

# SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

## - INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 7. No. 8

# PRESS

26<sup>th</sup> January 1927

# CORRESPONDENCE

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-Sixth Session (Conclusion).

(13th December 1926, Evening).

Full Report.

## Speech of Comrade Stalin

### in Reply to Discussion on the Inner-Party Questions of the C. P. S. U.

#### I. A Few Preliminary Remarks.

We want Facts, Not Inventions and Scandal.

Comrades, before taking up the subject itself permit me to correct several of the statements made by the Opposition which either distort the facts or else represent inventions and scandal.

1. First question — this is the question of the action of the Opposition at the Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. The Opposition declared that it decided to come here because the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party did not make any direct statement to the effect that the appearance of the Opposition here would violate the "Declaration" of the Opposition of October 16 1926, and that if the Central Committee had prohibited them from speaking, the leaders of the Opposition would not have dared to speak. The Opposition declared further that in speaking here, at the Enlarged Plenum, it would take all measures to prevent the struggle from becoming acute, that they would limit themselves to simple "explanations", that they, God forbid, did not even dream of attacking the Party, that they, God forbid, had no intention of bringing any charges against the Party or of appealing against its decisions.

This is not true, comrades. It is completely out of accord with the facts. It is a piece of hypocrisy on the part of the Opposition. Facts, and especially the speech of Comrade Kamenev, have shown that the speeches of the leaders of the Opposition at this Enlarged Plenum were not an "explanation", but an attack against the Party.

What does it mean openly to accuse the Party with revealing Right deviations? It is an attack, a sortie against the Party.

Did not the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. in its resolution point out that if the Opposition came to speak here it would intensify the fight and give an impetus to the factional struggle? Yes, it did. This was a warning to the Opposition uttered by the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. Could the Central Committee do more than this? No, it could not. Why? Because the Central Committee could not prohibit the comrades from speaking. Every member of the Party has the right to appeal against the decisions of the Party to the higher body. The Central Committee could not but take this right of a Party member into consideration. Consequently, the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. did all that was in its power to

prevent the struggle from becoming acute and to prevent a fresh outbreak of acute factional struggle.

The leaders of the Opposition, who are also members of the Central Committee, must have known that their speaking here could not but become an appeal against the decision of their Party, could not but assume the form of a sortie and an attack against the Party.

Hence, the speeches of the Opposition and particularly the speech of Comrade Kamenev, which was not merely his personal speech, but the speech of the whole Opposition bloc, for the speech which he read from manuscript was signed by Comrades Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev — the speech of Comrade Kamenev marks a turning point in the development of the Opposition bloc from the "Declaration" of October 16, 1926, in which the Opposition abandon factional methods of struggle, to a new phase of existence of the Opposition, in which it returns to factional methods of fighting against the Party.

From this it follows: the Opposition violates its own "Declaration" of October 16, 1926 and has resorted again to factional methods of fighting.

And this is how we will enter it in the records, Comrades. It is no use being hypocritical about it. Kamenev was quite right when he said that we must call a cat a cat (a voice: "Quite right!" Bukharin: "And a pig a pig").

2. Comrade Trotsky said in his speech that "Stalin, after the February Revolution advocated mistaken tactics, which Comrade Lenin characterised as a Kautskian deviation".

This is not true, comrades, it is scandal-mongering. Stalin never "advocated" a Kautskian deviation. I have never concealed the fact that I vacillated slightly after my return from exile; I myself, wrote about this in my pamphlet. "On the Road to October". But who of us has not experienced fleeting vacillations? As for the position taken up by Lenin in his theses of April 1917 — and this is precisely what is referred to here — the Party knows perfectly well that at that time I was in the same ranks with Comrade Lenin against Kamenev and his group, which was fighting against Lenin's theses. Those who are acquainted with the minutes of the April Conference of our Party in 1917 cannot but know that I was in the same ranks with Lenin fighting by his side against the opposition of Comrade Kamenev.

The fact of the matter is that Comrade Trotsky has mixed me up with Comrade Kamenev (Laughter and applause).

It is true that at that time Comrade Kamenev stood in opposition to Comrade Lenin against his theses, against the majority of the Party and developed a point of view which bordered on national defence. It is true that Comrade Kamenev at that time wrote in "Pravda", in March for example, an article of a semi-national defence character, for which of course, I cannot be responsible in the least degree.

What has this got to do with Stalin?

It is Comrade Trotsky's misfortune that he confused Stalin with Kamenev.

And where was Comrade Trotsky during the Conference of April 1917, when the Party was fighting Comrade Kamenev's group? In what Party was he to be found at that time — in the Left, Menshevik or Right Menshevik Party; why was he not in the ranks of the Left Zimmerwald, at the time? — let Comrade Trotsky tell us about this at least in the press. Comrade Trotsky should have remembered that he was not in our Party at that time.

3. Comrade Trotsky said in his speech that "in the national question, Comrade Stalin committed rather an important error". What error and under what circumstances? — Comrade Trotsky did not say.

It is not true comrades. It is scandal. I have never had any disagreements with the Party or with Comrade Lenin on the national question. Comrade Trotsky must have in mind a minor incident which occurred prior to the XII. Congress of our Party, when Comrade Lenin reproached me with conducting a too strict organisational policy towards the Georgian semi-nationalists, semi-Communists of the type of Mdivani, who was recently our Trade Representative in France, and that I was

"persecuting" them. However, subsequent facts showed that the so-called "deviationists", men of the type of Comrade Mdivani deserved to be treated with greater severity than even I treated them as one of the secretaries of our Party. Subsequent facts showed that the "deviationists" were a decaying faction of most avowed opportunism. Let Comrade Trotsky prove that this was not the case. Lenin did not know and could not have known about these facts because at that time he was ill in bed and unable to follow events. But what connection can this minor incident have with the position on principle of Stalin? Trotsky, evidently, is slanderously hinting at some kind of alleged "disagreements" between me and the Party. But is it not a fact that the Central Committee as a whole, including Comrade Trotsky, unanimously voted for Stalin's theses on the national question? Is it not a fact that the voting on these theses took place after the incident concerning Comrade Mdivani prior to the XII. Congress of our Party? Is it not a fact that the reporter on the national question at the XII. Congress was none other than Comrade Stalin? Where is the "disagreement" on the national question? And what was Comrade Trotsky's purpose in recalling this insignificant incident?

4. Comrade Kamenev declared in his speech that the XIV. Congress of our Party committed an error by "opening fire on the Lefts", i. e., by opening fire against the Opposition. It would appear therefore that the Party fought against and is continuing to fight against the revolutionary nucleus of the Party. It would appear therefore that our Opposition is a Left and not a Right Opposition.

All this is trifling, comrades. It is a piece of the Opposition's scandal-mongering. The XIV. Congress had no intention to and could not open fire against the revolutionary majority. As a matter of fact it opened fire against the Rights, against our Opposition, which is a Right opposition, although it drapes itself in a "Left" toga. Of course, the Opposition is inclined to regard itself as the "revolutionary Left", but the XIV. Congress of our Party on the contrary, laid it down that the Opposition was merely masquerading in "Left" phrases and that as a matter of fact it was an opportunist Opposition. We know that the Right opposition frequently masquerades in a "Left" toga in order to mislead the working class. The "Workers' Opposition" also regarded itself as being more Left than all the rest, but it proved to be in fact more to the Right than all the rest. The present Opposition also regards itself as being more Left than all the rest, however, practice and the whole of the work of the present Opposition shows that it serves as the centre of attraction, the hearth, of all the Right opportunist tendencies, from the "Workers Opposition" and Trotskyism to the "new Opposition" and all the various Souvarines.

Comrade Kamenev did a "little" shuffling with regard to "Lefts" and "Rights".

5. Comrade Kamenev read a quotation from Lenin to the effect that we have not yet completed the Socialist foundation of our economics, and declared that the Party is committing a mistake in asserting that we have already completed the Socialist foundation of our economics.

This is trifling, comrades. It is Comrade Kamenev's petty scandal. The Party has never declared that it has already completed the Socialist foundation of our economics. The present argument does not in the least concern the question as to whether we have or have not yet completed the Socialist foundation of our economics. This is not what the argument is about at the present time. What we are arguing about now is merely whether we can, by our own efforts, complete the Socialist foundation of our economics, or whether we cannot. The Party asserts that we possess all the possibilities of completing the Socialist foundation of our economics. The Opposition denies this, and by that slips onto the path of defeatism and capitulation. This is what the argument is about at the present time. Comrade Kamenev, realising that his position is shaky, tries to wriggle out of the question, but he will not be able to do so.

Comrade Kamenev did another "little" shuffle.

6. Comrade Trotsky declared in his speech that he "anticipated" Lenin's policy in March-April, 1917. It would appear therefore that Comrade Trotsky "anticipated" the April theses

of Comrade Lenin. It would appear therefore that Comrade Trotsky already in February-March, 1917, independently adopted the policy which Lenin advocated in April-May 1917 in his April theses.

Permit me comrades to declare that this is stupid and unseemly boasting. The picture of Trotsky "anticipating" Lenin is enough to make one laugh. The peasants are quite right when in such cases they usually say: "It is comparing a fly to a belfry" (Laughter). Trotsky "anticipated" Lenin!... Let Comrade Trotsky try and stick his head out and prove it in the press. Why does he not try to do it at least once? Trotsky "anticipated" Lenin!... Then how do you explain the fact that right from the first moment of his appearance in the arena of Russia in April 1917, Lenin considered it necessary to dissociate himself from the position of Trotsky? How is it to be explained that the one who is "anticipated" must dissociate himself from the one who "anticipates" him? Is it not a fact that in April 1917, Comrade Lenin on several occasions declared that he had nothing in common with Trotsky's principal formula: "Without a tsar but a workers' government"? Is it not a fact that Comrade Lenin, at that time on several occasions declared that he had nothing in common with Trotsky who was trying to skip over the peasant movement, to skip over the agrarian revolution?

Where is there "anticipation" in this?

Deduction: We need facts and not inventions and scandal. The Opposition, however, prefers to operate with inventions and scandal.

#### WHY THE ENEMIES OF THE PROLETARIAT PRAISE THE OPPOSITION.

I said in my report that the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Russian emigre Mensheviks and Cadets, praised the Opposition. I said that they praised the Opposition for its work, which is leading to the disruption of the unity of the Party and consequently to the disruption of the dictatorship of the proletariat. I read a number of quotations which proved that the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat praised the Opposition for its work, which releases the anti-proletarian forces in the country, because it strives to degrade our Party, degrade the proletarian dictatorship and in that way to help the cause of the enemies of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In reply to this, Comrade Kamenev (and also Comrade Zinoviev) referred at first to the capitalist press in the West, which it appears praises our Party and also Stalin and then referred to Ustryalov, the Smenovekhovist\*), the representative of the bourgeois experts in our country who associates himself with the position of our Party.

With regard to the capitalists, there is considerable disagreement among them concerning our Party. For example, recently the American press praised Stalin because, it alleges, he would provide opportunities for the American capitalists to obtain important and large concessions. Now, however, heaps of abuse are showered on Stalin because it turns out that he has "deceived" them. Recently, a cartoon appeared in a bourgeois newspaper representing Stalin, extinguishing the flames of revolution with a bucket of water. Later however, another cartoon appeared, reluting the former; in the new cartoon Stalin is also represented as holding a bucket, but this time filled with kerosene and it appears that Stalin is not extinguishing the flames of revolution, but is spreading the flames of revolution. (Applause).

As you see, considerable disagreement prevails among the capitalists concerning the position of our Party as well as the position of Stalin.

We will now take up the question of Ustryalov. Who is Ustryalov? Ustryalov is a representative of the bourgeois experts and of the new bourgeois generally. He is a class enemy of the proletariat. This is indisputable. But enemies vary. There are class enemies who cannot reconcile themselves with

the Soviet Rule and strive to secure its overthrow at all costs. There are class enemies, however, who in one way or another reconcile themselves with the Soviet rule. There are enemies who are striving to create the conditions for the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat. These are the Mensheviks, the Socialist Revolutionaries, the Cadets, etc. But there are enemies who co-operate with the Soviet rule and fight against those who stand for the overthrow of the Soviet rule in the hope that the dictatorship will gradually weaken and degenerate and then go out to meet the interests of the new bourgeoisie. Ustryalov belongs to the latter category of enemies.

Why did Kamenev refer to Ustryalov? Perhaps to show that our Party has degenerated and that is why Ustryalov is praising Stalin, or our Party generally? Apparently this is not the case, because Comrade Kamenev did not dare to say this openly. Why then did Kamenev refer to Ustryalov? In order to hint at "degeneration".

But Comrade Kamenev forgot to say that this Ustryalov has praised Lenin still more. The articles in which Ustryalov praises Lenin are known to the whole of our Party. What is in the wind then? Perhaps Comrade Lenin "degenerated" or began to "degenerate" when he introduced N. E. P. It is sufficient to put the question in order to reveal how absurd is the supposition concerning "degeneration".

But why does Ustryalov praise Lenin and our Party, and why do the Mensheviks and Cadets praise our Opposition — this is a question which must be replied to first of all and which Comrade Kamenev tries to avoid at all costs.

The Mensheviks and Cadets praised the Opposition because it disrupts the unity of the Party, weakens the dictatorship of the proletariat and by that helps the Mensheviks and the Cadets in their efforts to overthrow the Soviet Rule. This is proved by quotations. Ustryalov, however, praises our Party because the Soviet rule permitted N. E. P., permitted private capital, permitted the bourgeois experts, the aid and experience of whom the proletariat stands in need.

The Mensheviks and Cadets praise the Opposition because, by its factional work it aids them, involuntarily aids them in the work of creating the conditions for the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Ustryalovists, knowing that the dictatorship cannot be overthrown, reject the point of view of overthrowing the Soviet rule and strive to occupy a corner close to the dictatorship, strive to attach themselves to it, they praise the Party for having introduced N. E. P., for having, under certain conditions, permitted the existence of the new bourgeoisie, which strives to utilise the Soviet rule for its own class interests, but which the Soviet rule utilises for the purposes of the proletarian dictatorship.

Herein lies the difference between the various class enemies of the proletariat of our country.

Herein lies the root of the fact that the Mensheviks and Cadets praise the Opposition and the Ustryalovs praise our Party.

I would like to draw your attention to Comrade Lenin's point of view on this question:

"In our Soviet Republic", says Lenin, "the Social system is based on the co-operation of the classes: the workers and the peasants and now, under certain conditions, N. E. P. men", i. e., the bourgeoisie is permitted to co-operate." (Lenin. Vol. XVIII, Part II, p. 124.)

It is because the new bourgeoisie has been permitted conditionally to co-operate, to a certain extent, under certain conditions and under the control of the Soviet authorities that the Ustryalovs praise our Party in the hope that they can attach themselves to and utilise the Soviet rule for the aims of the bourgeoisie. Our Party, however, calculates quite differently: it calculates on utilising the representatives of the new bourgeoisie, their experience and their knowledge in order to Sovietise and assimilate a section of them and to throw overboard that section which proves incapable of being Sovietised.

Is it not a fact that Lenin drew a distinction between the new bourgeoisie and the Mensheviks and Cadets, that he permitted the existence and utilisation of the former and suggested that the latter all be arrested?

\*) "Smenovekhovsky": a section of the Russian bourgeoisie which supports the Soviet government.

This is what Comrade Lenin wrote in his: "Agricultural Tax":

"The Communists must not fear to 'learn' from the bourgeois experts, including the traders, the capitalist-co-operators and the capitalists. They must learn from them differently in form, but in content to learn from them in the same way as they learned from the military experts. The results of this 'learning' will be tested only by practical experience: Do things better than the bourgeois experts by your side!

Manage, by this way and that, to raise agriculture, to raise industry, to develop the turnover of agriculture and industry. Don't grudge paying for your 'lessons'. Do not grudge paying dearly for your lessons if only good results will be obtained." (Lenin, Vol. XVIII, part I, pp. 234—35.)

This is what Lenin said about the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois experts whom Ustryalov represents.

And this is what Lenin said concerning the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries:

"And the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries dressed in the fashionable Kronstadt non-Party clothes, should be carefully kept in prison or sent to Berlin to Martov, so that they may fully enjoy all the charms of pure democracy, or freely exchange ideas with Chernov, Miliukov and the Georgian Mensheviks." (Ibid.)  
This is what Lenin said.

Perhaps the Opposition does not agree with Lenin. Let them say so openly.

This is what explains the fact that we arrest the Mensheviks and Cadets, whereas we permit, under certain conditions and certain restrictions, the existence of the new bourgeoisie, in order that, while combating it with economic measures and overcoming it step by step, at the same time to utilise its experience and knowledge in our work of economic construction.

It follows therefore, that certain class enemies, like Ustryalov praise our Party because we introduced N.E.P. and permitted the bourgeoisie to co-operate with the existing system, under certain conditions and restrictions, in which our aim is to utilise the knowledge and experience of this bourgeoisie for our work of construction, which purpose, as is known, is being achieved not without success. But the Opposition is praised by class enemies like the Mensheviks and Cadets because its work leads to the disruption of the unity of the Party, to the disruption of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to facilitating the work of the Mensheviks and the Cadets of overthrowing the dictatorship.

I hope that the Opposition will understand at last the profound difference that exists between praises of the former kind and praises of the latter kind.

### MISTAKES AND MISTAKES.

The Opposition spoke here about certain mistakes made by some of the members of the Central Committee. Of course, some mistakes were made. There is no one among us who is "infallible". Infallible people do not exist. But there are mistakes and mistakes. There are mistakes upon which those who commit them do not insist and from which platforms, tendencies, and factions do not arise. Such mistakes are quickly forgotten. There are, however, mistakes of another kind, upon which those who commit them insist and from which factions, platforms and internal Party struggles arise. Such mistakes cannot be forgotten quickly.

A distinction must be drawn between these two categories of mistakes.

For example, Comrade Trotsky says that at one time I made a mistake in connection with the monopoly of foreign trade. That is true. Indeed at the time when our purchasing organisations were in a state of disorganisation, I did propose that one of our ports be opened temporarily for the importation of grain; but I did not insist on this mistake, and after discussions with Lenin, I hastened to correct it. I could enumerate tens, and hundreds of mistakes committed by Comrade Trotsky and afterwards corrected by the Central Committee, upon which Trotsky did not insist. If I were to enumerate all the very

serious, less serious, and minor mistakes which Comrade Trotsky has committed in his work on the Central Committee, upon which he did not insist and which were forgotten, I would have to read several reports. But I think that in a political fight, in a political controversy we should not talk about such mistakes, but about mistakes which later developed into platforms and give rise to internal Party conflicts.

But Comrade Trotsky and Kamenev touched upon such mistakes which did not grow up into tendencies and which were soon forgotten. Since the Opposition has touched upon such questions, permit me also to recall certain mistakes of this kind, committed by the leaders of the Opposition at one time or another. Perhaps this will teach them a lesson and next time they will not attempt to clutch at already forgotten mistakes.

At one time, Comrade Trotsky asserted in the Central Committee of our Party that the Soviet rule was hanging by a hair, that "the game was up", that the Soviet Government had only a few months if not only a few weeks to live. This was, I think, in 1921. This was a most dangerous error and revealed the dangerous moods of Comrade Trotsky. But the Central Committee ridiculed this prophecy, Comrade Trotsky did not insist upon his mistake and it was forgotten.

At one time, in 1922, Comrade Trotsky proposed that we should permit our industrial enterprises and trusts to mortgage State property, including basic capital, with the private capitalists as security for credits (Comrade Yaroslavsky: "This is the road to capitulation"). Perhaps this is so. At all events it would have been a prelude to the denationalisation of our enterprises. But the Central Committee rejected the plan. Comrade Trotsky fought a little while, then gave it up, did not insist upon his mistake and it is now forgotten.

At one time, — 1921, I think, Comrade Trotsky proposed a strict concentration of our industry, such an absurd concentration as would inevitably have put out of the factories and workshops nearly one-third of the working class (Bukharin: "This was in 1923"). Yes, I think it was in 1923. The Central Committee rejected Comrade Trotsky's proposal as scholastic, nonsensical and political dangerous. Comrade Trotsky several times reminded the Central Committee that in the long run it would have to do as he suggested. However, we did not accept his suggestion (A voice: "We would have to close the Putilov works"). Yes, matters stood like that. But subsequently, Comrade Trotsky ceased to insist upon his mistake and it was forgotten.

Etc., etc.

Now we will take Comrade Trotsky's friends, Comrade Zinoviev and Kamenev, who delight in recalling frequently that Bukharin once said "enrich yourselves! "Oh! how they gloated over this phrase "enrich yourselves!"

In 1922, we were discussing the question of the Urquart concession and the severe terms of that concession. Well, is it not a fact that Kamenev and Zinoviev proposed that we should accept the severe terms of Urquart and that they insisted upon their proposal? However, the Central Committee rejected the Urquart concession, Zinoviev and Kamenev ceased to insist upon their mistake and it was forgotten.

Or take for example one more mistake committed by Comrade Kamenev, of which I did not wish to speak, but of which Comrade Kamenev compels me to speak, because he has simply wearied us to death by continually recalling the mistakes made by Comrade Bukharin, which Comrade Bukharin has long ago corrected and liquidated. I refer to an incident that occurred to Comrade Kamenev when he was in exile in Siberia, after the February revolution. At that time Comrade Kamenev jointly with certain known merchants in Siberia (in Achinsk) took part in sending a telegram of greetings to the Constitutionalist, Grand Duke Michael Romanoff (Cries: "Shame!"), the very Grand Duke Michael Romanoff, whom the tsar, in abdication, appointed as his successor. Of course, it was a stupid mistake and Comrade Kamenev was severely trounced for it by the Party at the Conference in April 1917. But Comrade Kamenev admitted his mistake and it was forgotten.

Should such mistakes be recalled. Of course not, for they have been forgotten and long ago liquidated. Why then do Comrades Trotsky and Kamenev continually stick such mistakes in

front of the noses of their opponents? Is it not clear that by this they merely compel us to recall the numerous mistakes of the leaders of the Opposition? And we are compelled to do this if only for the purpose of teaching the Opposition to leave off picking quarrels and spreading scandal.

But there are mistakes of another kind, upon which those who commit them do insist and from which factional platforms afterwards arise. These are mistakes of an altogether different kind. It is the duty of the Party to expose these mistakes and overcome them; for the overcoming of these mistakes is the only means of affirming the principles of Marxism in the Party, of preserving the unity of the Party, of liquidating factionalism and of providing guarantees against a repetition of such errors.

Take for example the mistake Comrade Trotsky made at the time of the Brest Peace, which mistake was converted into a complete platform against the Party. Must we fight against such mistakes openly and resolutely? Yes, we must.

Or take another mistake committed by Comrade Trotsky during the trade union discussion, a mistake which gave rise to a discussion in our Party all over the country.

Or take for example, the October mistake committed by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, which created a crisis in the Party on the eve of the insurrection.

Or for example the present mistakes of the Opposition bloc which have merged into a factional platform and into a fight against the Party.

Etc., etc.

Should we fight against such mistakes openly and determinedly? Yes, we should.

Can we ignore such mistakes when they concern disagreements in the Party? Clearly we cannot.

#### THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT ACCORDING TO ZINOVIEV.

Comrade Zinoviev, in his speech, talked about the dictatorship of the proletariat and asserted that Stalin incorrectly explained the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a certain article entitled: "Questions of Leninism."

This is trifling, comrades. Comrade Zinoviev is trying to ascribe his mistakes to other people. As a matter of fact, the argument is the other way about, and it is Comrade Zinoviev who distorts the conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrade Zinoviev has two versions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, one of which certainly cannot be described as Marxism, and both of which fundamentally contradict each other.

The first version. Starting out from the correct premise that the Party is the principal guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Comrade Zinoviev comes to the totally incorrect conclusion that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the Party. By that Comrade Zinoviev identifies dictatorship of the Party with dictatorship of the proletariat.

But what does the identification of the dictatorship of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat imply?

It implies first of all, that class and Party are placed in the same category, that the part is equal to the whole, which is absurd and beyond reason. Lenin never identified and could not identify Party with class. A number of mass non-Party organisations of the proletariat stand between the Party and the class, and behind these organisations stands the whole mass of the proletariat. To ignore the role and specific gravity of these mass non-Party organisations and moreover, to ignore the whole mass of the working class and to think that the Party can take the place of these mass non-Party organisations of the proletariat and the whole mass of the proletariat generally, means to detach the Party from the masses, to increase the bureaucracy of the Party to the highest degree, to convert the Party into an infallible power and to introduce "Nechaevism" and "Arakcheyevism" into the Party.

It is superfluous to say that Lenin had nothing at all to do with such a "theory" of dictatorship of the proletariat.

Secondly, it implies that the term dictatorship of the Party is not understood in the figurative sense, not in the sense that the Party leads the working class, as indeed Lenin understood it, but to understand it in the literal sense of the word "dictatorship", i. e., in the sense that the Party's guidance of the working class is substituted by the violence of the Party over the working class. What is dictatorship in the strict sense of the word? Dictatorship in the strict sense of the word is power based on violence, for there is no dictatorship without the element of violence; that is, if the dictatorship is taken in the strict sense of the word. Can the Party represent a rule based on violence in relation to its own class, in relation to the majority of the working class? Clearly it cannot. The Party is the teacher, the guide, the leader of its class; but it is not a rule based on violence in relation to the majority of the working class. Otherwise, it would be useless to speak of methods of persuasion as the principal method of work of the proletarian Party in the ranks of the working class. Otherwise, it would be useless to say that the Party must convince the broad masses of the proletariat of the correctness of its policy, and that only in the process of fulfilling this task can the Party regard itself as a real mass Party capable of leading the proletariat. Otherwise, the Party would have to abandon the methods of persuasion in favour of methods of decrees and threats in relation to the proletariat, which would be absurd and which is incompatible with the Marxist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This is the nonsense to which Comrade Zinoviev's "theory" of identifying the dictatorship (leadership) of the Party with the dictatorship of the proletariat leads.

It is superfluous to say that Lenin had nothing to do with such a "theory".

It was against this nonsense that I objected in my article "Questions of Leninism" in which I wrote against Comrade Zinoviev.

Perhaps it would not be superfluous to state that this article was written and sent to press with the complete agreement and approval of the leading comrades in our Party.

This is how matters stand with regard to Comrade Zinoviev's first version of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

And now for the second version. While the first version is a distortion of Leninism in one direction, the second version represents a distortion in the very opposite direction. This second version is that Comrade Zinoviev defines dictatorship of the proletariat as the leadership, not by one class, not the proletariat, but as leadership by two classes, the workers and the peasants.

This is what Comrade Zinoviev says on this score:

"At the present time leadership, the helm, the direction of political life is in the hands of two classes — the working class and the peasantry." (G. Zinoviev, "The Workers' and Peasants' Alliance and the Red Army", Priboy Publishing Company, Leningrad, 1925, p. 4.)

Can it be denied that the dictatorship of the proletariat now exists in Russia? No, it cannot. What is the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country? According to Zinoviev it turns out to be that the political life of our country is directed by two classes. Is this compatible with the Marxist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat? Clearly not.

Lenin said that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of one class, — the proletariat. With the existence of an alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, this single rule of the proletariat expresses itself in that the guiding force in this alliance is the proletariat, its Party, which does not and cannot share the guidance of political life with any other force or any other Party. All this is so elementary and indisputable that it hardly requires explanation. But according to Comrade Zinoviev, it appears that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the guidance of two classes. Why then, should not this dictatorship be called, not the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry? Is it not clear that according to the Zinoviev conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat we should have the leadership of two parties, commensurate with the two classes "standing at the helm of political life"? What is there in common between Comrade

Zinoviev's "theory" and the Marxian conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat?

It is superfluous to say that Lenin has no relation whatever to this "theory".

Deduction: Comrade Zinoviev clearly distorts the Leninist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat, irrespective of whether we deal with the first version of the Zinoviev "theory" or with the second version.

### THE ORACULAR PRONOUNCEMENTS OF COMRADE TROTSKY.

I would like to deal further with several ambiguous statements made by Comrade Trotsky, the object of which in fact is to mislead the Party. I would like to bring forward just a few facts.

One fact. In reply to the question as to his attitude towards his Menshevik past, Comrade Trotsky said, not without some posing:

"The very fact that I joined the Bolshevik Party in itself shows that I left on the threshold of the Party all that which up to that time separated me from Bolshevism."

What does "left on the threshold of the Party all that which separated" Comrade Trotsky "from Bolshevism" mean? Comrade Remmele was quite right when he exclaimed: "Fancy leaving such things on the threshold of the Party!" Indeed, fancy leaving such rubbish on the threshold of the Party! (laughter). Comrade Trotsky has failed to reply to this question to this day.

Moreover, what does leaving Comrade Trotsky's Menshevik relics on the threshold of the Party mean? Did he leave these things on the threshold of the Party in order to keep them in reserve for future fights against the Party, or did he simply take them and burn them? It seems rather that Comrade Trotsky left these things on the threshold of the Party in order to keep them in reserve, for otherwise, how can we explain Comrade Trotsky's constant disagreement with the Party which commenced only a little while after he joined the Party and have not ceased to this day? Judge for yourselves. In 1918, Comrade Trotsky disagreed with the Party on the question of the Brest Peace, and so the fight within the Party. In 1920-21, Comrade Trotsky disagreed with the Party on the trade union movement, and so the discussion in the Party over the whole country. In 1923, Comrade Trotsky disagreed with the Party on the fundamental questions of Party organisation and economic policy, and so the discussion in the Party. In 1924, Comrade Trotsky disagreed with the Party on the question of the estimation of the October Revolution and of the leadership of the Party; again a discussion in the Party. In 1925-26, Comrade Trotsky and his Opposition bloc disagreed with the Party on fundamental questions of our revolution and current politics.

Are these not too many disagreements for a man who "left on the threshold of the Party all that which separated him from Bolshevism?"

Can we say that these constant disagreements between Trotsky and the Party are "accidental occurrences" and not a regular phenomenon?

It is hardly possible to say that.

What purpose can this more than ambiguous statement of Comrade Trotsky pursue in the present case?

I think only one purpose: to throw dust in the eyes of his auditors and to mislead them.

The second fact. It is known that the question of Comrade Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution is not of little importance from the point of view of the ideology of our Party, from the points of view of the perspectives of our revolution. It is known that this theory claimed and still claims to compete with the theory of Leninism on the question of the driving forces of our revolution. It is quite understandable therefore, that Comrade Trotsky should more than once have been asked what his attitude is now, in 1926, towards his theory of permanent revolution. What reply did Comrade Trotsky make to this question at this Plenum of the Comintern? A reply more than ambiguous. He said that the theory of permanent revolution has several "gaps", that certain aspects of this theory

have not been justified by our revolutionary practice. It follows therefore that if certain aspects of this theory represent "gaps", then there are other aspects of it which are not "gaps" and which should remain in force. But how can certain aspects of the theory of permanent revolution be separated from other aspects of it. Is not the theory of permanent revolution a complete system of views? Can we regard the theory of permanent revolution like a box, two corners of which, we will say, have rotted and the other two corners remained whole? And then is it possible to confine oneself here to bare and unbinding statements about "gaps" in general without indicating which gaps Comrade Trotsky has in view and precisely which aspects of the theory of permanent revolution he considers to be incorrect. Comrade Trotsky talks about certain gaps in the "theory of permanent revolution", but precisely which gaps he has in view and precisely which aspects he considers to be incorrect, he has not indicated by a single word. Therefore, Comrade Trotsky's statement on this question should be regarded as an evasion of the question, as an attempt to evade the question by ambiguous phrases about "gaps" which do not bind him down to anything.

Comrade Trotsky acted in this instance in the same way as in ancient times the shrewd oracles acted when they replied to their questioners by ambiguous statements like "in crossing the river large forces of troops will be routed", but which river and whose troops will be routed, let those understand who can (laughter).

### COMRADE ZINOVIEV IN THE ROLE OF A SCHOOLBOY QUOTING MARX, ENGELS, AND LENIN.

I would like to say a few words further concerning Comrade Zinoviev's special manner in quoting the Marxian classics. The characteristic feature of this Zinoviev manner is that it mixes up all periods and dates, heaps them all into one heap and detaches the various postulates and formulae of Marx and Engels from their vital contact with reality, converts them into worn out dogmas and thus violates the fundamental postulate of Marx and Engels to the effect that "Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action".

Here are a few facts.

1. First fact. In his speech, Comrade Zinoviev quoted a well-known passage from Marx' "Class War in France" — 1848-1850 which says: "the task of the working class (reference is made here to the victory of Socialism J. S.) cannot be fulfilled within national boundaries".

Comrade Zinoviev further quoted the following passage from Marx' letter to Engels (1858):

"The following is a difficult question that confronts us: on the Continent revolution is inevitable and will immediately assume a Socialist character. Will it not be inevitably crushed in this small corner owing to the fact that on an immeasurably larger territory the progress of bourgeois society is still proceeding in a rising curve". (The Letters of Marx and Engels, pp. 74-75 — Italics mine, J. S.)

Comrade Zinoviev quotes these passages from Marx written in the '40s and '50s of the last century and comes to the conclusion that the question of the victory of Socialism in single countries is solved in the negative for all times and periods of capitalism.

Can it be said that Comrade Zinoviev understood Marx' point of view and his fundamental line on the question of the victory of Socialism in separate countries? No, it cannot. On the contrary, it will be seen from the passages quoted that Comrade Zinoviev has utterly failed to understand Marx, and that he has distorted Marx' fundamental point of view.

Does it follow from the passages quoted from Marx that the victory of Socialism in separate countries was impossible under any conditions of development of capitalism? No, that does not follow. From the words of Marx it follows that the victory of Socialism in separate countries is impossible only if "the progress of bourgeois society is still proceeding in a rising curve". Well, and suppose the progress of bourgeois society as a whole, owing to the progress of things, changes its direction and begins to proceed along a declining curve?

From the words of Marx it follows that under such conditions the fundamental condition for denying the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate countries disappears.

Comrade Zinoviev forgets that the passages quoted from Marx apply to the period of pre-monopolist capitalism, when capitalism as a whole was developing along a rising curve and when the growth of capitalism as a whole was not accompanied by the decay of such a capitalistically developed country like England, when the law of the uneven development did not and could not yet represent such a mighty factor in the process of the disintegration of capitalism as it became subsequently, in the period of monopolistic capitalism, in the period of imperialism. For the period of pre-monopolist capitalism Marx' statement to the effect that the fulfilment of the fundamental task of the working class in separate countries is impossible, — is absolutely correct. In my report to the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. I said that for the past, for the period of pre-monopolistic capitalism, the question of the victory of Socialism in separate countries was replied to in the negative — and that was absolutely correct. But now, in the present period of capitalism, when pre-monopolist capitalism has grown to imperialist capitalism — can we say now that capitalism as a whole is developing along a rising curve? No, we cannot say so. The analysis of the economic content of imperialism made by Lenin shows that in the period of imperialism, bourgeois society as a whole proceeds along a declining curve. Lenin was absolutely right when he said that monopolist capitalism, imperialist capitalism was moribund capitalism. This is what Lenin said on this score:

"It is understandable why imperialism is moribund capitalism, transitional to Socialism: monopoly, which grows out from capitalism, is already moribund capitalism, the beginning of its transition to Socialism. The gigantic socialisation of labour by imperialism (that which the apologist bourgeois economists call 'interweaving') means the same thing. (Lenin. Vol. XIII, p. 470).

Pre-monopolist capitalism as a whole developing along a rising curve, is one thing; imperialist capitalism, when the world has already been divided up among the capitalist groups, when capitalism, developing in leaps and jerks requires fresh redistributions of the already divided up world by means of military conflicts, when the conflicts and wars among imperialist groups arising on this basis weaken the world front of capitalism make it vulnerable and create the possibility of breaking this front in separate countries — is another thing. Under pre-monopolist capitalism the victory of Socialism in separate countries was impossible. In the period of the imperialism, in the period of moribund capitalism, the victory of Socialism in separate countries becomes possible.

This is how the matter stands, comrades, and this is what Comrade Zinoviev refuses to understand.

You see that Comrade Zinoviev quotes from Marx like a schoolboy; he ignores Marx's point of view, clutches at separate quotations from Marx and employs them, not as a Marxist but as a Social Democrat.

What is this revisionist manner of quoting Marx? The revisionist manner of quoting Marx is the substitute of Marx's point of view by Marxian quotations, by various passages from Marx, separated from the concrete conditions of a definite epoch.

What is the Zinoviev manner of quoting Marx? The Zinoviev manner of quoting Marx is the substitution of Marx's point of view by the letter, by quotations from Marx, detached from living contact with the conditions of development of the 50's of the 19th century and converted into a dogma.

I think comment here is superfluous.

2. Second fact. Comrade Zinoviev quoted from Engels' "Principles of Communism" (1847) to the effect that the workers' revolution "cannot take place in a single country" and compared these words of Engels with my statement at the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. to the effect that we, in the U. S. S. R. have already carried out nine-tenths of the twelve demands which Engels put forward, and from this draws the conclusion: first that the victory of Socialism in separate countries is impossible, secondly, that in my statement I paint the present conditions in the U. S. S. R. in too bright colours.

With regard to the quotation from Engels it must be said that Comrade Zinoviev commits the same mistake in interpreting this quotation as he did with regard to the quotation from Marx. Of course, in the period of pre-monopolist capi-

talism, in the period when bourgeois society as a whole was developing along a rising curve, Engels had to reply to the question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate countries in the negative. To apply automatically Engels' postulate, which was formulated in connection with the old period of imperialism is to distort the point of view of Marx and Engels for the benefit of the letter, for the benefit of quotations, isolated from real conditions of development, in the period of pre-monopolist capitalism. I stated in my report at the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. that at one time this formula of Engels was the only correct formula. But it ought to be understood that the 40's of the last century, when we could not yet speak of moribund capitalism, cannot be compared with the present period of the development of capitalism, with the period of imperialism, when capitalism as a whole is moribund capitalism. Is it difficult to understand that what was regarded as impossible at that time is possible and necessary now under the new conditions of capitalism?

You see that Comrade Zinoviev remained true to his revisionist manner of quoting the classics of Marxism, in quoting from Engels, as he was in quoting from Marx.

With regard to Comrade Zinoviev's second conclusion he deliberately distorted Engels in connection with the twelve demands or measures of the workers' revolution. Comrade Zinoviev makes it appear that in the twelve demands Engels presents an extensive programme of Socialism, including the abolition of classes, including the abolition of commodity production and consequently, the abolition of the State. This is absolutely untrue. It is a complete distortion of Engels. In the twelve demands of Engels not a word is said concerning the abolition of classes, the abolition of commodity production, the abolition of the State, or the abolition of all forms of private property. On the contrary the twelve demands of Engels are based on the continued existence of "democracy" (at that time by "democracy" Engels implied dictatorship of the proletariat) the continued existence of classes and of commodity production. Engels said directly that his twelve demands have in view the direct "encroachment upon private property" (but not its complete abolition) and "guaranteed existence of the proletariat" (and not the abolition of the proletariat as a class). These are the words of Engels:

"The revolution of the proletariat, which in all probability will take place, will be able only gradually to transform existing society, and will be able to abolish private capital **only after** the necessary mass means of production have been created for it... First of all it will establish a democratic system and by that the direct or indirect political domination of the proletariat... Democracy will be absolutely useless for the proletariat if it will not utilise it immediately as a means for carrying through extensive measures **directly encroaching upon private property and guaranteeing the existence of the proletariat.** The principal measures which necessarily follow from the existing conditions are the following" — and then follows the enumeration of the twelve demands or measures already mentioned. (Engels, "Principles of Communism" (italics mine, J. S.).

You see, therefore, that Engels does not speak of an extensive programme of Socialism, which would include the abolition of classes, of the State and of commodity production, etc., but of the first steps of the Socialist revolution, of the first measures necessary to make a direct encroachment upon private capital, guarantee the existence of the working class and strengthen the political domination of the proletariat.

Only one deduction can be made. Comrade Zinoviev distorted Engels when he characterised the twelve demands as an extensive programme of Socialism.

What did I say in my concluding remarks at the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U.? I said that nine-tenths of the demands or measures put forward by Engels as the first steps of the Socialist revolution has been carried out by us here in the U. S. S. R.

Does this mean that Socialism exists in the U. S. S. R.?

Clearly it does not.

Consequently, Comrade Zinoviev, true to his manner of quoting, "slightly" shuffled the statement I made at the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U.

This is what Comrade Zinoviev's specific manner of quoting Marx and Engels leads to.

Speaking of this manner of quoting calls to my mind a rather funny story that was popular among revolutionary syndicalists at one time. This story was related by a certain Swedish revolutionary syndicalist in Stockholm in 1906, at the time of the Stockholm Congress of our Party. This Swedish comrade rather humorously described the Social Democrats' manner of quoting Marx and Engels and we, delegates, listening to the story, simply had to hold our sides with laughter. This is the story. The scene is laid in the Crimea at the time of the mutiny in the navy and among the infantry. Representatives of the seamen and the soldiers came to the Social Democrats and said: "During the last few years you have been calling upon us to revolt against tsarism. We have become convinced that your appeal was right and we seamen and soldiers have agreed to raise a revolt and we have come to you for advice". The Social Democrats were thrown into consternation and replied that they could not decide the question of rebellion without a special conference. The seamen gave them to understand that there could be no delay, that the whole thing was arranged and if they did not obtain a direct reply from the Social Democrats, and if they, the Social Democrats, did not undertake the leadership of the rebellion, all would be lost. The seamen and soldiers departed in the expectation that the Social Democrats would send them instructions. Meanwhile the Social Democrats convened a conference to discuss the situation and decided to refer to Marx' "Capital" for guidance. They opened the first volume of "Capital" and could find no guidance there. They opened the third volume with the same result. They sought for references to the Crimea, to Sevastopol and to Crimean rebellions, but not a single reference to any of these things could they find in any of the volumes of "Capital". (Laughter). They looked up other works of Marx and Engels, but without result (Laughter). What was to be done? The seamen had come back for their reply and something had to be told them. . . . Well and what happened? The Social Democrats had to confess that under the circumstances they were unable to give any directions to the seamen and soldiers. "And that is why the mutiny in the navy and the army did not come off", concluded our Swedish comrade (laughter).

No doubt the story somewhat exaggerates things, but there is no doubt also that it touches the spot with regard to the Zinoviev disease of misquoting Marx and Engels.

3. **Third fact.** I refer to quotations from the work of Comrade Lenin. What does Comrade Zinoviev not do in order to shuffle a whole heap of quotations from Lenin and "overwhelm" his auditors. Zinoviev apparently believes that the more quotations he makes the better and in doing so he pays not the slightest attention to what the passages he quotes refer. If we examine the passages Zinoviev quotes carefully we will easily understand that he has not quoted a single passage from Lenin which would serve even as a hint in favour of the defeatist position of the Opposition bloc. It should be stated that Zinoviev for some reason failed to quote one of the principal passages from Lenin to the effect that the solution of the "economic problems" of the dictatorship, the victory of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. in solving these problems, may be regarded as secure.

Comrade Zinoviev quoted a passage from Lenin's pamphlet "On Co-operation" to the effect that in the U. S. S. R. we have all that is necessary and sufficient for the construction of complete Socialist society, but he did not make the slightest attempt to show what was the logical conclusion to be drawn from this quotation and whether it speaks in favour of the Opposition bloc or in favour of the C. P. S. U.

Comrade Zinoviev tried to show that the victory of Socialist construction in our country is impossible, but in order to prove this he quoted passages from Lenin which turns Zinoviev's theses upside down.

Here for example is one of these quotations:

"I have more than once had the occasion to say: compared with the advanced countries it was easier for the Russians to commence the great proletarian revolution. But it will be more difficult for them to continue it to final victory, in the sense of the complete organisation of socialist complety" (Lenin, Vol. XVI, pp. 184-185).

It never occurred to Comrade Zinoviev that this passage does not speak in favour of the Opposition bloc, but in favour of the Party; for it does not speak of the impossibility of constructing Socialism in the U. S. S. R. but of the difficulties of this construction. And the possibility of constructing Socialism in the U. S. S. R. is taken for granted in this passage. The Party has always said that it will be easier to commence revolution in the U. S. S. R. than in Western European capitalist countries, but it will be more difficult to construct Socialism. Does this imply that the admission of this fact is tantamount to a denial of the possibility of constructing Socialism in the U. S. S. R.? Of course it does not. On the contrary, the only logical conclusion that follows from this fact is that the construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. is fully possible and necessary in spite of the difficulties.

The question arises, why was it necessary for Comrade Zinoviev to quote such passages?

Evidently to "overwhelm" his auditors with a heap of quotations and to stir up the mud (laughter).

It is now clear, I think, that Comrade Zinoviev did not achieve his purpose; that his more than ridiculous manner of quoting the classics of Marxism has failed him in the most unambiguous manner.

#### REVISION ACCORDING TO ZINOVIEV.

Finally, a few words concerning Zinoviev's interpretation of the term "revisionism". According to Zinoviev any improvement in the old formulae and separate passages from Marx and Engels, any alteration that would make them more precise and moreover, the substitution of these formulae by others, which correspond more to new conditions, is revisionism. Why? Is not Marxism a science; and does not science develop and become richer by new experiences and the improvement of its old formulae? For that reason, it turns out that "revisionism" means to revise and the improvement of old formulae and making them more precise cannot be brought about without revising these formulae. Consequently, improving and making more precise old formulae, enriching Marxism by new experiences and new formulae, is revisionism. All this is ridiculous of course. But what can we do with Comrade Zinoviev when he places himself in a ridiculous position and at the same time imagines that he is fighting against revisionism?

For example: was Stalin right in changing and making more precise his own formulae (1924) of the victory of Socialism in a single country, in accordance with the indications and the fundamental line of Leninism? According to Zinoviev I had no right. Why? Because the alteration of old formulae and making them more precise is a revision of these formulae and this is revisionism! It is not clear therefore that Stalin has become a revisionist?

It follows therefore that we have a new Zinoviev criterion of revisionism, which dooms Marxian thought to complete stagnation for fear of being charged with revisionism.

If for example Marx, in the middle of the last century said that, with a rising curve of development of capitalism the victory of Socialism within separate national frontiers is impossible and Lenin, in the 15th year of the 20th century said that, with a declining curve of capitalist development, under moribund capitalism such victory is possible, it follows therefore that Lenin revised Marx!

If Marx, for example said in the '50s of the last century that the social revolution in any country in Europe, or even in the whole of the European continent, without England would be merely "a storm in a teacup", and Engels, taking into account the new experiences of the class struggle subsequently changed the postulate and said that the "French will commence and the Germans complete" the social revolution, then it follows that Engels fell into revisionism and revised Marx.

If Engels said that the French will commence the Social revolution and the Germans will complete it, while Lenin, studying the experience of the victory of revolution in the U. S. S. R., substituted this formula by another and said that the Russians have commenced the social revolution and the Germans, French and English will complete it, it follows therefore that Lenin revised Engels and revised Marx still more!



Here, for example, are Lenin's words on this point:

"The great founders of Socialism, Marx and Engels, observing the labour movement and the growth of the world social revolution over a period of several decades, clearly saw that the transition from capitalism to Socialism will cause serious and prolonged birth pangs, will give rise to a long period of breaking down the old system, of ruthless destruction of all forms of capitalism and that for this purpose the co-operation was required of the workers of all countries who must combine all their efforts in order to secure final victory and they said: 'The French will commence and the Germans will end it' — The French will commence, because, in the course of decades of revolution they have developed such devoted zeal in revolutionary action which has brought them into the vanguard of the Social revolution.

We now see a different combination of the forces of international Socialism. We say that the movement will commence much more easily in those countries which do not belong to the exploiting countries, — which latter have more opportunities for plundering and are able to bribe the upper stratum of the working class.... Things have turned out differently from what Marx and Engels expected. Events have given us, the Russian toilers, and exploited classes the honourable role of vanguard of the international Social revolution, and we now see clearly how far the development of the revolution will proceed; the Russians commenced — the Germans, the French and the English will complete it and Socialism will be victorious".... (Lenin Vol. XV., pp. 87—88.) (Italics mine, J. S.)

You see here that Lenin positively "revised" Engels and Marx and became a "revisionist"!

If for example, Engels and Marx defined the Paris Commune as the dictatorship of the proletariat, which as we know, was guided by two parties, neither of which was a Marxian party, — and Lenin, taking into account the new experiences of the struggles of classes and the condition of imperialism said later that the dictatorship of the proletariat may be achieved to any degree only under the guidance of one party, the party of Marxism, it follows that Lenin became an obvious revisionist of Marx and Engels!

## II. The Question of the Victory of Socialism in Separate Capitalist Countries.

I have spoken of the various mistakes of the Opposition and of the inexactitude observed in the speeches of the leaders of the Opposition. I tried to deal with this question fully in the first part of my concluding speech in the form of separate remarks. Permit me now to come right down to the subject.

### THE PREMISES OF PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION IN SEPARATE COUNTRIES IN THE PERIOD OF IMPERIALISM.

First question — this is the question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries in the period of imperialism. You see, therefore, that we are not discussing any particular country but all the more or less developed imperialist countries.

What is the fundamental error of the Opposition in the question of the victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries?

The fundamental error of the Opposition is that it does not understand, or does not wish to understand the difference between pre-imperialist capitalism and imperialist capitalism; it does not understand the economic content of imperialism and mixes up two different phases of capitalism: the pre-imperialist phase with the imperialist phase.

From this mistake of the Opposition follows another mistake, which is, that it does not understand the sense and significance of the law of uneven development in the period of imperialism and opposes to this law a tendency of levelling up and in this way slides into the Kautsky position of ultra-imperialism.

If, in the period of the imperialist war Lenin said that federation is not an acceptable type of State system; and in 1917, taking into consideration the new experiences of the struggles of the proletariat, changed, revised this formula and said that federation is a proper type of State system in the period of transition to Socialism, it follows that Lenin became a revisionist and revised Leninism!

Etc. Etc.

According to Zinoviev it follows therefore that Marxism should not be enriched by new experiences, that every improvement of the various postulates and formulae of the classics of Marxism is revisionism.

What is Marxism? Marxism is a science. Can Marxism be preserved and developed as a science if it is never enriched by these new experiences of the class struggle of the proletariat if it will not absorb this experience from the point of view of Marxism, from the point of view of the Marxian method? Clearly it cannot.

Is it not clear after this that Marxism requires that the old formulae be improved and enriched on the basis of the new experiences while at the same time the point of view of Marxism and the Marxian method is preserved? Zinoviev, however, acts quite contrary to this. He preserves the letter and substitutes the letter of various postulates of Marxism for the point of view and the method of Marxism.

What can there be in common between real Marxism and the substitution of the fundamental line of Marxism by the letter of various formulae and quotations from the various postulates of Marxism?

Can there be any doubt that this is not Marxism but a caricature of Marxism?

Marx and Engels had in view precisely such "Marxists" as Zinoviev when they said: "Our doctrine is not a dogma, but a guide to action".

Comrade Zinoviev's misfortune is that he does not understand the sense and significance of these words of Marx and Engels.

These two mistakes lead to a third, viz, that it automatically applies the formulae and postulates which arose on the basis of pre-imperialist capitalism to imperialist capitalism, the result of which is that they deny the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries.

What is the difference between old pre-monopolist capitalism and the modern monopolist capitalism?

Expressed in a few words this difference is that development through free competition has given place to development through grandiose monopolistic combinations of capitalists; that the old "cultured" "progressive" capitalism has given place to finance capital, to "decaying" capital; that the "peaceful" expansion of capitalism and its spreading to "free" territories has given place to development, in leaps and jerks, a development through the re-division of the already divided world by means of military conflicts among the capitalist groups; that old capitalism which on the whole developed along a rising curve has given place to moribund capitalism, capitalism developing, on the whole, along a declining curve.

This is what Lenin said concerning this point:

"Let us recall what the substitution of the previous "peaceful" epoch of capitalism by the modern imperialist epoch is based upon: its basis is that free competition has given place to monopolist combinations of capitalists; and that the mir (globe? J. S.) is divided up. It is clear that both these facts (and factors) are of real world significance; free trade and peaceful competition were possible and necessary as long as capitalism could without hindrance increase its

colonies and seize, in Africa, etc. unoccupied territories, when the concentration of capitalism was still weak and monopolist enterprises i. e., enormous enterprises that dominate over whole branches of industry, did not yet exist. The rise and growth of such monopolist enterprises renders the previous free competition impossible; it removes the ground from under its feet, while the division of the surface of the globe compels a transition from peaceful expansion to armed conflict for the re-distribution of colonies and spheres of influence." (Lenin Vol XIII., p. 151.)

And further:

"We cannot live according to the old style of the comparatively calm, cultured, peaceful conditions of smoothly evolving and gradually expanding capitalism, for a new epoch has set in. Finance capitalism is squeezing out and will finally squeeze out completely the given country from the ranks of the Great Powers; it will deprive it of its colonies and its spheres of influence." (Lenin, Vol. XIII. pp. 153-154.) (Italics mine, J. S.)

From this Lenin draws the following conclusion concerning the character of imperialist capitalism:

"It is understandable therefore why imperialism is moribund capitalism, transitional to Socialism: monopoly growing out of capitalism is already the dying out of capitalism, the beginning of its transition to Socialism. The gigantic Socialisation of labour by imperialism (what the apologist bourgeois economists call "interweaving") is the same thing" (Lenin, Vol. XIII, p. 470).

It is the Opposition's misfortune that it does not understand the importance of this difference between pre-imperialist capitalism and imperialist capitalism.

Thus our Party starts out from the recognition that present-day capitalism, imperialist capitalism is moribund capitalism.

This does not yet mean unfortunately, that capitalism is already dead. But it does undoubtedly mean that capitalism as a whole is not reviving but is dying; that capitalism as a whole is developing, not in a rising curve, but in a declining curve.

From this general question emerges the question of uneven development in the period of imperialism.

What have Leninists in mind when they speak of uneven development in the period of imperialism?

Do they speak of the great difference that exists in the level of development of various capitalist countries, that some countries lag behind others in their development and that this difference is increasing more and more?

No, they do not speak of this. To confuse uneven development under imperialism with the difference in the level of development of capitalist countries means to sink into philistine-ism. It was precisely into philistine-ism that our Opposition sank when at the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. it confused the question of uneven development with the question of the difference in the economic level of various capitalist countries, and precisely because of this confusion the opposition, at that time, came to the absolutely wrong conclusion that formerly the unevenness of development was greater than it is now under imperialism. It is precisely for this reason that Comrade Trotsky said at the XV. Conference that "in the 19th century this unevenness was greater than it is in the twentieth century" (see Comrade Trotsky's speech at the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U.). Comrade Zinoviev implied the same thing when he said: "It is not true that the unevenness of development of capitalism was less up to the beginning of the imperialist epoch" (see Zinoviev's speech at the XV. Conference). It is true that now, after the discussion of the XV. Conference, the Opposition considered it advisable to change front and in their speeches at the Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I., they said something the very opposite or else tried to pass over their mistakes in silence. For example, take the statement Comrade Trotsky made in his speech at the Enlarged Plenum: "As for the rate of development, imperialism has infinitely intensified this unevenness". Comrade Zinoviev in his speech at the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. thought it wise to remain silent about this question, although he could not but know that the argument centred precisely around the question as to whether the operation of the law of uneven development was intensified under im-

perialism, or whether it diminished. This only shows that the discussion has taught the Opposition something and therefore was of some value to them.

Hence, the question of uneven development in the period of imperialism must not be confused with the question of the difference in the level of the economic state of various capitalist countries.

Perhaps the diminishing difference in the level of development of capitalist countries and the levelling up of these countries diminishes the operation of the law of unevenness of development under imperialism? Does the difference in the level of development increase or diminish? Undoubtedly diminishes. Does the levelling up increase or diminish? Unquestionably it increases. But does this process of levelling up contradict the intensification of uneven development under imperialism? No it does not contradict it. On the contrary, the levelling up is the background upon which the intensification of operation of the law of uneven development under imperialism is possible. Only those who fail to understand the economic content of imperialism, as does our opposition, can oppose the process of levelling up to the law of uneven development under imperialism. It is precisely for the reason that countries which have lagged behind hitherto now accelerate their development and have reached the level of the advanced countries, precisely for this reason the possibility is created for certain countries to outstrip other countries and squeeze them out of the markets and in this way create the premises for military conflicts, for the weakening of the world front of capitalism, for the breach of this front by the proletariat in various capitalist countries. Those who have failed to understand this simple thing, understand nothing about the question of the economic content of monopolist capitalism.

Thus, levelling up is one of the conditions for the accentuation of the unevenness of development in the period of imperialism.

Perhaps uneven development under imperialism means that one country overtakes others and then outstrips them in economic relations in the ordinary way, so to speak, in the evolutionary way, without leaps, without cataclysms, without the re-distribution of the already divided world? No it does not mean that. Such unevenness prevailed even in the pre-monopolist period of capitalism, which Marx knew and concerning which Lenin wrote in his "Development of Capitalism". At that time the development of capitalism proceeded more or less smoothly; more or less in an evolutionary manner and some countries outstripped others over a considerable period of time, without leaps and without military conflicts necessarily taking place on a world scale. It is not about this unevenness that we are speaking now.

In that case, what is this law of uneven development under imperialism?

The law of uneven development in the period of imperialism means the leapy and jerky development of some countries as compared with others, the rapid squeezing out of some countries from the world market by others; the periodical re-distribution of the already divided world by means of military conflicts and military cataclysms, the intensification of conflicts in the camp of imperialism, the weakening of the front of world capitalism, the possibility of the breach of this front by the proletariat of separate countries, the possibility of victory of Socialism in separate countries.

What are the fundamental elements of the law of uneven development under imperialism?

First, the fact that the world is already divided up among the imperialist groups. There are no more "free" unoccupied territories in the world and in order to occupy new markets and sources of raw materials, in order to expand, it is necessary to seize this territory from others by force.

Second, the unparalleled development of technique and the increasing levelling up of the standard of development of capitalist countries have created the possibility and facilitated the leapy and jerky outstripping of some countries by others and the process of the less powerful but rapidly developing countries squeezing out the more powerful.

Thirdly, the old division of spheres of influence among the various imperialist groups comes into conflict with the corre-

lation of forces on the world market, that in order to establish "equilibrium" between the old distribution of spheres of influence and the new correlation of forces, a periodical re-distribution of the world by means of imperialist wars is necessary.

From this follows the acceleration and accentuation of uneven development in the period of imperialism.

From this follows the impossibility to settle the conflicts in the camp of imperialism by peaceful means.

From this follows that the Kautsky theory of ultra-imperialism, which preaches the possibility of the peaceful settlement of these conflicts, is bankrupt.

But from this also follows that the opposition, which denies the fact that uneven development in the period of imperialism is becoming accelerated and accentuated, is sliding into the position of ultra-imperialism.

These are the characteristic features of uneven development in the period of imperialism.

When was the division of the world among the imperialist groups completed?

Lenin said that the division of the world was completed at the beginning of the XX. century.

When was the question of the re-distribution of the already divided world brought up for the first time?

In the period of the first world imperialist war.

But from this it follows that the law of uneven development under imperialism could have been discovered and established only at the beginning of the XX. century.

This is what I referred to when in my speech at the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. I said that the law of uneven development under imperialism was discovered and established by Comrade Lenin.

The world imperialist war was the first attempt to re-distribute the already divided world. That attempt cost capitalism the victory of the revolution in Russia and the shattering of the foundations of imperialism in colonial countries and dependencies.

It is superfluous to say that the first attempt to redistribute the world must be followed by a second attempt, for which preparations are already being made in the imperialist camp.

There is hardly room for doubt that the second attempt to re-distribute the world will cost world capitalism much more than did the first attempt.

These are the perspectives of development of world capitalism from the point of view of uneven development in the conditions of imperialism.

You see that these perspectives lead directly to the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate imperialist countries in the period of imperialism.

It is known that Comrade Lenin drew the conclusion of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate countries directly from the law of uneven development of capitalist countries, and Lenin was absolutely right; for the law of uneven development under capitalism removes all ground for the "theoretical" exercises of all the Social Democrats concerning the impossibility of the victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries.

This is what Comrade Lenin says concerning this in his programme article written in 1915:

"Uneven economic and political development is undoubtedly a law of capitalism. From this it follows that the victory of Socialism is possible at first in a few or even a single capitalist country, taken separately". (Lenin, Vol. XIII, p. 133.) (Italics mine, J. S.)

Deductions:

a) The fundamental mistake of the opposition is that it does not see the difference between the two phases of capitalism, or it fails to emphasise this difference. And why does it fail to do so? Because this difference logically leads to the law of uneven development in the period of imperialism.

b) The second mistake of the opposition is that it does not understand or that it underestimates the decisive significance

of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries under imperialism. And why do they so under-estimate it? Because a proper estimation of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries leads to the conclusion of the possibility of victory of Socialism in separate countries.

c) From this emerges the third mistake of the Opposition, viz, their denial of the possibility of victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries under imperialism.

He who denies the possibility of the victory of Socialism is compelled to pass over in silence the significance of the law of uneven development under imperialism. And he who is compelled to pass over in silence the significance of the law of unequal development cannot but tone down the differences existing between pre-imperialist capitalism and imperialist capitalism.

This is how the matter stands with the question of premises for proletarian revolutions in capitalist countries.

What is the practical significance of this question.

From the point of view of practice, two lines stand out before us. One line is the line of our Party, calling to the proletariat of separate countries to prepare for the coming revolutions, vigilantly to follow the progress of events and be prepared, when favourable conditions arise, independently to break the front of capital, take power and shatter the foundations of world capitalism. The other line is the line of our Opposition, which sows doubt concerning the expediency of the proletariat of each country separately and independently breaking through the capitalist front and which calls upon the proletariat of each separate country to wait for the "general denouement".

While the line of our Party is the line of the proletariat of each country bringing intense revolutionary pressure upon its bourgeoisie and giving scope to the initiative of the proletariat in each country, the line of our opposition is the line of passively waiting and restricting the initiative of the proletariat in each country in their fight against their bourgeoisie.

The first line is the line of rousing the proletariat of each separate country to action.

The second line is the line of weakening the will to revolution of the proletariat, the line of passivity and procrastination.

Lenin was a thousand times right when he wrote the following weighty words, which directly concern our present discussion:

"I know there are wiseacres who think that they are very clever, and even call themselves Socialists, who assert that no resort to arms should be made until the revolution has flared up in all countries. These people do not suspect that in speaking in this way they are abandoning the revolution and going over to the side of the bourgeoisie. To wait until the toiling classes have made a revolution on an international scale means to stagnate in expectation. This is nonsense." (Lenin, Vol. XV, p. 287.)

These words of Lenin should never be forgotten.

#### HOW COMRADE ZINOVIEV "ELABORATES LENIN".

I have spoken of the premises for proletarian revolution in separate capitalist countries. I would like now to say a few words concerning the manner in which Comrade Zinoviev distorts or "elaborates" Comrade Lenin's fundamental essay on the premises for proletarian revolution and on the victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries. I have in mind Comrade Lenin's well-known article entitled "**The Slogan of the United States of Europe**" written in 1915 and which has been quoted several times in our discussion. Comrade Zinoviev reproached me with not having quoted this article in full, and he tried to give this article an interpretation which cannot be described as anything else than the utter distortion of Comrade Lenin's own views, of his fundamental line, on the question of the victory of Socialism in separate countries. Permit me to read this passage in full. The lines I left out in quoting this passage on the last occasion, owing to shortness of time, I will try to emphasise by italics. This is the passage:

"Uneven economic and political development is undoubtedly a law of capitalism. From this it follows that the victory of Socialism is possible at first in a few or even in a single capitalist country taken separately. The victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and having organised Socialist production in that country, will rise against the rest of the capitalist world, rally to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise insurrection against the capitalists in those countries, and in the event of necessity even come out with military force against the exploiting classes and their State. The political form of the society in which the proletariat will be victorious by overthrowing the bourgeoisie will be a democratic republic more and more centralising the forces of the proletariat of that nation, or of those nations, in the struggle against the States which have not yet passed over to socialism. The abolition of classes is impossible without the dictatorship of the oppressed class, the proletariat. The free combination of nations under socialism is impossible without more or less prolonged struggles of the socialist republics against the conservative States." (Lenin, Vol. XIII, p. 133.)

In quoting this passage Comrade Zinoviev makes two remarks: the first, concerning the democratic republic and the second concerning the organisation of Socialist production.

We will first of all speak about the first remark. Comrade Zinoviev thinks that if Lenin in this passage speaks about the democratic republic, the most he can have in mind is the seizure of power by the proletariat, and Comrade Zinoviev is not ashamed persistently, if rather vaguely, to hint that perhaps Lenin was speaking about a bourgeois republic. Is this true? Of course it is not. In order to refute this not altogether honest hint of Comrade Zinoviev, it is sufficient to read the last lines of the quotation, where it speaks of the "struggles of the socialist republics against the Conservative States". Clearly, Comrade Lenin, in speaking of a democratic republic had in mind, not a bourgeois republic, but a Socialist republic. In 1915 Lenin did not yet conceive of the Soviet Government as the State form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Already in 1905 Lenin conceived the idea that certain Soviets were the embryos of revolutionary power in the period of the overthrow of tsarism. But he did not yet conceive the idea of the Soviet rule combined on a national scale as the State form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin discovered the Soviet Republic as the State form of the dictatorship of the proletariat only in 1917 and elaborated the question of this new form of political organisation of transitional society in the summer of 1917 principally in his book "State and Revolution". This indeed explains why, in the above-mentioned passage, Lenin does not speak of the Soviet Republic but of the Democratic Republic, meaning by that, as is evident from the passage, a Socialist Republic. Lenin in this case acted in the same way as Marx and Engels acted in their time, prior to the Paris Commune, when they regarded a republic generally as the form of political organisation of transitional society, but after the Paris Commune they deciphered the term republic by saying that this republic should be a republic of the type of the Paris Commune.

It is superfluous for me to say that if Lenin in this passage had in mind a bourgeois democratic republic then there could be no talk of "dictatorship of the proletariat", "expropriation of the capitalists", etc.

You see therefore that Comrade Zinoviev's attempt to "elaborate" Lenin can hardly be described as successful.

Let us now take up the second remark of Comrade Zinoviev. Comrade Zinoviev asserts that Comrade Lenin's phrase concerning "the organisation of Socialist production" must be understood not as normal people generally should understand it, but somehow differently, viz. that Lenin had in mind here merely the commencement of the work of organising Socialist production. Why it should be so understood Comrade Zinoviev did not explain. Permit me to state that Comrade Zinoviev here makes another attempt to "elaborate" Lenin. In the passage quoted it says clearly "the victorious proletariat of that country, having expropriated the capitalists and having organised Socialist production in that country will rise against the rest of the capitalist world". Here it says "having organised" and not "organising". Is it necessary to point out the difference here? Is it necessary to prove that if Lenin had in mind only the commencement of the work of organising Socialist production he would have said "organising" and not "having organised"? Consequently, Lenin had in mind not only the commencement of the work of organising Socialist production but even the possibility of completely organising, the possibility of completely constructing, Socialist production in separate countries.

You see that even this second attempt of Comrade Zinoviev to "elaborate" Lenin must be regarded as more than a failure.

Comrade Zinoviev strives to conceal his attempts to "elaborate" Lenin by bits of humour about being "unable to build Socialism by word of command in two weeks or in two months". I fear that Comrade Zinoviev stands in need of these bits of humour in order to "put the best face on a bad bargain". Where has Comrade Zinoviev met with people who want to build Socialism in two weeks, two months or even in two years? Why does he not name such people if they exist at all. He did not name them because there are no such people. Comrade Zinoviev stood in need of his false humour in order to conceal his "work" in "elaborating" Lenin and Leninism.

Hence: a) starting out from the law of uneven development under imperialism, Lenin, in his fundamental essay on the "Slogan of the United States of Europe" came to the conclusion that the victory of Socialism in separate capitalist countries is possible;

b) By victory of Socialism in separate countries Lenin means the seizure of power by the proletariat, the expropriation of the capitalists and the organisation of Socialist production: these tasks however, are not aims in themselves but a means to be able to aid the proletariat of all countries in their struggle against capitalism;

c) Comrade Zinoviev tried to wittle down these postulates of Leninism and "elaborate" Lenin to suit the semi-Menshevik positions of the Menshevik bloc. This attempt proved futile.

I think that further comment is superfluous.

### III. The Question of Construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R.

Permit me now comrades, to take up the question of the construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R., in our country.

#### THE "MANOEUVRES" OF THE OPPOSITION AND THE "NATIONAL REFORMISM" OF THE PARTY OF LENIN.

Comrade Trotsky said in his speech that Stalin's most important mistake is the theory of the possibility of the construction of Socialism in a single country, in our country. It would appear therefore, that we are discussing, not Lenin's theory concerning the possibility of constructing Socialism in our country but a hitherto unknown Stalin "theory". I understand it in this way, that Comrade Trotsky set out to fight against the theory of Lenin, but as it is a risky job openly to fight against Lenin, he decided to conduct this fight in the form of fighting the "theory" of Stalin. Comrade Trotsky wishes to facilitate his fight against Leninism by masking it with his criticism of the "theory" of Stalin. That this is the case, that neither Stalin nor any Stalin "theory" has anything to do with the case, that Stalin never pretended to put forward any new theory but always tried to secure the complete triumph of Leninism in his Party in spite of the revisionist efforts of Trotsky, I will try to prove later on. For the time being we will observe that Comrade Trotsky's statement about a Stalin "theory" is a ruse, cowardly and fatuous manoeuvre, intended to conceal his fight against Lenin's theory on the victory of Socialism in separate countries, a fight which goes back to 1915 and has continued to our day. The question as to whether the method that Comrade Trotsky employs is a mark of honourable polemics, I will leave to you comrades to decide.

The starting point of the decisions of our Party on the question of the possibility of constructing Socialism in our country is the well-known works of Lenin explaining the programme. In these works of Lenin it is stated that the victory of Socialism in separate countries under imperialism is possible: that the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat in solving the economic problems of that dictatorship is assured, that we, the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. possess all that is necessary and sufficient for the construction of complete Socialist society.

I have just quoted a passage from the well-known article by Lenin where for the first time he raises the question of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in separate countries and which, consequently, I will not repeat. This article was written in 1915. In it it is stated that the victory of Socialism in separate countries, the seizure of power by the proletariat, the expropriation of the capitalists, and the organisation of Socialist production are possible. It is known that Comrade Trotsky at that very time, in 1915, wrote in the press against this article of Lenin and described the narrow theory of Socialism in a single country, the theory of "narrow nationalism".

The question arises then, what has Stalin's "theory" got to do with it?

Furthermore, in my report I quoted a passage from a well-known work by Lenin entitled "Economics and Politics in the Epoch of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat" in which it is stated directly and definitely that the victory of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R., in the sense of fulfilling the economic problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat, should be regarded as assured. This work was written in 1919 and this is the passage:

"However much the bourgeoisie and their avowed and tacit accomplices (the "Socialists" of the Second International) may lie and slander, it remains beyond a doubt: from the point of view of the fundamental economic problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat we are assured of victory, the victory of Communism over capitalism. It is precisely for this reason that the bourgeoisie of all countries rave and rage against Bolshevism, organise military invasions, plots, etc., against the Bolsheviks; for they very well understand the inevitability of our victory in the reconstruction of social economy unless they crush us by military force. And this they will fail to do." (Lenin Vol. XVI, p. 350.) (Italics mine, J. S.)

You see that Lenin here directly talks about the victory of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. in the task of reconstructing social economy, in the task of solving the economic problems of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

It is known that Comrade Trotsky and the Opposition as a whole, do not agree with the principal postulates contained in this passage.

The question arises then, what has the Stalin "theory" got to do with it.

Finally I quoted from a well-known pamphlet by Lenin entitled "Co-operation", which was written in 1923. In this passage it is stated:

"Indeed, with the power of the State over all the large means of production, with the power of the state in the hands of the proletariat, the union of this proletariat with the many million of small and smallest peasants, the guarantee that the leadership of these peasants will remain in the hands of the proletariat, etc., — is this not all that we require in order that co-operation and co-operation alone, which we formerly treated with contempt as huckstering, and which, from a certain aspect, we have the right to treat with contempt now, under N. E. P., — is this not all that is necessary for the construction of complete socialist society? This is not yet the construction of Socialist society completed, but it is all that is necessary and sufficient for this construction." (Lenin, Vol. XVIII, Part II, p. 140.) (Italics mine, J. S.)

You see that this quotation does not leave the slightest doubt about the possibility of the construction of Socialism in our country.

You see that in this passage are enumerated the principal factors in the construction of Socialist economy in our country: proletarian power, large-scale production in the hands of the proletarian power, the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, leadership of the proletariat in this alliance and co-operation.

Recently at the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. Comrade Trotsky tried to oppose this passage by another passage from Lenin in which it is stated that "the Soviet rule plus electrification is Socialism". But to oppose these passages to each other means to distort the fundamental idea of Lenin's pamphlet "Co-operation". Is not electrification a component part of large-scale production and is electrification at all possible in our country without large-scale production concentrated in the hands of the proletarian power? Is it not clear that the words of Lenin in the pamphlet "Co-operation" concerning large-scale production as one of the factors of the construction of Socialism include electrification?

It is known that the opposition is conducting more or less open, but more frequently a concealed fight against the fundamental postulates elucidated in this passage from Lenin's pamphlet "Co-operation".

The question arises, what has Stalin's "theory" to do with it?

These are the fundamental postulates of Leninism on the question of the construction of Socialism in our country.

The Party asserts that these postulates of Leninism fundamentally contradict the well-known postulate of Comrade Trotsky and of the Opposition bloc which lays it down that "the construction of Socialism within national State boundaries is impossible", that the "theory of Socialism in a single country is the theoretical justification of narrow nationalism". That "without direct State support of the European proletariat the working class of Russia will be unable to retain power" (Trotsky).

The Party asserts that these postulates of the Opposition bloc are an expression of the Social Democratic deviation in our Party.

The Party asserts that Comrade Trotsky's formula "the direct State support of the European proletariat" is the formula of the complete break with Leninism; for what does it mean to place the construction of Socialism in our country in depend-

ence upon the "direct State support of the European proletariat?" Well, and what will happen if the European proletariat fails to take power within the next few years? Is our revolution to mark time in the expectation of a revolution in the West in the course of an indefinite period of time? Can we calculate on the bourgeoisie in our country, agreeing to wait for a victory of the revolution in the West and in the meantime abandon its work and its fight against the socialist elements of our economy? Does it not logically follow from Comrade Trotsky's formula that the perspective ahead is the gradual surrender of our positions to the capitalist elements of our economy and then, further, the perspective of our Party abandoning power in the event of the victorious revolution in the West being delayed?

Is it not clear that here we are faced with two absolutely different lines of which one is the line of the Party and Leninism and the other is the line of the Opposition and Trotskyism?

In my report I asked Comrade Trotsky and I ask him now: is it not true that in 1915 Comrade Trotsky characterised Comrade Lenin's theory of the possibility of victory of Socialism in separate countries as a theory of "narrow nationalism"? But I have received no reply. Why? Is silence the mark of manliness in polemics?

Further I asked Comrade Trotsky and I ask him now: Is it not true that he repeated the charge of "narrow nationalism" against the theory of the construction of Socialism only quite recently, in September 1926, in his celebrated document addressed to the Opposition; but I have received no reply to this question either. Why? Is it because silence is also one of Comrade Trotsky's "manoeuvres"?

Of what does all this speak?

It speaks of the fact that Comrade Trotsky sticks to his old position of combating Leninism in the fundamental question of the construction of Socialism in our country.

It speaks of the fact that Comrade Trotsky, not having the courage openly to come out against Leninism, tries to conceal his fight by criticising the non-existent "theory" of Stalin.

Now we will take up the other "strategist", Comrade Kamenev. He apparently, has become infected with the same complaint as Comrade Trotsky and also started to manoeuvre. But his manoeuvres turned out to be more clumsy than those of Comrade Trotsky. While Comrade Trotsky tried to bring charges only against Stalin, Kamenev hurled a charge against the whole Party to the effect that it, i. e. the Party, "was substituting the international revolutionary perspective by national reformist perspectives". There: If you please! Our Party it appears is substituting international revolutionary perspectives by national reformist perspectives. But as our Party is Lenin's Party, as in its resolutions on the question of the construction of Socialism it bases itself wholly and entirely on certain known postulates of Lenin, it follows that a Leninist theory of the construction of Socialism is a theory of national reformism. Lenin is a — "national reformist" — this is the nonsense with which Comrade Kamenev entertains us.

Has our Party passed any resolutions on the question of the construction of Socialism in our country? Yes it has, and very definite resolutions. When were these resolutions passed by the Party? In April 1925 at the XIV. Party Conference. I have in mind a well-known resolution of the XIV. Conference on the work of the E. C. C. I. and Socialist construction in our country. Is that resolution a Leninist resolution? Yes, it is, for even such competent persons like Comrade Zinoviev, who delivered the report at the XIV. Conference in defence of this resolution and Comrade Kamenev, who was chairman at the Conference at which the resolution was passed and who voted for the resolution, can guarantee that it is.

Why then did not Comrade Kamenev and Zinoviev try to prove that the Party was contradicting itself, that it was in disagreement with the resolution of the XIV. Party Conference on the question of the construction of Socialism in our country which, as is known was passed unanimously?

Nothing would seem to be easier! The Party has a special resolution on the construction of Socialism. Kamenev and Zinoviev voted for this resolution, both these Comrades charge the Party with national reformism. Why do not these com-

rades base their arguments on an important Party document like the resolution of the XIV. Conference, which deals with the construction of Socialism in our country and which apparently, is Leninist from beginning to end. Have you observed that the opposition generally and Kamenev in particular avoided the resolution of the XIV. Conference as a cat avoids hot porridge (laughter). Why do they fear so much the resolution of the XIV. Conference which was carried on the report of Comrade Zinoviev and with the active support of Comrade Kamenev? Why do Kamenev and Zinoviev fear even to hint at this resolution? Does not this resolution deal with the construction of Socialism in our country? Is not the question of the construction of Socialism the principal controversial question in our discussion?

What is the matter?

The matter is that while they were in favour of the resolution of the XIV. Conference in 1925, Kamenev and Zinoviev afterwards renounced this resolution and consequently renounced Leninism and went over to the side of Trotskyism. And now they fear even to hint at this resolution for fear of being exposed.

What does this resolution say?

Here is a passage from this resolution.

"Generally speaking the victory of Socialism (not in the sense of final victory) is undoubtedly possible in a single country."

And further:

"... The existence of two diametrically opposed social systems gives rise to the constant menace of capitalist blockades, of other forms of economic pressure, armed intervention and restoration. The sole guarantee of the final victory of Socialism, i. e. the guarantee against restoration is therefore victorious social revolution in a number of countries. From this it by no means follows that the complete construction of socialist society in such a backward country like Russia without the 'state support' (Trotsky) of more technically and economically developed countries is impossible. The assertion that 'the genuine rise of Socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe' (Trotsky 1922) — an assertion which dooms the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. in the present period to fatalistic passivity, is a component part of the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution. Against such 'theories' Comrade Lenin wrote: 'Infinitely stereotyped is the argument which they have learned by heart during the development of Western European Social Democracy to the effect that we are not yet grown up enough for Socialism, that we do not yet possess what their various' scholars call the objective pre-requisites for 'Socialism' (Notes on Sukhanov)". (Resolution of the XIV. Conference of the R. C. P. on "the Tasks of the Comintern and the R. C. P. in connection with the Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I.")

You see that the Resolution of the XIV. Conference contains a precise elucidation of the fundamental postulates of Leninism on the question of the possibility of the construction of Socialism in our country.

You see that in the resolution Trotskyism is qualified as a counter-balance to Leninism and that a number of the theses of the resolution start out from a direct repudiation of the principles of Trotskyism.

You see that the resolution wholly reflects the controversies that have broken out again on the question of the construction of Socialist society in our country.

You know that my report was constructed on the basis of the leading postulates of this resolution.

You probably remember that I particularly referred to the resolution of the XIV. Congress in my report and charged Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev with violating this resolution and departing from it.

Why did not Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev attempt to meet this charge?

What is the secret of it?

The secret is that Kamenev and Zinoviev have long ago renounced this resolution and in renouncing it went over to the side of Trotskyism.

One of two things: either the resolution of the XIV. Conference is not a Leninist resolution, — in that case, Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev were not Leninists when they voted for it, or that the resolution is a Leninist resolution, — in that case, having renounced it, Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev have ceased to be Leninists.

Several speakers have said here (including, I think, Comrade Riese) that it was not Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev who went to Trotskyism, but on the contrary, Trotsky went over to Zinoviev and Kamenev. This is all nonsense comrades, the fact that Kamenev and Zinoviev have renounced the resolution of the XIV. Conference proves that Kamenev and Zinoviev went over to Trotskyism.

Hence, who renounced the Leninist line in the question of the construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R., as formulated in the resolution of the XIV. Conference of the C. P. S. U.? It would appear that it is comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev.

Who "substituted international revolutionary perspectives" by Trotskyism? It would appear that it was comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev.

If now Kamenev is raising a clamour about the "national reformism" of our Party he does so simply to divert the attention of the comrades from his backslidings and to throw his sins upon others.

That is why comrade Kamenev's "manoeuvre" in connection with the "national reformism" of our Party is a trick, a dishonest, clumsy trick calculated to conceal his own renunciation of the resolution of the XIV. Conference, his renunciation of Leninism and his transition to the side of Trotskyism by shouts about the "National reformism" of our Party.

## WE ARE BUILDING AND CAN COMPLETE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE ECONOMIC BASE OF SOCIALISM IN THE U. S. S. R.

1. I said in my report that the Political base of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. has already been laid down — this is the dictatorship of the proletariat. I said that the economic base of Socialism is far from being completed yet and that much has yet to be done for its completion. I said further, that in view of this the question can be formulated as follows: have we the possibility, with our own forces to construct the economic basis of Socialism in our country? Finally, I said, that if this question is translated into class language, it will assume the following form: have we the possibility, by our own forces, to overcome our own Soviet bourgeoisie?

Comrade Trotsky in his speech asserted that in speaking about overcoming the bourgeoisie in the U. S. S. R., I had in mind overcoming it politically. That is not true, of course. This is one of Comrade Trotsky's transports of factional zeal. From my report it is clear that in speaking of overcoming the bourgeoisie of the U. S. S. R. I had in mind overcoming it economically, for politically it is already overcome.

What does it mean economically to overcome the bourgeoisie in the U. S. S. R.? In other words, what does it mean to establish the economic base of Socialism in the U. S. S. R.?

"To establish the economic basis of Socialism means — to link up agriculture with Socialist industry into one, whole economy, subordinate agriculture to the guidance of Socialist industry, lay down proper relations between the city and the rural districts on the basis of the direct exchange of the products of agriculture with the manufactures of industry, to close and liquidate all the channels by which classes and particularly capital arise, and finally to create such conditions of production and distribution as will lead directly to the abolition of classes". (Stalin's report at the VII. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I.)

This is how I define the substance of the economic base of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. in my report.

This definition is a precise restatement of the definition of "the economic content", the "economic base of Socialism given

by Lenin in his well-known draft of his pamphlet "The Tax in Kind".

Is this definition correct, and can we calculate on the possibility of constructing the economic base of Socialism in our country? This is the central question of our disagreements.

Comrade Trotsky did not even touch upon this question. He simply evaded it, evidently regarding it wiser to remain silent.

The fact that we are building and can complete the construction of the economic base of Socialism is evident at least from the following:

a) Our Socialised production is large scale and combined construction, whereas non-nationalised production in our country is petty and scattered and moreover it is known that the superiority of large scale production, and combined production at that, over small production is an indisputable fact.

b) Our Socialised production already guides and is beginning to subordinate to itself small production including both urban and rural small production.

c) On the front of the struggle between the Socialist elements of our economy and the capitalist elements, the former has an undoubted superiority of forces over the latter and is moving forward step by step, overcoming the capitalist elements of our economy both in the sphere of production as well as in the sphere of circulation.

I have already spoken of the other factors leading to the victory of the Socialist elements of our economy over the capitalist elements.

What grounds are there for assuming that the process of overcoming the capitalist elements of our economy will not continue in the future?

2. Comrade Trotsky in his speech said:

"Stalin says that we are carrying out the construction of Socialism, i. e. we are striving to abolish classes and the State, i. e. overcoming our bourgeoisie. But comrades, the State stands in need of an army against foreign foes" (quoted from stenographic report. J. S.).

What does this mean? What is the sense of this passage? From this passage only one conclusion can be drawn, namely: as the construction of the economic base of Socialism implies the abolition of classes and the State, and as the army is nevertheless necessary for the defence of the Socialist homeland, and an army without a State is impossible (so comrade Trotsky thinks) it follows therefore, that we cannot construct the economic base of Socialism until the necessity for the armed defence of the Socialist homeland has disappeared.

Comrades, this is simply the mixing up of all conceptions. Either the State is understood to be simply the apparatus for the armed defence of Socialist society, which is absurd, because the State first of all is an instrument employed by one class against other classes, and moreover it goes without saying that immediately classes disappear there can be no State; or the army for the defence of Socialist society is not conceived here without the existence of the State, which again is absurd, for theoretically we may conceive such a state of society in which there are no classes, no State, but where there is the armed nation defending its classless State against foreign foes. The same thing must be said with regard to future classless society which, while not having classes and not having a State may, for all that, have a Socialist militia for defence against foreign foes. I think it hardly likely that things will reach to such a stage with us, for there is not the slightest doubt that the success of Socialist construction in our country, and moreover the victory of Socialism and the abolition of classes are facts of such world historical importance which cannot but give a powerful stimulus to the advance of the proletariat of capitalist countries towards Socialism, which cannot but call forth revolutionary outbreaks in other countries. Theoretically, however, we can conceive a state of society in which there is a Socialist militia, but no classes and no State.

As a matter of fact, this question is dealt with to a certain degree in the programme of our Party. This is what is stated in our programme:

"The Red Army as the weapon of the proletarian dictatorship must necessarily possess an openly class character, i. e. it must be formed exclusively of proletarians and the semi-proletarian strata of the peasantry which stand close to the proletariat. **Only in connection with the abolition of classes will such a class army become a national socialist militia.**" Programme of the C. P. S. U. — italics mine J. S.

Evidently Comrade Trotsky forgot this point of our programme.

3. In his speech, Comrade Trotsky spoke about our national economy being dependent upon world capitalist economy, and declared that "from isolated war Communism we are more and more approaching to the point of **merging** with world economy".

From this it follows therefore, that our national economy with its struggle between the capitalist and Socialist elements is **merging** with world capitalist economy. I say capitalist world economy because there is no other world economy at the present time.

This is not true, comrades, it is absurd, it is one of Comrade Trotsky's transports of factional zeal.

No one denies that our national economy does depend upon capitalist economy. No one has denied this nor denies it now, no more than anyone denies that every country and the economy of every nation, not excluding the economy of the United States of America, is dependent upon international capitalist economy. But this dependence is mutual. Not only is our economy dependent upon capitalist countries, but capitalist countries depend upon our economy: upon our oil, upon our grain, upon our lumber and finally upon our extensive markets. We obtain credits say, from the standard Oil Company, we obtain credits from the German capitalists; but we obtain these credits not for the sake of our beautiful eyes, but because the capitalist countries stand in need of our oil, of our grain and our markets in which they can dispose of machinery and equipment. It must not be forgotten that our country represents one-sixth of the globe, that it represents an enormous market and that the capitalist countries cannot dispense with establishing connections with our market. All this shows that the capitalist countries are dependent upon our economy. The dependence is mutual.

Does it follow that the dependence of our national economy upon capitalist countries excludes the possibility of constructing socialist society in our country? Of course it does not mean that. To represent Socialist economy as something absolutely exclusive and absolutely independent of surrounding national economies means to assert what is stupid. Can it be asserted that Socialist economy has absolutely no exports or imports, will not import into the country the things that are lacking in the country and will not as a result export goods? No, it is impossible to assert things like that. And what are exports and imports? They are the expression of the dependence of some countries upon others. They are the expression of economic, mutual inter-dependence.

The same thing must be said with regard to the capitalist countries of our time. You cannot conceive of a single country which did not import and export goods. Take America, the richest country in the world. Can we say that the present day capitalist States, say Great Britain or America are absolutely independent States? No we cannot say that. Why? Because these States depend on exports and imports, they depend upon the raw materials of other countries (America for example depends upon rubber and other raw materials) they depend upon foreign markets on which they dispose of their machinery and other manufactured goods.

Does it mean that since there are no absolutely independent countries the independence of separate national economies is, therefore impossible? Not it does not. Our country depends upon other countries in the same way as other countries depend upon our national economy. But this does not imply that our country has lost or will lose its independence, that it will not be able to defend its independence, that it must become reduced to a mere screw in international capitalist economy. A distinction must be drawn between the dependence of some countries upon others and the economic independence of these countries. The denial of the absolute independence of separate

national economic units does not and cannot imply a denial of the economic independence of these units.

But comrade Trotsky speaks not only about the dependence of our national economy. He converts this dependence into the merging of our economy with capitalist world economy. But what does the merging of our national economy with capitalist world economy mean? It means that our economy will become converted into an auxiliary of world capitalism. But does our country represent an auxiliary of world capitalism? Of course not! It is stupid comrades, it is not talking seriously. If this were true we would be deprived of every possibility of maintaining our socialist industry, our monopoly of foreign trade, our nationalised transport, our nationalised credit and our planned guidance of economy. If this were true, then we would be already standing on the road of the degeneration of our Socialist industry into ordinary capitalist industry. If this were true, we would have no successes to show on the front of the struggle between the Socialist elements of our economy and the capitalist economy.

4. In his speech, comrade Trotsky said, "actually we shall always be **under the control** of world economy".

It follows, therefore, that our national economy will develop under the control of world capitalist economy, for besides capitalist economy there is no other world economy.

Is this true? No, it is not true. It is the dream of the capitalist sharks, a dream, however, which will never come true.

What is the control of capitalist world economy? In the mouths of the capitalists, control is not an empty word. In the mouths of the capitalists control is something real.

Capitalist control means, first of all, financial control. But are not our banks nationalised, or do they work under the control of European capitalist banks? Financial control means the establishment of branches of large capitalist banks in our country. It means the establishment of so-called "daughter" banks. Are there such banks in our country? Of course not. And there never will be as long as the Soviet Government exists.

Capitalist control means control over our industry, the de-nationalisation of our socialist industry, the de-nationalisation of our transport. But is not our industry nationalised, and is not our industry growing precisely as nationalised industry? Does anybody really intend to de-nationalise even one of our nationalised enterprises? Of course I do not know what are the plans of the Concessions Committee (Laughter), but that there will be no place for de-nationalisation as long as the Soviet Government exists — of that you need not doubt.

Capitalist control means the right to control our markets. It means the abolition of the monopoly of foreign trade. I know that more than once the Western capitalists have beaten their heads against the wall in trying to break through the armour of our monopoly of foreign trade. It is known that the monopoly of foreign trade is the shield and the defence of our young Socialist industry. But have the capitalists managed to achieve any success in the direction of abolishing our monopoly of foreign trade? Is it difficult to understand that as long as the Soviet Government exists the monopoly of foreign trade will live and thrive in spite of everything?

Capitalist control finally, means political control, the abolition of the political independence of our country, the adaption of the laws of the country to the interests and tastes of international capitalist economy. But is not our country a politically independent country, are not our laws dictated by the interests of the proletariat and the masses of the toilers of our country? Why did they not bring forward at least one fact to show that our country has lost its political independence? Let them try to bring forward such facts!

This is how the capitalists understand control; that is, of course, if we are speaking of real control and are not simply chattering about some kind of fleshless control.

If we are talking of real capitalist control, and we can only talk of such control, because only pitiful scribes can engage in empty chatter about some kind of fleshless control, then I must say that there is no such control in our country and there will never be such control as long as our proletariat lives and as long as the dictatorship of the proletariat exists in our country. (Applause.)



## 5. Comrade Trotsky in his speech said:

"What we are discussing is the construction of an isolated Socialist State in an environment of capitalist world economy. This can be achieved only if the productive forces of this isolated State will be superior to the productive forces of capitalism, as, in the perspective of not a year, or 10 years, but for half a century or even a century, only that State, that new social form will be able to consolidate itself, the productive forces of which prove to be more powerful than the productive forces of the old economic system" (Trotsky's speech at the VII. Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. Stenographic report).

It follows, therefore, that 50 years or even a hundred years are necessary in order that the Socialist system of economy may prove its superiority, from the point of view of the development of productive forces over the capitalist system of economy.

This is not true, comrades, that is the mixing up of all perspectives.

It required, I believe, about 200 years, if not less, for the feudal system of economy to prove its superiority over the slave system of economy. This was inevitable, because the rate of development at that time was extremely slow, and the technique of production was more than primitive.

About 100 years, or less, was required for the bourgeois system of economy to prove its superiority over the feudal system of economy. Already in the womb of feudal society the bourgeois system of economy showed that it was much superior to the feudal system of economy. The difference in the length of intervals is due to the more rapid rate of development and the more developed state of technique in a bourgeois system of economy.

Since that time technique has achieved unparalleled successes, and the rate of development has become positively furious. A question arises: what grounds has Trotsky for assuming that the Socialist system of economy requires about 100 years to prove its superiority over the capitalist system of economy? Is not the fact that at the head of industry will stand, not the parasites, but the producers themselves, an extremely important factor in causing the Socialist system of economy to progress in seven league strides and prove its superiority over the capitalist system of economy in a much shorter period? Is not the fact that Socialist economy is more combined economy, that Socialist economy is conducted according to plan, evidence that Socialist economy will have everything in its favour in order, in a comparatively short period of time, to prove its superiority over the capitalist system of economy, which is torn by internal contradictions and consumed by crises.

Is it not clear after all this that to put forward perspectives of 50 or 100 years is to suffer from the superstitious fear of a frightened petty bourgeois of the omnipotence of the capitalist system of economy? (A voice: "Quite true.")

What deductions must be drawn from this? Two deductions.

First, in his arguments on the question of the construction of Socialism in our country, Comrade Trotsky retreated from his old base in the controversy to a new base. Formerly the Opposition argued from the point of view of the inherent contradictions, from the point of view of the antagonisms between the proletariat and the peasantry and considered that these antagonisms were insurmountable. Now Comrade Trotsky emphasises external contradictions between our national economy and world capitalist economy and considers that this contradiction is insurmountable. While formerly comrade Trotsky considered that the rock upon which Socialist construction in our country must be wrecked is the antagonism between the proletariat and the peasantry, he has now changed front, retreated to a new base for criticising the position of the Party and asserts that the rock upon which Socialist construction will be wrecked is the contradiction between our system of economy and the capitalist system of economy. By this he has admitted the bankruptcy of the old arguments of the Opposition.

Second, Comrade Trotsky's retreat is a retreat into the marsh. As a matter of fact Comrade Trotsky has retreated frankly and openly to Sukhanov. What really are Comrade Trotsky's

"new" arguments? They are that in view of our economic backwardness we have not yet grown up sufficiently for Socialism, that we do not yet possess the objective prerequisites for the construction of Socialist economy, that our national economy, as a consequence, must be an auxiliary of capitalist world economy, must become a controlled economic unity of world capitalism.

But this is frank and naked "Sukhanovism".

The Opposition has slipped right towards the Menshevik Sukhanov, to the latter's position of downright denial of the possibility of victorious Socialist construction in our country.

## WE ARE BUILDING SOCIALISM IN ALLIANCE WITH THE WORLD PROLETARIAT.

That we are building Socialism in alliance with the peasantry the Opposition does not dare to deny openly, but it shows an inclination to doubt whether we are building Socialism in alliance with the world proletariat. Several members of the Opposition even assert that our Party underestimates the significance of this alliance, and one of them, Comrade Kamenev, went so far as to charge the Party with national reformism and with substituting international revolutionary perspectives by national reformist perspectives.

Comrades, this is stupidity, impenetrable stupidity. Only a madman would deny the supreme significance of the alliance between the proletariat of our country and the proletariat of all other countries in the task of constructing Socialism. Only a madman would charge our Party with under-estimating the alliance of the proletariat of all countries. Only in alliance with the world proletariat is the construction of Socialism in our country possible.

The whole question is, how is this alliance to be understood?

When the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. seized power in October 1917 this was aid rendered to the proletariat of all countries. This was an alliance with them.

When the proletariat of Germany raised the banner of revolt in 1918, this was aid rendered to the proletariat of all countries and particularly to the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. This was an alliance with the proletariat of the U. S. S. R.

When the proletariat of Western Europe upset the work of intervention in the U. S. S. R., refused to transport arms for the counter-revolutionary generals, set up committees of action and disrupted the rear of the capitalist forces — this was aid rendered to the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. This was an alliance between the Western European proletariat and the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. Without such sympathy and without such support on the part of the proletariat of the capitalist countries, we would not have emerged victorious from the civil war.

When the proletariat of capitalist countries send delegation after delegation to us who inspect our work of construction and then carry word of the successes of our construction over the whole of Europe — that is aid rendered to the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. It is supreme support to the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. It is alliance with the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. and a fetter upon possible imperialist intervention in our country. Without such support and without such fetters we would not have a respite at the present time, and without a respite we would not be able to develop our work of constructing Socialism in our country.

When the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. consolidates its dictatorship, removes the state of economic ruin, extends its work of construction and achieves successes in the work of constructing Socialism — they thereby render supreme support to the proletariat of all countries in their fight against capitalism and their fight for power. For the existence of the Soviet Republic, its stability and its successes on the front of Socialist construction are supreme factors of world revolution which embolden the proletariat of all countries in their struggle against capitalism. It can hardly be doubted that the abolition of the Soviet Republic would result in the blackest and most ferocious reaction in all capitalist countries.

The strength of our revolution and the strength of the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries lies in the mutual support and in the alliance of the proletariat of all countries.

These are the various forms of alliance of the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. and the world proletariat.

The mistake of the Opposition is that it fails to understand or refuses to recognise these forms of alliance. The misfortune of the Opposition is that it recognises only one of the forms of alliance, namely, the form of "direct State support" to the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. by the proletariat of Western Europe, i. e. the form which unfortunately cannot be applied at the present time, and that it makes the fate of Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R. directly dependent on this support, forthcoming in the future. The Opposition thinks that only by recognising this form of support can the Party preserve its "international revolutionary perspective". But I have already said that in the event of the world revolution being delayed, such a position can only lead to continuous concessions to the capitalist elements of our economy, and in the last resort to capitulation and defeatism.

It follows, therefore, that in the event of the world revolution being delayed the "direct State support" proposed by the Opposition as the only form of alliance with the world proletariat would be a concealed form of capitulation.

"The International revolutionary perspective" of Comrade Kamenev as a concealed form of capitulation, — this is where Comrade Kamenev is leading us.

Hence, one can only express astonishment at the boldness with which Comrade Kamenev spoke here and charged our Party with national reformism.

Were did Comrade Kamenev get this boldness, to put it mildly? He was never distinguished for his revolutionariness and internationalism.

Where did Comrade Kamenev get his boldness? He was always a Bolshevik among the Mensheviks and a Menshevik among the Bolsheviks (laughter). Where did Comrade Kamenev get this boldness? Lenin at one time quite justly called him the "blackleg" of the October Revolution.

Comrade Kamenev wishes to know whether the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. is international. I must say that the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. does not stand in need of a certificate of internationalism from the "blackleg" of the October Revolution.

You wish to know the measure of the internationalism of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R.? Ask the British workers, ask the German workers (loud applause), ask the Turkish workers, ask the Chinese workers — they will tell you about the internationalism of the proletariat of the U. S. S. R.!

## IV. The Opposition and the Question of the Unity of the Party.

I come now to the last question, the question of the Opposition bloc and the unity of our Party.

### HOW WAS THE OPPOSITION BLOC FORMED?

The Party asserts that the Opposition bloc was formed as a result of the transition of the "new Opposition" i. e. Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev to the side of Trotskyism.

Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev deny and hint that it was not they who went over to Trotsky, but that Trotsky came over to them.

Let us examine the facts.

I have referred to the resolution of the XIV. Conference and the question of the construction of Socialism in our country. I said that Kamenev and Zinoviev have renounced this resolution — which Comrade Trotsky has not accepted and cannot accept — in order to be able to approach Trotsky and go over

### THE QUESTION OF DEGENERATION.

Hence, we may take it as proved that the point of view of the Opposition is a direct denial of the possibility of constructing Socialism in our country.

But the denial of the possibility of constructing Socialism leads to the perspective of the degeneration of our Party, and the perspective of degeneration in its turn leads to the abandonment of power and the question of the formation of a new Party.

Comrade Trotsky pretended that he could not treat this question seriously. That was camouflage.

There can be no doubt that if we cannot construct Socialism and the revolution in other countries is delayed, and if meanwhile, capitalism in Russia will grow in the same way as our national economy is "merging" with world capitalist economy, then from the point of view of the opposition only two possibilities remain:

a) Either we must remain in power and carry out a policy of bourgeois democracy, participate in a bourgeois government and consequently conduct a policy of "Millerandism";

b) or we must give up power in order not to degenerate and to form a new Party parallel with the official Party which in fact, is what our Opposition strove for and is still striving for.

The two Party theory, or the new Party theory, directly results from the denial of the possibility of constructing Socialism, it is a direct result of the perspective of degeneration.

Both these possibilities lead to capitulation, to defeatism.

How did this question stand in the period of the civil war? It stood this way. If we fail to organise an army and put up resistance against our enemies, then the dictatorship will fall and we shall lose power. At that time war was in the forefront.

How does the question stand now, when the civil war has come to an end and the tasks of economic construction have come to the forefront? Now the question stands in this way: if we cannot construct Socialist economy, then the dictatorship of the proletariat, making more and more serious concessions to the bourgeoisie, must degenerate and drag at the tail of bourgeois-democracy.

Can Communists agree to conduct a bourgeois policy if the dictatorship degenerates?

No, they cannot and they must not.

From this it follows that we must abandon power and form a new Party and thus clear the road for restored capitalism.

Capitulation is the natural result of the present position of the Opposition bloc. This is the deduction that we must draw.

to the side of Trotskyism. Is this true or not? Yes, it is true. Did Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev attempt to refute this assertion? No, they made no attempt to do so. They passed it by in silence.

Furthermore, we have the resolution of the XIII. Conference of our Party which describes Trotskyism as a petty-bourgeois deviation and as a revision of Leninism. As is known, this resolution was endorsed by the V. Congress of the Comintern. In my report I said that comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev renounced this resolution and in special declarations have recognised the correctness of Trotskyism in its fight against the Party in 1923. Is this true or not? Yes, it is true. Did comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev make any attempt to oppose this statement by any other? No, they did not, they remained silent. Some more facts.

In 1925 comrade Kamenev wrote the following concerning Trotskyism:

"Comrade Trotsky has become the channel through which the petty-bourgeois element is revealing itself inside our Party. The whole character of his actions, the whole history of his past shows that this is the case. In his fight against the Party he has already become the symbol in the country for all that which is directed against our Party"

... "We must take all measures to protect from the contagion of this non-Bolshevik doctrine, the strata in our Party for whom it is calculated — our Youth, the future membership which is destined to take the fate of the Party in its hands. Therefore, the intensification of efforts in explaining the error of the position of Comrade Trotsky, of explaining that a choice must be made between Trotskyism and Leninism and that the two cannot be combined — must become the immediate task of our Party." (Kamenev, "The Party and Trotskyism" in the symposium "For Leninism", pp. 84—86). *Italics mine J. S.*)

Will Comrade Kamenev have the courage to repeat these words now? If he is prepared to repeat them, why has he formed a bloc with Trotsky? If he does not dare to repeat them, then is it not clear that Kamenev has abandoned his old position and has gone over to the side of Trotskyism.

In 1925, Comrade Zinoviev wrote the following concerning Trotskyism:

"Comrade Trotsky's recent book ("The Lessons of October") is nothing more nor less than a fairly open attempt to revise, or even the downright liquidation of the principles of Leninism. Only a very short time will elapse, and this will become clear to the whole of our Party, and to the whole of the International". (Zinoviev, "Bolshevism or Trotskyism?" in symposium "For Leninism" p. 120) *Italics mine J. S.*)

Compare this quotation from Zinoviev with the statement Kamenev made in his speech: "We are with Trotsky because he does not revise the fundamental ideas of Lenin", — and you will see how low Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev have fallen.

In the same year 1925, Comrade Zinoviev also wrote the following concerning Trotsky:

"Now the question is being decided as to what is the R. C. P. in 1925. In 1903, this question was decided by its attitude towards paragraph 1. of the Party rules; in 1925, it is decided by its attitude towards Trotsky, towards Trotskyism. He who says that Trotskyism may become a "lawful shade" in the Bolshevik Party, himself ceases to become a Bolshevik. He who now desires to build the Party in alliance with Trotsky, in cooperation with the Trotskyism which openly comes out against Bolshevism, departs from the principles of Leninism. It must be understood that Trotskyism is a stage of the past, but to build a Leninist Party now is possible only in spite of Trotskyism." ("Pravda" Feb. 5. 1925) *Italics mine J. S.*)

Will Comrade Zinoviev have the courage to repeat these words now? If he is prepared to repeat them, then why has he formed a bloc with Trotsky. If he cannot repeat them, then is it not clear that Comrade Zinoviev has departed from Leninism and has gone over to Trotskyism.

What do these facts prove?

They prove that the Opposition bloc was formed by the transition of Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev to the side of Trotskyism.

#### WHAT IS THE PLATFORM OF THE OPPOSITION BLOC?

The platform of the Opposition bloc is a platform of Social Democratic deviation, the platform of the Right deviation in the Party, a platform for rallying all the opportunist tendencies for the purpose of organising the struggle against the Party, against its unity and against its authority. Comrade Kamenev speaks of the Right deviation in our Party making a gesture in the direction of the Central Committee, but this is a ruse, a clumsy and false ruse for the purpose of concealing the opportunism of the Opposition bloc by shouting charges of opportunism against the Party. As a matter of fact the expression of the Right deviation in our Party is the Opposition bloc. We judge the Opposition, not by its declarations, but by its deeds, and the deeds of the Opposition show that it is the rallying point and the hearth of all the opportunist elements from Ossovsky and the "Workers' Opposition" to Souvarine and Maslow, Korsch and Ruth Fischer. The revival of factionalism, the revival of the theory of the freedom of factions in our Party, the rallying of all the opportunist elements in our Party, the fight against the unity of the Party, the fight against its leading cadres, the fight for the formation of a new Party — all this indicates the direction in which the Opposition is leading, if we are to judge by the speech of Comrade Kamenev. In this respect, Comrade Kamenev's speech marks the turning point from the "Declaration" of the Opposition of October 1926, to the revival of the splitting tactics of the Opposition.

#### WHAT IS THE OPPOSITION BLOC FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF PARTY UNITY?

The Opposition is the embryo of a new Party within our Party. Is it not a fact that the Opposition had its Central Committee and parallel local committees? In its "Declaration" of October 16, 1926, the Opposition declared that it has renounced factionalism. But does not Comrade Kamenev's speech indicate that the Opposition has returned to the factional struggle? What guarantee have we that it has not revived its Central and parallel local organisations? Is it not a fact that the Opposition collected special membership dues for its funds? What guarantee have we that it has not returned to the path of splits?

The Opposition Bloc is the Embryo of a New Party, disrupting the unity of our Party.

Our task is to smash up this bloc and liquidate it. (Loud applause).

Comrades, at the time when imperialism is dominant in other countries, when only one country has managed to cause a breach in the capitalist front, under such conditions the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot exist for a single moment, unless the unity of the Party is maintained and unless it is armed with iron discipline. The attempt to disrupt the unity of the Party, the attempt to form a new Party must be completely eradicated if we desire to preserve the dictatorship of the proletariat, and if we desire to construct Socialism.

Therefore, the task is to liquidate the Opposition bloc and reinforce the unity of our Party.

## V. Conclusion.

I now conclude comrades.

If we summarise the discussion, we can come to one general conclusion, which does not leave room for the slightest doubt, and that is, that the XIV Congress of our Party was right when it said that the Opposition suffers from lack of confidence in the strength of our proletariat, lack of confidence in the possibility of constructing Socialism in our country.

This is the general impression that remains, the general conclusion that the comrades cannot help but draw.

Hence, two forces confront us. On the one hand is our Party, confidently leading the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. forward, constructing Socialism and calling upon the workers of all countries to the struggle. On the other hand there is the Opposition, hobbling behind the Party like a decrepit old man with rheumatism in his legs, pains in the side and pains in the head, the Opposition sowing pessimism and poisoning the atmosphere with its whining to the effect that nothing will come of our efforts to construct Socialism in the U. S. S. R., that among the bourgeoisie everything is going well, whereas among us, the proletariat, everything is bad.

Comrades, these are the two forces that confront you. You must make your choice between them. (Laughter).

I have no doubt that you will make the proper choice. (Applause).

The Opposition, in its factional blindness, regards our revolution as being deprived of any independent force, as something in the nature of a free supplement to the future, not yet victorious revolution in the West.

Comrade Lenin did not regard our Revolution and our Soviet Republic in this way. Comrade Lenin regarded the

Soviet Republic as a torch lighting up the path of the proletariat in all countries.

This is what Comrade Lenin said:

"The example of the Soviet Republic will stand before them (i. e. the proletariat of all countries, J. S.) for a long time to come. Our Socialist Soviet Republic will stand firm like a flaming torch of international Socialism, as an example to the masses of the toilers. Over there — conflicts, wars, bloodshed, the sacrifice of millions of men and women, capitalist exploitation; here — a real policy of peace and the Socialist Soviet Republic". (Lenin Vol. XV. p. 88).

Two fronts have been formed around this torch: the front of the enemies of the proletarian dictatorship trying to tear down the torch, to shake it and extinguish it, and the front of the friends of the dictatorship trying to hold the torch aloft and to spread its flames.

Our task is to hold this torch aloft and maintain it firmly for the sake of the victory of the world revolution.

Comrades! I have no doubt that you will take all measures to keep the torch alight so that it may illuminate the path of all the oppressed and the enslaved.

I have no doubt that you will take all measures to spread the flames of this torch to the utmost, to the terror of the enemies of the proletariat.

I have no doubt that you will take measures to light similar torches in all parts of the world to the joy of the proletariat of all countries. (Loud and prolonged cheers. Delegates rise and sing the "Internationale").

(Close of Session).