist League of the Soviet Union. As you did not allow him to proceed, I hope you will allow me to read the statement contained in paragraph 4 of the programme of the Young Communist League:

"Although Russia possesses enormous natural wealth, it is an economically backward country, with a pre-eminently petty bourgeois population. It can only arrive at socialism through the world proletarian revolution, the epoch of the development of which we have just entered."

Comrades, this statement certainly clashes with the theory "of Socialism in one country" as propounded here. If you accept this theory, you will have to alter this statement.

I propose to follow the good old adage — calling a spade a spade (voices from the audience: "And Trotskyism — Trotskyism") (laughter), and consequently calling those who propose to revise the programme — revisionists (Disorder, interjections) and those who stand up for the old programme, orthodoxists (interjections, disorder, laughter). I am asking you; who is proposing to eliminate from this programme the words about the world revolution? Is it Trotsky? If Trotsky were to do so, we would be against him. But the fact is that it is not Trotsky who proposes to revise this programme, to eliminate the words about the world proletarian revolution, but the others. And, therefore, we, together with Comrade Trotsky, are against these others. Whoever were to propose this revision, this distortion of a clear and precise Leninist doctrine — you are, surely not going to say that this programme was written under the influence of Trotsky and not under the influence of Lenin. — we would be always against him and always on the side of those who would carry on a struggle against such a revision. We are with Trotsky because he does not revise Lenin's fundamental ideas, such ideas as the ties between our revolution and the international revolution, but there are others who would revise this.

It was said at the XV. Conference that the new element which appeared in our Party during the last years, was the fact

that we had identified ourselves with Trotskyism. (Voices: "Hear, hear.") This is not so. The new element in the Party is that some comrades are departing from Leninism with respect to very serious and fundamental questions, including the question of the ties between our revolution and the world revolution. (Zinoviev: "Hear, hear.")

As to the question of two parties, we stand up for the idea of one monopolist Communist-Bolshevik Party personifying dictatorship in our country. I defy you to find a single word in any of our writings which can be interpreted as going against this (Disorder, a voice: "What about your deeds?"). On the contrary, you must admit that when a tendency made its appearance in our Party towards undermining this question and giving it an erroneous interpretation, we were the ones who proposed to reaffirm the true, Leninist idea of the dictatorship of the Party. (Disorder, a voice: "What about Ossovsky?").

With respect to the question of prices, we reject the policy of higher prices. I declared this already at the July Plenum of the C. C. and then this same declaration was put in writing and signed by Trotsky and myself in order that it should be added to the minutes of the XV. Conference — a straightforward and open declaration that we reject the policy of raising wholesale prices. Although this written declaration of ours was not added to the minutes and will therefore not be read by those members of our Party who read minutes, this declaration remains in force, and whatever efforts be made to saddle us with the policy of higher prices, I declare that I was never a supporter of this policy and will always fight against it.

Comrades, such are the charges against us.

What do we then actually assert? What is our Credo? Our reply to the most important questions can be formulated in the following brief propositions. It goes without saying that this reply is not an exhaustive one; I cannot in such a short space of time reply to all the questions, but will limit myself to the most important.

Firstly, we assert that it is essential to carry on a struggle not only against those who have deserted Communism for ultra-Leftism, who maintain that the October Revolution is degenerating into a bourgeois revolution, who are espousing syndicalism and anarchism or are throwing themselves, in their despair, into the arms of the enemies of the U. S. S. R., and of the Comintern, but also against the Right tendencies — I have already described them — which consciously or semi-consciously on the basis of the idea that stabilisation has come to stay for decades, drive the Party on to the path of a relaxation of proletarian dictatorship.

Secondly, we assert that the entire politico-educational work within the proletariat must be based on the idea of world revolution, that one cannot eliminate from the programme of the Young Communist League the words quoted by me, just as one could not eliminate the profintern from the statutes of the trade unions. We must tell all the workers that we will build up a complete Socialist society in our country, but that we will do so with the help of the world proletariat, that with regard to this point it is impermissible to revise Lenin's views.

Thirdly, we assert that this perspective can in no way impair the energy and enthusiasm of the proletariat of our Party and of the Young Communist League with respect to the practical construction of Socialism in our country, that every success of the proletariat and of the Soviet Power with respect to socialist construction is a powerful element of the growing world revolution which is not far distant.

Fourthly, we assert that the pre-conditions for the construction of Socialism are the alliance between the working class and the peasantry (on the basis pointed out by Lenin, i. e. preservation of the leading role of the proletariat) and the industrialisation of the country. If industrialisation is retarded, there can be no further consolidation of the alliance between the peasantry and the proletariat. At the present juncture, industrialisation is the premise of a further consolidation of the union with the peasantry and particularly the premise of the preservation of the leading role of the working class in this union. This explains our attitude to the question of the pace of industrialisation.

Fifthly, we assert that the cause of victorious construction of socialism and preservation of the leading role of the proletariat in the economic as well as the political sphere demand a systematic increase of its share of the national revenue given the present level of our economy, in the tenth year of Soviet

Power — a correct wage policy must be based on the idea that higher wages are the premise for a greater productivity of labour, and not vice versa. Approchement of the workers to the State, increasing their activity to counteract the indisputable growth of the activity of non-proletarian and anti-proletarian groups of the population, such are the fundamental political tasks at the present juncture.

Sixthly, we assert that among the various sections of the peasantry the poor peasantry is the only solid prop of the proletarian revolution. We are still of the opinion that the entire policy in the villages must be guided by the following words used by Lenin:

"To be able to arrive at an agreement with the middle peasantry, whilst not relinquishing for a minute the struggle against the kulaks and to look upon the poor peasantry as the only solid prop."

In order to act in accordance with these instructions, it is essential to carry on a policy in this spirit with respect to the poorest sections of the peasantry (freeing 40% of taxes, credit on favourable conditions, preferential supply of agricultural implements, etc.), looking upon the poor peasantry, the consolidation of its social power and political role in the villages as the chief basis for the construction of socialism in our country.

Seventhly, we assert that in the international sphere it is essential to revert to the fundamental instructions of Lenin who dissociated himself from any attempts to spread the illusion that the U. S. S. R., in the international movement, can depend on elements represented in the Anglo-Russian Committee or in the General Council, etc.

Such are our real views. This is not Social Democracy, not "Trotskyism", but Leninism.

We are of the opinion that the defence of these, our real views does not justify anyone to reproach us with any deviation from Lenin's views. We think that it is essential to create in the Party conditions which would make it impossible that the propagation of these views — even if they do not coincide with the views of this or that member of the C. C. — be looked upon as a crime against the Party. The declaration of October 16th remains in force as far as we are concerned, but it is a declaration of submission to the decisions of the Party Congresses and Conferences of the C. C. and C. C. C. (Disorder, interjections: "We do not believe words, we want deeds), and certainly not a recognition of our views, as being Social Democratic.

Comrades, we are submitting and we will submit to any decision of the Party (Voices: "You do not show it"). You are preparing to deal the opposition a blow. We are convinced that this blow will only strengthen the Right tendencies which I described. They are bound to come to the surface very soon, and I have no doubt whatever that in the face of their inevitable growth and pressure we, the so-called "oppositional elements", will find ourselves in the same ranks with the overwhelming majority of the proletarian elements of our Party.

We submit to every decision of the Party. We cannot, however, acknowledge that our practical work or our views in any way deviate from Leninism. As always, so now and for all time, the only proletarian revolutionary organisation to us is the Communist International, and Leninism the only guide in the struggle.

Comrade TAN-PING-SCHAN (China):

I will deal with four main questions:

1. The possibility of building Socialism in one country, like the U. S. S. R.
2. The sharpening of capitalist contradictions in the imperialist epoch.
3. The lessening of the dependence of a State in which the proletariat is already victorious, upon the capitalist world market, upon the capitalist world economy.
4. The possibility of drawing petty bourgeois economy into Socialist economy.

On all four questions the Party answers affirmatively whereas the Opposition replies negatively. On the basis of the facts that we now see in China we shall estimate this theory of the Opposition. Were the Opposition correct it would mean that the Chinese revolution is futile, that the 400 million population of China must continue to carry the imperialist yoke, that the whole liberation movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is a hopeless cause. But the facts show the contrary.

At the very first appearance of Trotskyism the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Communist Youth immediately

unanimously adopted a resolution against Trotskyism, even though at that time the Communist Party was theoretically weak. It immediately recognised the harm that Trotskyism would do to the Chinese revolution were it to prevail in China. Comrade Lenin once said that China will most speedily be in a position to break through the imperialist front. In what consists this opportunity? Precisely because the contradictions of imperialism become intensified with each succeeding day. Imperialist contradictions appear everywhere but in China they take on an especially crass, visible and vigorous form. With the rise of the Chinese revolutionary movement there are sharpened the contradictions of imperialism on the one hand, while on the other hand the revolutionary flood rises higher from day to day precisely because of this sharpening of imperialist contradictions. This very fact forms the strongest bulward for the victory of the Chinese revolution. If the theory of Comrade Trotsky were correct, that the contradictions of capitalism are supposed to have become milder in the imperialist period, this would mean that despite the revolutionary fervour of the national movement in China it would now be easier for the imperialists to smother the Chinese revolution by means of a united international intervention, as was done in 1900 in the case of the Boxer uprisings. But the facts are quite otherwise. The fact that the Chinese military lords cannot fight jointly against the Chinese revolution means also that the imperialists cannot proceed jointly against the Chinese revolution.

In 1918—19, in the period of most stubborn civil war in Russia, Comrade Lenin utilised these very contradictions among the imperialists when he said that these contradictions will give us a breathing spell that will permit our arming and organising against imperialism. The Chinese revolution will utilise the intensification of these imperialist antagonisms.

Now, as to the peasant question, Comrade Trotsky writes:

"The proletariat which has captured power enters upon hostile conflicts not only with all groupings within the bourgeoisie, which in the beginning supported the revolutionary struggle, but also with the broad masses of the peasantry by whose aid it has attained power."

If this were true it would mean that the Chinese revolution is hopeless. Everyone knows that China is an agrarian country, that the proletariat constitutes only a small minority of the population. Petty bourgeois economy dominates throughout the entire country. Thanks to the organisation, the class consciousness of the Chinese proletariat in recent years in every national struggle the proletariat has led broad masses of peasantry and has defended their interests.

The fact that the proletariat is in a position to lead the peasantry and make it an ally, directly contradicts the theory of Comrade Trotsky. To be sure there is a difference between the Soviet Union and China. In the Soviet Union we have the dictatorship of the proletariat, but a correct perspective of the Chinese revolution shows that there is a possibility that under the hegemony of the proletariat, supported by the masses of peasants and with the aid of the Soviet Union, economic construction after the victory of the revolution will proceed not upon a capitalist, but upon a non-capitalist basis.

Is there a lessening of the dependence of the State in which the proletariat has been victorious, upon the capitalist world, upon the capitalist world market? In the present Chinese revolutionary movement the anti-British tendency is particularly obvious. From the very beginning British imperialism tried to organise a military intervention in order to stamp out the Chinese revolution. But it did not succeed. The denial of this thesis by the Opposition means in practice that if the British intervention can not stamp out the Chinese revolution, then American capitalism will be able to conquer China. This means that if the canons of British imperialism cannot shatter the Chinese revolution, the cheap commodities of American imperialism will engulf China.

If Comrade Trotsky thinks that the building of Socialism, of socialist industry, depends solely upon the quality of technique, of machinery, then he has entirely forgotten the political power which is in the hands of the proletariat. The proletariat of the Soviet Union has prevailed by means of its political power, and likewise the Chinese revolution will be able, through the nationalisation of the chief means of production, to carry out this building jointly with the non-capitalist economy of other States.

Under these circumstances we can say with certainty that the building of Socialism in a single country, in the Soviet Union,

is possible unless imperialism successfully destroys this constructive work by means of military intervention. Lenin was entirely right when he said that we have everything necessary for the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

In conclusion, if the Opposition accuses the Party of national limitation because it affirms the possibility of building Socialism in the Soviet Union, this is the exact opposite of the facts. The support of the British General Strike, of the British coal strike, by the toilers of the Soviet Union proves as clear as day that this is an empty charge. And then the support of the Chinese revolution! Every worker, every toiler knows what the Soviet Union means to the Chinese revolution. And our enemy, the bourgeoisie, knows this equally well. The Opposition only wants to conceal the proof even though it also knows this quite well. When Comrade Zinoviev allows himself the pleasure of proposing that Souvarine, expelled from the French Communist Party, should be sent to China, then I do not know what this means. Perhaps because Comrade Souvarine sympathises with the Opposition, or because he is an ultra-Rightist — do they want the Chinese revolution to become degenerated through him?

What does this mean, to demand the withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang? It means that the Chinese proletariat sacrifices the united battle-front in the Chinese revolution, it means that the proletarian Party surrenders the broad revolutionary masses, that is surrenders the hegemony of the proletariat in the international revolution, it means the liquidation of the Chinese revolution. Every counter-revolutionary, every one of our enemies in China demands and propagates the withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang. For example, Chang-Tso-Lin in November 1924 told a Kuomintang member: I am for Sun-Yat-Sen, I am for the Kuomintang, because Sun-Yat-Sen is a good man and the Kuomintang is a good party. If Sun-Yat-Sen and the Kuomintang expel the Communists, I will collaborate with Sun-Yat-Sen and the Kuomintang. Thus Chang-Tso-Lin demands the withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang and likewise, though perhaps for different reasons, the Opposition demands the withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang.

The Chinese Party is in complete agreement with the policy of the Leninist Central Committee of the C. P. S. U., with the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union, as well as with the methods of the Party against the Opposition bloc. If the leaders of the Opposition bloc have tried to appeal to the Enlarged Executive of the international proletariat, then we assure them that the revolutionary proletariat, under the leadership of the Comintern, is always ready, not to support but to defeat and liquidate them. (Applause.)

Comrade ERNST MEYER (Germany):

The speeches of the Russian Opposition sounded their key note in this sentence: With the help of the Comintern we shall bring our views to victory. Translated from the diplomatic language of Comrade Kamenev into a more understandable tongue, this means: We appeal against the Russian majority's policy which is degenerating into capitalism. We are calling for a struggle against it with the aid of the oppositional groups and Parties of the Comintern.

Did even a single one of these opposition speakers devote his speech to an explanation of the difficulties of the situation in the Soviet Union, in order to destroy the ultra-Left and Social Democratic vilification of Soviet Russia, in order to strengthen confidence in Russia? No, the tone and content of all their speeches were calculated to deepen the scepticism of the Central and West European proletariat concerning further development in Russia.

Heretofore all Parties have looked to the Russian Party as an unattained model of uniform ideology and unshakable organisational unity and solidity. The appearance of the Opposition is apt to destroy this model in the eyes of the Comintern. All Opposition speakers, most sharply Comrade Kamenev, have proclaimed factional freedom. This is particularly dangerous because to menace the unity of the C. P. S. U. means to endanger the Soviet Union, the State of the proletarian dictatorship. To be sure in their October declaration and in the Russian Party Conference they made a promise that they would defend this unity under all circumstances, but their deeds here are an open violation of this pledge.

Comrade Zinoviev said that precisely because he is for the dictatorship of the Party, he is for the unity of the Communist Party. He thereby gave us a false counter-position between

the dictatorship of the Party and the dictatorship of the class. In his "Left Communism", Comrade Lenin pointed out the nonsense of making such a differentiation.

In this crooked counter-position there is still another mistake, namely, the veiling of the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat in a Leninist sense is not only the dictatorship of the industrial proletariat, but of the toiling class under the hegemony of the proletariat. Comrade Lenin formulated it thus:

"The highest principle of dictatorship is the maintenance of the alliance between proletariat and peasantry so that the proletariat can preserve the leading role and the State power."

Furthermore:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a special form of the class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the toilers, and the numerous non-proletarian toiling strata (petty bourgeoisie, small property owners, peasantry, intellectuals, etc.) or with their majority, an alliance against capital, an alliance for the purpose of the complete overthrow of capital, of the complete suppression of resistance on the part of bourgeoisie and restoration . . ."

In the emphasis upon the dictatorship of the Party by Comrade Zinoviev there lies a certain menace to the alliance between industrial proletariat and peasant class.

In the whole attitude of the Russian Opposition, which more coarsely is also the position of the German Opposition, we see a vulgarisation of the concept of dictatorship, in which only the application of naked force is considered instead of also the means of economically overcoming the bourgeoisie.

With this I come to the question of the N. E. P. The question is closely bound up with that of the building of Socialism in Soviet Russia. What is Socialism? Comrade Bukharin has already pointed out that Marx understood by Socialism, the first, lowest phase of Communism. Lenin in his "State and Revolution" went deeper into this question. It is stated there:

"Thereby in the first phase of Communist society (which is usually called Socialism) 'bourgeois rights' are not completely done away with, but only partially, to the extent of the already achieved economic transformation, i. e., with respect to the means of production".

Lenin then explains that Socialism does not yet mean the complete establishment of a Communist social order, but only the transfer of the means of production from private ownership into the possession of the proletarian State power.

Is it possible to reach this goal in a single country, in this case in Soviet Russia? Is it possible to bring about a socialisation of the means of production in Soviet Russia? Is the N. E. P. a means whereby to reach this? How contradictory the Opposition is we can see from the statements of Trotsky in his pamphlet "Socialism or Capitalism" in which it is stated, with respect to the intertwining of Soviet economy with world economy:

"But the capitalist world market contains not only terrors for us — it also opens big possibilities to us. We receive thereby a constantly broader access to the achievements of scientific technique, to its most complicated products. If the world market, by drawing into itself a socialist economy, creates new dangers for the latter, it at the same time assures the socialist State, provided only that its economic dealings be regulated correctly, powerful antidotes against these dangers. If we utilise the world market for ourselves in the correct manner, we shall be able to accelerate further the process of the shifting of equalisation coefficient to the advantage of Socialism. . . ."

"And to the extent that we move forward this advantage will appear more and more victorious."

In his preface Comrade Trotsky took up the question of what objections could be raised against the N. E. P.:

"Hostile judgment follows two directions: 1. they say that by building up socialist economy (this is the German translation corrected by Comrade Trotsky himself) — we will ruin the country; 2. on the other hand they say about us that by developing the productive forces we are in reality coming to capitalism".

Trotsky then continues:

"The first sort of criticism is characteristic of bourgeois thought. The second sort of criticism is that of the Social Democracy, that is, the Socialist-masked bourgeois thinkers." And now, we ask, does not this Social Democratic conception which says that we are approaching capitalism, stand much closer

to the views of the Russian Opposition than to the conceptions of the Party majority?

The clarification of these problems is necessary not only for the building of Socialism in Soviet Russia, but for all Communist Parties, which will be confronted with the problem of not only capturing power but also of maintaining power and building Socialism in their country. Precisely because we desire that the experiences made in Soviet Russia with N. E. P. and war Communism shall not remain unused, but that they shall be exploited by the proletariat of all countries, precisely for this reason we emphasise the importance of clarifying these problems in connection with the question of socialist construction in Soviet Russia.

With this I come to the question of the reaction of the activity of the Russian Opposition upon the Communist International, and especially upon the German ultra-Left. That which the Russian Opposition whispers here will be trumpeted on a worsened scale by the oppositional groups in the Comintern. Comrade Zinoviev spoke quite in the style of Korsch, Ruth Fischer and Maslow, that one cannot confuse the N. E. P. with Socialism. If the Russian Opposition talks about the existence of the danger of a degeneration, in the mouths of Korsch, Ruth Fischer and Maslow this no longer is stated as an intertwining in world economy, but an already accomplished retreat to capitalism. We find that the Russian Opposition means not only a disturbance of the building of Socialism in Soviet Russia, but also a disturbance of the building of the Communist Parties outside of Russia, and thereby a hindering of the world revolution. Just as little as the small Spartakus Bund in autumn 1917 allowed itself to be held back from supporting the C. C. of the Bolshevik Party and the revolution because of reports on the oppositional attitude of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev on the question of the conquest of power, just as little will the larger Communist Party of Germany allow the attitude of the Opposition to hold it back from the support of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its present C. C.

Comrade Zinoviev closed his speech with the assurance that he would fight against factions. In reality the appearance of the Opposition was an attempt to form a new international faction and for this purpose to strengthen the Opposition which exists in the Comintern. Comrade Zinoviev here defended, in principle the permissibility of a bloc, of course he only spoke about his bloc with Comrade Trotsky, but Comrade Zinoviev and the Russian Opposition are also in a bloc with the German ultra-Left, even with those who were expelled from the Communist Party of Germany. Yet the Russian comrades in their October declaration solemnly promised to oppose all these factional efforts. But has even a single one of the Opposition leaders said one single word against their supporters in Germany? Comrade Zinoviev said that he stood upon the Leninist viewpoint: struggle against Right and Left. To this I want to say that at the time of the Open Letter Comrade Zinoviev said: "The greatest danger in Germany is the ultra-Left". In March of this year, at the Enlarged Executive, he was guilty of poor taste politically of putting Comrade Brandler on one place with the expelled renegade Katz, and now, when he still speaks in principle about the struggle against Right and Left, concretely he only combats the alleged or actual Right mistakes in the various Parties. The actual behaviour of Comrade Zinoviev shows that his signature to the Open Letter was worth exactly as much as the signature of Ruth Fischer and the other ultra-Leftists. The policy of equivocation and double dealing carried on by the German ultra-Left is also a feature of certain leaders of the Russian Opposition.

Comrade Zinoviev and the ultra-Left allegedly demand the most vigorous struggle against Social Democratic and opportunist deviations. But what contributed more to the strengthening of the German Social Democracy, to the weakening of Communism in Germany, than the policy of Ruth Fischer conducted with the support of Zinoviev, which Zinoviev would like to continue to-day in a bloc with Ruth Fischer!

The lack of principle of the Opposition bloc is characterised, for instance, by Comrade Radek, who formerly opposed the Ruth Fischer and Maslow policy, but who has now enlisted with Zinoviev, body, boots and breeches, in Comintern politics.

Does Party democracy, which the Russian Oppositional leaders demand in the Russian Party and in the Comintern, mean the hushing up of all differences and the toleration of all principal mistakes? That is surely a bloc which by its lack of principle leads to a political morass.

Especially in recent months through the struggle against the

ultra-Left we have gained in influence and we have severely weakened the Social Democracy. We know that only by continuing this policy, which is also expressed in the resolutions of the Enlarged Plenum, will we be able to hasten the world revolution. The appearance of the Opposition means a damage to the Soviet Union; and it is also a crime against the international labour movement.

Comrade BIRCH (America) (LOVESTONE)

Comrades, I propose to introduce a declaration in the name of the American Delegation.

But, before presenting the resolution, I propose to handle very briefly four questions: firstly, the Monroe Doctrine "theory" given us by Comrade Trotsky the other night; secondly, the question of the role of the Soviet Union for the American labour movement; third, the problem of pessimism; and fourth, the question of blocs and factionalism in the Communist International.

The other night Comrade Trotsky attacked Comrade Pepper as the supposed evangelist of a new theory of Monroe-Doctrine for the Soviet Union and from that, Comrade Trotsky turned the centre of gravity of his attack to Comrade Stalin, on the question of building up Socialism in the Soviet Union.

First of all: it must be said that no one has ever proposed any such doctrine, or theory, as the joke given us by Comrade Trotsky in his talk about the Monroe-Doctrine. Secondly, either Comrade Trotsky wilfully misrepresents the Monroe-Doctrine in its full significance and real meaning at different times, or he misunderstands the whole question of the Monroe-Doctrine. Comrade Bukharin in speaking of the Monroe-Doctrine merely asked: what about the slogan against the capitalists: "Hands off the Soviet Union."

Let me tell very briefly what the Monroe-Doctrine is. If one analyses the Monroe-Doctrine in all its phases he will find some very serious basis for Comrade Trotsky being wrong even in his jokes. The Monroe-Doctrine provides — and Comrade Trotsky forgets — (I am quoting literally from the Doctrine) "that the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintained, are henceforth not to be colonised as subjects for future colonisation by any European powers".

Today the Monroe-Doctrine is utilised by American imperialists as a lever for a monopolist position on the American continents. But at the time the Monroe-Doctrine was issued — one hundred years ago — it was issued by the then revolutionary American bourgeoisie, who, through a revolution against the British monarchy, had put themselves in a position to issue this doctrine. Against whom and against what? Against the colonisation of the American continents by feudal forces, against the Holy Alliance! It is a bold misrepresentation of fact to bring in this theory of the Monroe-Doctrine as it is to-day, as it is used by the imperialists of the United States, and to try thereby to throw dirt over the whole fundamental question of the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union. Would Comrade Trotsky say he is opposed to the rejecting of any attempt at capitalists colonisation of the Soviet Union? Would he be opposed to resisting all attempts to treat the Soviet Union as a colony? Of course not.

And when Comrade Trotsky comes and uses the Monroe-Doctrine in his static, narrow sense, when he interprets the Monroe-Doctrine solely as it is to-day, and omits deliberately the historical background and the statement of conditions at the time of its issuance, at that time — the young American bourgeoisie were struggling against the feudal powers, — he either misunderstands or misrepresents. To-day the Socialist Soviet Union can very well say to the imperialist powers, "Hands off and no colonisation".

Comrades, for us in America the Soviet Union plays an extraordinary role. In Germany, in France, in England, the objective conditions are far more favourable; there the working class is far more developed, the revolutionary interests are far more advanced. The lack of these forces, the absence of these elements for the revolutionising of the American working class — presents us with a situation in which the very example, the very role and the very experience of the Soviet Union are a revolutionising factor.

One word about pessimism. Because of our difficult objective conditions, with our numerous obstacles to the building of a mass Communist Party in the United States, pessimism may be a very serious problem. We have to fight it in certain sections of our Party and we have had to fight it doubly hard because of the tendency to develop a pessimistic outlook, because of the tendency to lose faith in the revolutionary movement, as shown

by the Opposition of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is now trying to extend its influence on an international scale.

Coming to the question of factionalism. The line of the Opposition here was not only a renewal of the conflict, but a preparation for more conflicts, for conflicts in other sections of the Comintern. And as I read this, I remind myself of the statement of Comrade Lenin, when he said that he who believes in words is an idiot. Deeds are what count! The line that the Opposition has continued here, has shown that their words are empty words, and that they will do everything in their power not only to prolong, but to extend the Opposition in other parties.

Comrade Zinoviev gave one part of the Opposition programme, Comrade Trotsky added another part, Vuyovitch dealt with a concrete part of the programme, Kamenev capped the whole programme with his threats. This was an organised attempt to lay the basis, to give a programme to the Opposition in the International. It is ridiculous to say that we are in favour only of blocs and not of factions, or of two Communist Parties. The bloc theory leads to the faction theory, and the faction theory leads to the double party theory, which implies the tactics of the split. Just as the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has annihilated the attempt to form this April bloc, I feel confident that the Communist Parties of every country will destroy the attempt to form in the International a so-called "December bloc".

Speaking for the delegation from the American Communist Party, I want to say that every one of us feels that particularly because of the weakness of our Party, particularly because of the objective difficulties we face, do we realise the dangers of the position taken by the Opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. I can add that our delegation after listening to the speeches of Zinoviev, Trotsky, Kamenev and Vuyovitch, feels more convinced and better equipped to go back to America to see to it that not a trace of support shall be given in our Party to this Opposition. Every report we have received from the districts on this question has shown that not a single member of these district committees has so far voted for the Opposition, for Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev and others. We assure you that with the equipment which we have now gathered, including the speeches delivered here by the Opposition, we will do our utmost to convince, to educate our Party so that not a member of the Communist Party of America will give his support to the destructive position taken by Comrades Zinoviev, Trotsky and the others. (Applause.)

The following declaration was thereupon read into the record of the proceedings:

Declaration of the American Delegation.

The Delegation of the Workers (Communist) Party of America to the VII Enlarged Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, declares on behalf of the whole Party, its whole-hearted solidarity with the results of the XV Party Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We unreservedly agree with and support the political line and Leninist leadership of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. (b), approved unanimously by the XV Party Conference, and are unalterably opposed to the ideology and policies of the Opposition bloc.

Our Party from the beginning opposed Trotskyism, not only as an international phenomenon, but also in its American variation as expressed in the gross social-democratic deviations of Lore. Our Party deemed it necessary to continue to fight against Trotskyism also when it received the support of the leaders of the new Opposition, Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, whose platform is a deviation from Leninism and a surrender to Trotskyism. In July and October, and again in its last November Plenum, our Central Committee condemned severely the new Opposition and the new Oppositional bloc. We were convinced that their policies were wrong, and that this Opposition not only imperilled the unity of the C. P. S. U. (b), and thereby the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Republic, but that it was detrimental also to the most vital and important interests of the proletariat of all countries, as well as of our American Party.

The brilliant example of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is one of the greatest sources of inspiration and will-to-fight for our Party, as well as for the class-conscious section of the American working class. The Communist Party of America was founded in connection with the mighty wave of enthusiasm called forth by the outbreak of the Russian Revolution. In America (with its scarcity of other revolutionary factors), where capitalism is still on the upgrade, in the country of the most

powerful imperialism and the most reactionary labour aristocracy, where independent mass actions of the working class are so few, where the working class has yet no political mass party — the existence of the Soviet Union and the successful building of socialism within it, play relatively a more important role as revolutionary stimulus to the working class than in other countries which possess a revolutionary tradition, where capitalism is declining.

The American Party, severely condemned and fought the Russian Opposition's attitude which is tantamount to a relinquishment of revolutionary perspectives for the Soviet Union. The heterogeneous elements of the Russian Opposition are kept together by the common basis of disbelief in the possibility of the building up of socialism in the Soviet Union with its own internal revolutionary forces, they are united in an unprincipled Opposition to the Leninist leadership of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. (b). Trotskyism, which based all its hopes upon direct state aid by the West European proletariat, which continually prophesied the inevitable, irreconcilable ultimate struggle between the peasantry and the working class, certainly represented, from the very beginning, the complete negation of the fundamental premises of proletarian dictatorship. Only an unhealthy pessimism can at present ignore the growing predominance of Socialist elements in the economy of the Soviet Union. Only people who have lost faith in the leading position of the proletariat and the revolutionary role of the Communist Party, only those who have accepted Trotskyism as against Leninism, can proclaim the principle that it is altogether impossible to build socialism in the country completely, or deny the possibility of completing the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union with the internal forces of the Russian Revolution. It is contrary to the living principles of Leninism to say with comrade Zinoviev, that the New Economic Policy is the "broadest retreat" and nothing but a retreat. It is a social-democratic deviation to characterise the state enterprises, which Lenin called "enterprises of a consistently socialist type", as State capitalist enterprises. The whole hue and cry of the Opposition about "kulakisation" originates entirely in the opportunist conception that the peasantry can develop only in a capitalist direction. The opposition bloc came dangerously close to Menshevik conceptions when it proclaimed the present situation in the Soviet Union as a revival of capitalism disregarding the growing predominance of Socialist elements in the economic system of the Soviet Union, denying that the Soviet Union possesses all the premises for a complete construction of socialism, and announcing the degeneration of the Soviet State and the C. P. S. U. (b) as a Party no longer representative of the working class.

The American Party rejects this Social-Democratic disbelief in the revolutionary cause. It rejoices in the complete victory over the Opposition at the XV Party Conference, it welcomes the ideological struggle against the Oppositional bloc and demands that the adherents of the Opposition be kept out of the leadership of the Communist International.

The American Party has tremendous difficulties to face. The labour aristocracy has gone over to the side of the capitalists, and even large sections of the real proletariat are disheartened by the tremendous difficulties which confront them, affecting them with a disinclination to fight. The struggle of our powerful Russian brother party, the energy it shows in overcoming the difficulties of the construction of socialism, and in struggling against scepticism and lack of faith in its own ranks, constitute the greatest and most substantial help for our small Party, which lacks revolutionary traditions and which must work within a proletariat with few traditions of mass revolutionary struggles. Pessimism, scientism, disbelief and over-estimation of difficulties, are the worst enemies of the Communist idea in America. In no other country do we find such a quantity of "ex-socialists", "ex-champions of the class struggle", "tired radicals".

Lassitude and pessimism, sometimes show themselves even in our own ranks, and it is one of our most important tasks to eradicate this evil. The American Party, which struggles for the cause of socialism in the most powerful imperialist country, the representative of the capitalist pole of present society, looks with full admiration to the great C. P. S. U. (b) which created a powerful Workers' Republic and which is building socialism at the other pole — the Socialist pole. We see clearly the connection between the disbelief in the possibility of complete construction of socialism in the Soviet Union and the disbelief in the final defeat of capitalism in America. The Workers' (Communist) Party of America declares relentless struggle

against the Russian Opposition. It is convinced that the growth of socialism in the Soviet Union is giving the greatest impetus to the world revolution and to the revolutionary forces which will accomplish the final defeat of capitalism in America.

The action of the leaders of the Opposition bloc at the Plenum of the Enlarged Executive cannot be interpreted otherwise than an attempt to unleash a new factional struggle. They did not give an "explanation" of their standpoint, they brought forward an Opposition platform against the platform of the C. P. S. U. and of the Communist International. They attempted an international prolongation of the Russian Opposition and sought an ideological basis for the open and disguised Oppositional elements within the Communist International. The American Party protests energetically against these new attempts at factional struggle, which can only benefit the enemies of the Communist International. The American Party which, after many years of factional struggles under which the Party suffered severely, is now on the way of inner consolidation, declares itself in complete agreement with the slogan issued by Comrade Bukharin "Down with factionalism in the Communist International". It urges the Plenum of the Enlarged Executive to take a definite stand against the international factionalism again proclaimed by the leaders of the Oppositional bloc within the C. P. S. U. as well as within the Communist International".

Comrade FIALA (Austria):

In the name of the Austrian delegation I wish to make the following declaration:

"The Austrian delegation at the VII. Enlarged Executive of the Comintern sees in the appearance of the Opposition bloc at the Plenum an attempt to extend the struggle against the unity of the C. P. S. U. into all the Sections.

The appearance of the Opposition bloc, whether or not this is desired by Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, etc., is a signal for the coalescence of all oppositional tendencies inside of the Sections of the Communist International, and this appearance becomes the starting-point to new factional struggles that will most seriously menace Party activity and that must therefore be most decisively repudiated.

The comrades whose platform was unanimously rejected by the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U. have without any political necessity reopened the discussion, and have carried it into the Comintern and its Sections. These permanent discussions needlessly hinder the Party in the carrying out of its practical tasks, but at the same time they also strengthen among our enemies the speculation on the defeat of the workers.

The members of the Opposition have tried in vain to awaken the impression that the majority advocates the conception of a possible complete victory of Socialism in one country and ignores the support of the world proletariat. The exact contrary proceeds from the report of Comrade Stalin. The purpose of these efforts, is entirely transparent just as is the absolutely unprovable claim that the Comintern is developing towards the Right. By this tactical manoeuvre attention is to be diverted from the real gist of the problem, the possibility of socialist construction in the Soviet Union.

In discouragement the Opposition denies this possibility and tries to make of its pessimism a theory which menaces the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, as well as the international Communist labour movement.

The creation of such a theory is inclined to foster passivity and pessimism among the workers. If after all we cannot build up Socialism, will it not be wiser to invite the capitalists to take over the business? For the European workers the question arises as to why they should fight for the revolution if it cannot be realised even in a country like the Soviet Union. The denial of the possibilities of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, which leads to such ideology, is not only incorrect, as Stalin and Bukharin have already sufficiently demonstrated theoretically, but it is also highly dangerous. Anyone who denies the possibility of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, slides back uncheckable into the camp of the Social Democracy, which, since the first weeks of the existence of the Soviet Union, resorted to the same arguments now used by the Opposition, to try to prove that the revolution in Russia is a transitory adventure on the part of Bolshevik adventurers, and that it is impossible for so backward a country as Soviet Russia to build up Socialism.

Comrade Zinoviev gave us a citation from the "Arbeiter-Zeitung" according to which the S. P. of Austria apparently makes advances to the Russian Party. But he forgot to offer a

vast number of other citations from the same paper in which the Social Democrats point out that they had long foreseen and predicted the impossibility of building Socialism in the Soviet Union. Comrade Zinoviev forgets to cite those passages which state that the representatives of the Opposition bloc at last recognise the correctness of Social Democratic criticism, and that they really only repeat that which the Social Democrats have said in the past.

But the most serious attack against the C. P. S. U. and the unity of the Comintern is the effort of the Opposition bloc with despicable means, to foist its views upon the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern. No Party, and especially no Party like the C. P. S. U. which has realised the proletarian dictatorship in a country of 130 million population and which stands at the head of the revolutionary proletariat of the whole world, can or should under any circumstances tolerate in its ranks either factions or blocs which disturb the work of the Party and menace the existence of the proletarian dictatorship, least of all such an unprincipled bloc as that formed by Zinoviev and Trotsky.

Having considered the extraordinarily extensive material and after listening to the report of Comrade Stalin and the speeches of the Opposition representatives, the Austrian delegation has received new confirmation of the correctness of the views that the C. C. of the C. P. A. already laid down in a resolution in the Comintern. The Austrian delegation considers the decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., and of the XV. Party Conference to be indispensably necessary and correct. The Austrian delegation expresses to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. its full solidarity, and its readiness to support and foster with all forces and means at its disposal the struggle of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. for the unity of the Party, as well as for the building of Socialism in the U. S. S. R.

Comrade DUBOV (Yugo-Slavia):

reads the following declaration:

The Communist Parties of Yugo-Slavia, Roumania and Bulgaria, which are affiliated with the Communist Balkan Federation, express their complete solidarity with the C. P. S. U. and its C. C. in the struggle against the efforts of the new Opposition to force the Party off the correct Leninist road. This applies chiefly to the most fundamental questions of policy, viz. 1. the possibility of building Socialism in the Soviet Union, 2. the socialist character of State industry, 3. the necessity of the New Economic Policy in an actual transition stage, 4. the industrialisation of the Soviet Union, 5. the maintenance of the foreign trade monopoly, 6. the intensification of the struggle against the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet apparatus by the revival of the Soviets through drawing in the great masses of non-Party people into this work, 7. the consolidation of the alliance of the proletariat with the poor and middle peasantry on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat, 8. the preservation of the unified character of the Party by forbidding all factions and by depriving all elements hostile to the dictatorship of the proletariat of every possibility to organise politically.

The constant growth of socialist State industry, the political and economic stabilisation of the Soviet Union, the victorious struggle against the difficulties inherent in this growth, the raising of the activity of the broad masses by Soviet and socialist training, the constant improvement of the cultural and material standard of these masses, the growing faith of the proletariat and peasantry in the C. P. S. U., the undoubted successes of the Soviet Union on the field of foreign diplomacy, etc. — all these fully confirm the correctness of the Leninist line of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. This guarantees that insofar as the Party will continue it, the country will be led to the complete victory of Socialism and the overcoming of all difficulties that may arise. The Communist Parties and the Communist Balkan Federation unreservedly support all decisions of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and especially the energetic measures against the new Opposition, which, contrary to the decisions of the XIV. Congress, has endeavoured to exploit the domestic and foreign difficulties of the Soviet Union in order to organise within the Party the factional struggle against Party unity.

The new Opposition, by opposing the decisions of the XIV. Congress, by its factional dealings and by its various demagogic and utopian proposals, has not only departed from the Leninist line of the Party, has not only under-estimated the

forces of the proletariat, but it has tried to destroy the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry, to call forth a split in the Party and thereby shatter the dictatorship of the proletariat itself.

Secondly, between the present attitude of Zinoviev and Kamenev, and that which they had in the October Revolution, there is a very close relationship. But if in 1917—18 the revolutionary proletariat, which was still weakly organised, and which had no experience in leading the peasant masses, which had not yet consolidated its power and had not yet definitely broken down the counter-revolution within the country, if at that time the proletariat did not waver for a single minute in continuing its revolutionary work, and in contemptuously shaking off all fear and pessimism, then it is not surprising that at present also it does the same only with a thousand times more self-confidence, with a thousand times greater decisiveness.

The Communist Parties of the Balkans most heartily congratulate the members of the C. P. S. U. on the determined resistance they made against the shameless attempts of the new Opposition to compromise Party unity and to break down the struggle against the tremendous difficulties of the present transition period.

By forming a bloc with Comrade Trotsky the new Opposition completely adopted his anti-Leninist platform. By forming a faction in the Party the Opposition bloc made an attempt to found a new Party, which in the main would not be Leninist. Viewed from an international standpoint the Opposition bloc has created a centre around which are rallying all elements hostile towards the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, and which have either already left, or have been expelled from, the Communist Parties. The activity of this bloc against the unity of the C. P. S. U. was at the same time an attempt to undermine the unity of the Comintern and its Sections; its attack against the policy of the C. P. S. U. might have destroyed the confidence of the International proletariat in the proletarian dictatorship, might have slowed down the process of the radicalisation of the Social-Democratic workers, and weakened the solidarity of the international proletariat in its defensive actions for the Soviet Union against the assaults of the international counter-revolution — and all this at a moment when the imperialists are preparing themselves for an attack upon the Soviet Union. The proposal of the Opposition to dissolve the Anglo-Russian Committee, to withdraw from the Kuomintang, to open up a broad discussion at the moment when all attention must be directed towards overcoming the tremendous difficulties of Socialist construction and the dangers which threaten the Soviet Union, likewise contribute to the weakening of the position of the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, and to the strengthening of the tendencies hostile to the Soviet Union and Comintern.

In the Balkan countries the appearance of the Opposition has aroused new hopes for the downfall of the Soviet Union among the bourgeoisie and reformists. Thereby the Opposition has contributed to the intensification of the persecution against the Communist Parties. Under the most severe conditions of White Terror the Communist Parties of the Balkans must parry the blows directed against them by the foes of the revolutionary ideology of the Balkan proletariat.

Although the Opposition has not succeeded in winning even the slightest sympathy among the members of the Communist Parties of the Balkans, their appearance has nevertheless aroused a certain confusion among the workers, which encourages elements hostile to the Comintern, and thereby slows down the process of the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties. The Communist Parties of the Balkans welcomed the dissolution of the Opposition bloc and its defeat, from a political as well as organisational standpoint.

They greet the unshakable unity of the C. P. S. U., which was so forcefully defended at the XV. Conference; they greet the Leninist line which was expressed in all the resolutions of this conference.

But the danger is not yet definitely over. The struggle against the anti-Leninist deviations cannot come to a standstill. No compromise can be made between Leninism and its theoretical deviations. The Opposition is defeated, it is in retreat, but a final end must be made to it.

The Communist Parties and the Communist Balkan Federation assure the C. P. S. U. that they will stand by it in its struggle against the Opposition, and that they will unceasingly defend the unity and Leninist line of the Communist International.

(Close of Session.)