

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 7. No. 73

PRESS

29th December 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.

C O N T E N T S

- Results of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.
- China.**
Declaration of the Soviet Government on Recent Events in China.
Appeal of the International Red Aid.
- Politics.**
Comrade Stalin on the Forgeries of the American Press.
Willi Schlamm: Intensification of the Situation in Austria.
- The Labour Movements.**
J. R. Campbell: Communist Successes in Scottish Miners' Union.
Claro: Labour Movement in Portugal.
- The White Terror.**
A Fresh Pogrom against the Trade Unions of Bulgaria.
- For Leninism — against Trotzkyism.**
Resolution of the Politbureau of the C. P. of Italy on Trotzky's and Zinoviev's Expulsion from the C. P. S. U.
Ernst Meyer: The Platform of the Opposition.
XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.
N. Bukharin: The International Position and the Tasks of the Communist International.
The Discussion on the Report of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.
Speeches of Comrades Krupskaya, Rakovsky, Rudsutak, Jevdokimov, Kirov, Kamenev and Rykov.
Concluding Speech of Comrade Stalin.
Report of Comrade Ordshonikidse on the Activity of the C. C. C. and Workers and Peasants Inspection.
From the Discussion on Comrade Ordshonikidse's Report.
Speech of Comrade Yaroslavsky.
Report of Comrade Litvinov.

Results of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

(Leading article of the "Pravda" of 20th December, 1927.)

The XV. Party Congress has done its work and has made firm and weighty decisions. There is no doubt whatever that the decisions of this Congress will constitute in the history of the Party and of proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. an important stage of the Communist Labour Movement. The fact alone that the Congress met at a time when, on the one hand, international struggle was very acute and, on the other hand, the "reconstructive process" was rapidly developing, puts a special imprint on the whole work of this great Communist "parliament".

First of all, the Congress summed up the prolonged struggle between the Leninist Party and Trotzkyism. Trotzkyism was always more or less an alien body in our Party. When Lenin's genius and iron hand were no longer there to lead the Party, Trotzkyist attacks increased. Ideologically, as well as organisationally, Trotzkyism began to multiply its attacks, selecting and assimilating a number of oppositional groupings which had begun to doubt the correctness of the Lenin-path and which had given way to the croakings and prophecies concerning the inevitable downfall of our revolution. The differentiation of Trotzkyism, which was developing more and more its specific

peculiarities and was being rapidly converted into Menshevism, finally played havoc with Party and Soviet law and order. Trotzkyites began to act openly as instruments of petty bourgeois democracy, up in arms, against the iron regime of proletarian dictatorship.

The Opposition has been beaten in the Party, the working class and the country. Demoralised ideologically, again divided into factions, without faith in its own cause, without even a vestige of sympathy on the part of the masses, it stands before the eyes of the world, a powerless and bankrupt group of captains without ships and without crews. At the same time the dialectics of development have once more isolated Trotzkyism already at a higher stage of the whole development. The decisions of the Congress sum up definitely this development. The Party has purged itself of a disease which was calling forth continual crises, was impeding constructive work, undermining the international position of the Soviet Union and was bringing confusion into the ranks of the Communist International.

But in spite of the importance of the question of the Opposition (and not only from the viewpoint of relations within the Party) it was not the only and the most important question at the Congress.

The Congress of the C. P. S. U. (b) was a business Congress, determined to deal in a businesslike manner with a series of very important problems connected with the policy of the moment.

In the report of the C. C. (Comrade Stalin's report) and also in the report of the E. C. C. I. delegation, a number of questions were raised which are connected with one another by the special international situation. The war danger, the colonial movements, the veering to the Left of masses of workers (a certain veering to the left throughout the European labour movement in spite of the croaking of the Trotzkyites about the working class "taking a back seat") made it incumbent on the Party to take up a definite attitude commensurate with these tendencies and processes. Transference of the centre of gravity of the united front to the rank and file, more energetic struggle against social democrats and Amsterdam, support of the mass struggle of the Chinese workers — such was the answer of the Party to these questions.

The Party Congress adopted, in connection with the reports of Comrades Stalin, Rykov and Molotov, a number of highly important resolutions in regard to internal policy, development of the industrialisation course coupled with an endeavour to raise the level of agriculture; more energetic struggle for the elimination of capitalist elements from the U. S. S. R. economy in general; issuing the practical slogan "collectivisation of agricultural production"; increased attention to the problems of the cultural revolution—such are the main milestones on the road which is to be pursued in accordance with the decision of the XV. Party Congress.

Very remarkable was the tone of businesslike self-criticism which pervaded the Congress. There was much discussion on Comrade Ordzhonikidze's report and on all other reports, which divulged all our sore points. The spirit of struggle against bureaucracy, of intimate proximity to broad sections of the working population, of critical, proletarian self-examination pervaded the halls of the palace where the Communist Labour Congress was held. It is not for nothing that delegations from non-Party workers were streaming to the Congress from all parts of the country, that about 100,000 new members, out and out proletarians, poured, during the last few days, into the ranks of our powerful Party.

The trend and result of the XV. Party Congress are a safe guarantee that the leading party of proletarian dictatorship will lead the working class with a firm hand to further victories, keeping at the same time watch over its unity, its conquests and the victorious development of international revolution.

CHINA

Declaration of the Soviet Government on Recent Events in China.

Moscow, 22nd December 1927.

The following declaration of the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, signed by comrade Chicherin was published to-day in the press:

"Already on numerous occasions the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs has observed that whenever a revolutionary movement arises in any part of the globe, the adversaries of the Soviet Union immediately declare that it was caused by the agents of the Soviet Union.

With regard to China, not only the reactionary press, but also members of the governments of capitalist countries, have sought from the beginning to represent the whole nationalist movement as a result of the policy of the Soviet Union and the activity of its agents. This is also the path chosen by the counter-revolutionary generals who have drowned the powerful insurrection of the revolutionary workers of Canton in blood. When they piled up the bodies of the tortured workers in the streets of Canton, their hatred was directed primarily against the citizens of the Soviet Union there, who are to be found among the first victims.

We have not yet definite and detailed reports of what happened in Canton, however, we can already say with certainty that a number of soviet citizens in Canton met with various maltreatment and a terrible death. Reports are to hand from various sources concerning the tragic death of the Vice-Consul of the Soviet Union, comrade Chassins. It is difficult to doubt the truth of these terrible reports.

Although the crime of the Canton generals against the Soviet Union is atrocious and great, the responsibility for this crime cannot be restricted to Canton. The political actions of the Canton generals against the Soviet Union and against its representatives have spread over the whole of South China and the slaughter in Canton was only the worst expression of all this. The political responsibility for this bestial crime is thus not alone on the shoulders of the leading persons in the territory of the so-called 'national' governments. Not only Generals Chang Fa-Kwei and Li Fu-ling who are attacking Canton, but also others, Li Ti-sing, Chiang-Kai-shek and Pei Chung-shi are the originators of this atrocity.

In this case the responsibility also falls upon the other anti-soviet powers of the world reaction. The campaign of incitement carried on by all imperialist and white guardist groupings in Shanghai, Hongkong and other centres of the colonial policy in China, and the undoubted instigation from London, which was corroborated by the hymns of praise in the British press, played an almost decisive role in the outbreak of the events. British imperialist reaction was the most important driving force in the Canton slaughter and in the violence, murders and expulsions of the citizens of the Soviet Union.

The toilers of the Soviet Union mourn the tragic death of those comrades who have been tortured to death by the hangmen and garroters from the ranks of the counter-revolution in South China. However, the blood of these martyrs has not flown in vain. A people of four hundred millions cannot be indefinitely held up on the way to its emancipation, and the clique of militarists who from the leaders of the national movement have become its suppressors, will be swept away. The freed Chinese people will not forget its friends from the Soviet Union who were murdered by the oppressors of the Chinese people. Their memory and the joint bloodshed of the two great peoples will bind the two States indissolubly together.

In the unheard-of and atrocious crimes of the Chinese counter-revolutionaries and the forces behind them, the government of the Soviet Union sees an attack upon the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union which unswervingly pursues a policy of peace and non-aggression which was expressed in the proposals for disarmament at the conference in Geneva, is at the same time prepared for the worst and will not let itself be taken by surprise. In the name of the Soviet government, the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs protest before the whole world against the atrocities of the Chinese counter-revolution. The Soviet government reserves to itself the right to take any measures in connection with the bloody atrocities committed against the Soviet Union, which may seem fit. These bestial atrocities shall not go unpunished."

Appeal of the International Red Aid.

To All Workers! To all Progressive Intellectuals of the World!

The Telegraph brings every day appalling news of the insane fury of the white reaction in China.

The hangmen of the Chinese people want to surpass their imperialist instructors, they want to annihilate in streams of blood by wholesale shootings, in the flames of heaps of ruins all the champions for the freedom the Chinese people.

Canton, for which the working people of South China fought, has now become the scene of an unprecedented terror. Hundreds and thousands of workers and peasants are being shot, strangled or burnt alive on the slightest suspicion of resisting the infamous plans of the corrupt generals to hand over the country to the imperialists. The thousands of murdered and horribly mutilated victims are being joined by thousands

of fresh victims, while the foreign imperialists render every assistance in this bestial crushing of the advanced workers and peasants of China.

The Executive of the International Red Aid calls upon all workers, all progressive intellectuals to protest energetically and immediately. Brotherly solidarity with the working people of China and powerful remonstrance against the executioners who are dripping with blood must call a halt to the lust for blood in order to prevent still further thousands of workers and peasants and intellectuals from being shot down, strangled and cruelly tortured.

Organise immediately material assistance in order that thousands of women and children can be saved from torture, mishandling and starvation!

All workers, all lovers of freedom must raise their voice in defence of the working people of China and prevent the governments of the imperialist Powers from actively supporting the Chinese counter-revolution, sending punitive expeditions in order to convert the region of South China into a bloody mortuary for the workers and peasants of South China.

Down with the bloody terror of the Chinese militarists!

Away with counter-revolutionary intervention with the punitive expeditions!

Honour to the martyrs of the emancipatory struggles of the workers and peasants of China!

Long live the solidarity of the workers of the whole world with the Chinese workers and peasants in the fight against imperialism!

The Executive of the International Red Aid.

POLITICS

Comrade Stalin on the Forgeries of the American Press.

Moscow, 18th December 1927.

To-day's Moscow press publishes the following declaration of Comrade Stalin to the representatives of the foreign press in Moscow with reference to the forged "Stalin Article":

It is hardly necessary today to refute the forgers of the "New York American", the "Wide World News" or the "Anglo-American Newspaper Service" who set all sorts of canards in the world about non-existent "articles of Stalin", about the "air forces" of the Soviet Union, about the "reconciliation of the Soviet power with the Orthodox Church", about "the return of the oil lands to the capitalists" etc. There is no necessity to refute their canards for the simple reason that these gentlemen expose themselves in the press as professional forgers. It is sufficient to look at the "explanations" of these gentlemen which have appeared recently in the press, in which they seek to justify their deceptions, in order to see that these people are not press representatives, but press bandits.

However, at the request of the press representatives, I am prepared to declare: I have never even seen any Mr. Goffrey, nor any other representative of the foreign press to whom, it is alleged, I gave the interview. In the course of the last year I have given no interview whatever, either to this gentleman or to any other representative of the foreign press. I have spoken neither in the Presidium of the Moscow Soviet, nor in the Moscow Committee about the "return of the oil lands" in the Soviet Union to the capitalists, or about the "orthodox church" or about the "air forces of the Soviet Union". I have issued no article or notices of any sort in this connection to the press.

The gentlemen from the "New York American", the "Wide World News" and the "Anglo-American Newspaper Service" deceive their readers by saying that there was no denial of the article at the time. The forged articles about the "air forces" and about the "Orthodox Church" became known at the end of 1927 in Moscow and were exposed by the Peoples Commissariat for Foreign Affairs as falsehoods and at the same

time the representative of the "Associated Press" in Moscow, Reswick was informed. Upon the basis of the information given to him, Reswick wired on the 1st December to the "Associated Press":

"To-day I was told in the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs that the question of prosecution against the "New York American" and the Hurst papers was being considered in order to put an end to the publication of the articles with Stalin's signature. The authorities object particularly to a notice of the "New York American" of the 6th November entitled "Utilisation of the Church in support of the Soviets" which was allegedly a secret report of Stalin in a session of the Moscow Presidium. According to the statements of the foreign commissariat, this notice is pure and simple invention. Reswick."

Was this telegram printed? And if not, why not? Perhaps because the publication of this telegram of Reswick would have stopped the sources of income of the American-Hungarian or Hungarian-American Korda. It is not the first time that the "New York American" has attempted to earn money by the fabrication of "interviews" which were never given and "articles" by Stalin. I know for instance, that in June 1927, the "New York American" published a false interview with Stalin given allegedly to a certain Cecil Winchester in connection with the "breach with Gt. Britain", on the retreat from the world revolution, about the search of the "Arcos" building etc. The Press Cuttings Bureau "Argus" proposed at the time that I should confirm the genuineness of the interview and become its client. As I did not doubt for a moment but that the whole matter was a swindle, I addressed myself at the time to the New York "Daily Worker" with the following denial:

"Dear Comrades, The Press Cuttings Bureau 'Argus' has sent me a clipping from the "New York American" of the 12th June 1927 containing an interview which I allegedly gave to a certain Cecil Winchester. I declare that I have never seen such a person and that I gave no such interview either to him or to any one else, and that I have no relations whatever with the "New York American". Unless the "Press Cuttings Bureau Argus" is a swindle agency, one must assume that it has been misled by swindlers having connections with the "New York American". Stalin, 11th July 1927".

However, despite this, the forgers of Korda's organisation continued their lying. What is the meaning of this swindle? What do Korda and his accomplices expect to achieve with their swindles? Perhaps a sensation? No, not this alone. Their aim is to destroy the effect caused by the declaration of the delegation of the Soviet Union in Geneva concerning complete disarmament. Will they achieve their aim? Certainly not. The forgery will be exposed, it is exposed already, and the truth will remain. The truth is however that the Soviet Union is the only country in the world which is pursuing a real policy of non-aggression and peace, the Soviet Union is the only country in the whole world which has honestly raised the question of a real disarmament. The fact that the agents of capitalism are compelled in their struggle against the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union, to accept the assistance of various doubtful persons and press bandits, this circumstance demonstrates best of all the moral power and the fundamental strength of the position which the delegation of the Soviet Union took up in Geneva.

Signed: Stalin.

Intensification of the Situation in Austria.

By Willi Schlam m (Vienna).

A Red Front Fighters' League is in the process of formation in Austria. A preparatory National Congress took place in Vienna on December 11th which was attended by social democratic and communist functionaries and bore witness to the fact that the mass organisation which is coming into being is the result of a mass initiative arising from the inevitable necessities of actual class war. Five hundred and twenty functionaries

who had been invited by the proposing committee attended the Congress, amongst them 176 members and functionaries of the Social Democratic party and of the Social Democratic Defence Corps. An official delegation of the German Red Front Fighters' League brought the greetings of the revolutionary proletariat of Germany to the Austrian brother organisation which is being established among enthusiastic acclamation on the part of the Congress.

The social democratic workers and the functionaries of the Defence Corps rose one after the other in the course of the discussion in order to welcome the creation of the R. F. F. L. and to declare that he himself and the corresponding members of the Defence Corps wanted to join the super-party revolutionary fighting organisation. All resolutions were passed unanimously, the provisional management — consisting of communists and social democrats — was confirmed unanimously; it was further resolved upon that propaganda should be begun at once on a large scale and that the first regular National Congress should be convoked on January 21st 1928.

With this preparatory congress, with the foundation of the Austrian Red Front Fighters' League the greater part of the big balance of July 15th has been drawn. The Austrian proletariat, which is directly threatened by the danger of Fascism and which has, more suddenly and shamefully than ever before, been deserted by the Austro-Marxist leaders, is now beginning to check its flight before the class enemy and to collect round the Red Flag.

The social democratic catchword of the defensive capacity of the proletariat took its origin in Austria. The social democratic "Republican Defence Corps" became the social democratic pattern of that organised defensive capacity in a large number of countries.

In the first year after the overthrow of the Government, when it existed in the form of the Labour Guard (stewards organisations), it had, as a matter of fact, a certain revolutionary significance.

In the course of time, however, the Austro-Marxists succeeded in taking possession of the Labour Guard just as it understood how to get the Labour councils into their hands. They used the ill-famed tactics of taking the lead in order to break the wings of the movement. The decisive task which the Austro-Marxists set themselves when they "took over" the revolutionary organs, was that of purging them systematically of all the revolutionary elements, consequently above all of the Communists.

Systematic action with a view to disarming the Labour Guards was started. That disarmament was achieved partly with the help of the interallied military commissions, partly with malicious craftiness. Everyone will certainly bear in mind how the last remnants of the weapons in the Vienna arsenal were, by their own free will, handed over to the counter-revolutionary Government by the socialist democratic leaders.

The workers did not become fully conscious of what had happened until they were roused by an event of such importance as the July revolt in Vienna.

On that occasion, the Defence Corps proved to be an auxiliary troop of the police in restoring "peace and order".

There was no coming back on it. In spite of all their futile attempts to continue their hypocrisy, historical development compelled the Defence Corps to show its true features more and more clearly. It had always been closely linked up with organisations such as the "Reichsbanner", refusing to make common cause with the R. F. F. L. of Germany whilst pretending to be a Left, proletarian organisation. On July 16th and ever since that time, facts have proved that the "Defence Corps" is not one jot "different" from the "Reichsbanner" etc. On 16th October a Conference of the Republican Defence Corps dealt with the lessons of July 15th. That conference of paid secretaries of the "Defence Corps" approved of the policy of July 15th and reorganised the "Defence Corps" with a view to continuing that policy. The "Defence Corps" was systematically curtailed; today it hardly embraces 5 per cent. of the workers of Austria who are organised in trade unions. None but the most reliable, the most faithful partisans of the leading body of the Social-Democratic party Executive are allowed to be members of the Defence Corps. They must take an oath upon the bourgeois

Republic, upon the Social Democratic party and upon the unquestioned carrying out of any orders issued by the party leaders against whomsoever they may be directed. Since July 15th, thousands of workers have been expelled from the Defence Corps because they did not renounce their class consciousness. The leaders of the Defence Corps are nominated from above, without any exception; no meetings of the members are taking place nowadays. To put it briefly, the Defence Corps has been transformed into a body of praetorians of the social democratic leaders which, as a reserve troop of the State apparatus, is admittedly intended for the only purpose of nipping in the bud any expression of proletarian fighting initiative, and that with all the means at its disposal. To all this it should be added that the management of the Defence Corps is sharing in Renner's policy of "internal disarmament" and in the coalition.

The Austrian Red Fighters Front League has thus taken its origin in the splitting activity, the cowardly policy of capitulation and coalition, in the recognition of the true rôle played by the Defence Corps. Its intention is to become the mass organisation of the Austrian proletariat in its fight against Fascism and against the danger of war, and it will carry out this plan to the end. Closely allied with the R. F. F. L. of Germany, it is already now supported by the sympathy of the broad masses of Austrian workers. Its development cannot be checked.

The last means tried to prevent it, have been piteously wrecked. Frey, the adventurer and Menshevik, the friend of Maslov and Ruth Fischer and leader of the Trotzkyist branch in Austria, tried in great haste, to "found" an R. F. F. L. In a meeting called to that purpose, the revolutionary workers of Vienna however, sent him about his own business in such a manner that his adherents — numbering sixteen altogether — left the room in a flight. The "4th International" can certainly not set any hopes on Austria...

The Austrian R. F. F. L. started its active propaganda among the masses immediately after the preparatory National Congress. The Red front of Austria is falling into line!

THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

Communist Successes in Scottish Miners' Union.

By J. K. Campbell (London).

The recent results of the elections in the Fife mining area in Scotland illustrate the growing influence of the Communist Party over the Scottish miners. Seven posts were open for election, two permanent officials (or agents) and five representatives from the Fife miner's Union to the Scottish Miners' Executive. The results of a series of ballot votes, in which the majority of the workers participated, show that two Communists have been elected to the permanent officials' posts and four Communists and one Left-winger to the post of Fife representatives on the Scottish Executive.

This result is due to a very considerable extent to the excellent work performed by the Party in this area during the miners' lockout, when the actual leadership of the workers in the struggle was in the hands of the Communist Party and sympathetic left-wing workers, the right-wingers cutting no figure in the struggle at all.

The voting for those posts commenced last June, and during the close of the first vote the right-wing launched their usual attacks on the Communists for faction work and intrigue within the Union. A copy of a Communist fraction circular containing instructions to delegates attending the County Monthly Delegate Meeting was circulated and it was claimed that this circular showed quite clearly that the Communists were obeying the dictates of a political party and not the dictates of the rank and file of the Union. The various questions raised by the circular were, however, questions in which the miners themselves were interested and of which they approved. So far from the production of this circular having a bad effect it helped the Party, inasmuch as it showed that the Party representatives were working in an organized fashion to carry

through the policy on which they were elected. The result of the first vote that was taken showed that the Communists headed the list of votes for the two permanent officials, and three Communists headed the list for the five posts on the Scottish Executive.

At this stage it was decided that the Party vote should be transferred from the Party member having the lowest votes amongst the five who were standing for Executive posts, to the Left-wingers and a new list went forward for the Executive consisting of four party members and one left-winger. This list received considerable votes in the second ballot but not sufficient to get them elected. In the third ballot the results showed that the Communists had been elected for the two permanent officials' positions and that the complete Communist and left-wing list had been elected as representatives on the Scottish Executive.

The right-wing has at the moment however, a slight majority on the Monthly Delegate Meeting of the Fife Miners' Union itself, and under the influence of the General Secretary of that Union, Mr. W. Adamson, M. P. Secretary for Scotland in the MacDonald Government in 1924, the Fife Miners Monthly Delegate Meeting refused to declare the Communists and Left-Wingers elected, because they had engaged in a campaign during the time that the vote was being taken. After considerable argument at this meeting it was agreed by a considerable majority to submit the question to the Branches as to whether the results of the ballot vote should be accepted. Meantime those results were not declared and no-one knew officially which side had actually come out on top. The belief of the right-wing was that the Branches would vote in favour of annulling the ballot owing to the propaganda that had been indulged in by the Right-wing. The result gave the Right-wing the surprise of their lives. No less than 48 Branches decided that the ballot should be accepted and only 6 votes against. Amongst the 48 Branches which voted in favour of the ballot being accepted there were quite a number of right-wing Branches who generally always voted against the Communist Party. Thus the workers in Fife have not only declared in favour of Communists and Left-Wingers fighting on a straight left-wing programme, but they have also declared against attempts to refuse recognition to democratic decisions, which attempts might have led to the splitting of the Union. The results in Fife will hearten the C. P. G. B. in its struggles to win over a majority of workers in the mine-fields.

Labour Movement in Portugal.

By Claro (Lisabon).

In Portugal the Fascists are in control today. The present Government is supported by the worst reactionary groups in the country. Last year the military clique overthrew the democratic Republic and crushed the resistance of the working class. In the labour movement at that time, which was led by the Anarcho-Socialists there was, unfortunately, a tendency that the working class should remain neutral to the impending coup d'etat. The R. I. L. U. adherents told the workers that if the reactionary military party won it would only worsen the position of the working class. The workers were urged to struggle against the plans of the reactionaries.

To-day the working class stands convinced of the truth of this position. One of the immediate factors leading up to the coup d'etat last year was the question of the tobacco monopoly which was then terminating. The large capitalist tobacco company which was seeking necessary "elbow room" for its industry initiated this State Revolution. The victory of the Fascist party was largely due to the fact that the Labour Movement was divided and unable to resist the Fascists unitedly.

The economic position of the country to-day is extremely bad. Unemployment is widespread. The Government is endeavouring to get a foreign loan, but the leaders of the old Constitutional Parties who were exiled, whose most prominent representative Alphonso Costa is freely admitted in the League of Nations, are doing their best to prevent such a loan being granted.

The Portuguese Dictators are in close and intimate connections with the Government of Prima de Rivera of Spain. The Portuguese and the Spanish Governments have signed an agreement to struggle jointly against the revolutionary movement, against the Communist and the Red International of Labour Unions. The famous League to fight against the Third International is much supported by the Portuguese authorities, while the special police it has created to fight against Bolshevism received unlimited powers to arrest and deport all "suspected" elements.

The working class took an active part in the revolution that broke out in February last to overthrow the Fascist Government of General Carmona and to set up a Democratic Republic. However, this rising was sternly repressed; the Government carried out widespread persecutions and deportations of the workers. The General Confederation of Labour was disbanded because it participated in the rebellion, while "A Batalya", its organ, was likewise closed down. Many trade unions, as for example the Water Transport Workers' Union, were dispersed, and active trade union militants were arrested.

In order to get over the prejudices which the Portuguese workers have imbibed long years of Anarcho-sindicalist propaganda, the adherents of the R. I. L. U. have to carry on much stubborn work. It must be said that the absence of Marxist literature in the Portuguese language seriously handicaps these activities. "A Internationale", the organ of the Executive Committee of the R. I. L. U. adherents movement, was closed down by the Censor.

The Water Transport Workers' Federation which previously upheld the position of the R. I. L. U. has now withdrawn its support. This was due to the fact that many of the foremost trade union militants were forced to leave the Federation owing to repressions, while the leadership has been taken over by Jose Almeida, an inveterate opportunist and supporter of the Amsterdam International, who even attended the International Labour Conference in Geneva as a "Delegate from the Portuguese workers". The R. I. L. U. adherents, however, hope to increase the activities of the revolutionary opposition inside the Water Transport Workers' Federation.

A Congress of all the Lisbon Trade Unions was held in 1926. The revolutionary Independent Trade Unions also attended. Although the R. I. L. U. adherents were deprived of a decisive voice at this Congress, their point of view on the necessity of trade union unity gained the support of the majority and a T. U. Unity Committee was duly organised by the Independent Unions. All the trade unions supporting the Red International of Labour Unions have joined the Committee.

THE WHITE TERROR

A Fresh Pogrom against the Trade Unions of Bulgaria.

Sofia, December 8th 1927.

The Congress of the Independent Trade Unions of Bulgaria recently took place in that country. The course it took is a proof of the fresh strengthening of the Bulgarian proletariat. The Congress aroused and excited the reaction which as soon as the Conference was over started a campaign for annihilating the whole independent trade union movement throughout the country. A regular pogrom against all the trade unions in almost every town has already been undertaken. In the town of Rustchuk for instance, all the members of the local Trades Council (nine persons) were arrested and domiciliary visits made even at the time when the Congress was still sitting. The members of the Trades Council were kept under arrest a whole week.

On November 23rd, the secretary of the Trades Council of the town of Shumla was arrested, the archives of all the trade unions were confiscated and the trade union premises sealed, an occasion on which seven trade union functionaries were arrested.

On November 24th, the trade union chief organ "Edinstvo" (Unity) was confiscated while it was still in the press, because it contained the resolutions of the Congress.

On December 1st an army of police and criminalist detectives entered the trade union premises in Sofia, searched all those who were present (more than 150 workers), arrested more than 30 persons and beat a large number of them in a cruel manner. The police demolished all the cupboards and shelves, possessed themselves of the archives of both the C. C. of the Unity Trade Union League and those of the centres of all the various craft unions, further of the archives of the Trades Council of Sofia, of the local trade union organisations and of the whole editorial material together with the collection of books of the trade union central organ "Edinstvo".

The material damage caused by the raid, and the objects forcibly seized amount in Sofia alone to 30,000 leva (1 dollar = 38 leva).

The trade union building and the trade union office were sealed.

In the same brutal way, the trade union premises of the town of Stara Zagora and Chaskovo were raided, searched and sealed on December 2nd.

On December 3rd, the same incident happened in the town of Plovdiv, Vidin and Jambol, on December 7th in the town of Stanimaka and Gor. Orechoviza.

Raids, domiciliary visits and arrests are still taking place in all the towns of the country.

A large number of workers throughout the country have been arrested and ill-treated. The number of persons who have been arrested cannot yet be ascertained, as fresh arrests are still taking place. Any trade union activity, both within the organisation and in public has been prohibited by the police.

The Liapcheff Government wants in this way to annihilate the Independent Trade Unions of Bulgaria in order thus to ensure for themselves and for the capitalists a time of respite in preparation for their campaign against the working class.

The Government Press and the Fascist Press are zealously carrying on a furious campaign of provocation and calumny in order to provide for themselves the justification to declare the trade unions as being outside the law.

They use the following "arguments" in order to achieve that end: the class character of the trade union movement, the fact that comrades of other countries are attending the Congress, i. e. Hais, the representative of the revolutionary trade unions of Czechoslovakia and Simonin, the representative of the Unitarian Trade Unions of France, further the telegram of greetings to the Congress by the A. U. C. T. U. and by the R. I. L. U., and the telegram to the A. U. C. T. U. sent in reply by the Congress on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Russian Revolution etc.

This campaign of reaction and Fascism against the class-conscious trade union movement is, to its full extent, approved of and supported by the Social Democracy and by the Reformists.

The true reason of the pogrom against the trade union movement is that the Government and the capitalists will not tolerate a class-conscious trade union movement which is capable of fighting.

The working class of Bulgaria however is firmly determined to defend its independent organisations with all its might. Numerous telegrams are being received from all parts of the country, addressed to the Government, to the Parliament and to the Press in protest against the pogrom organised by the Fascist Government against the trade unions. Both the organised workers and those outside the organisation are rising for the protection of the I. T. U. L.

The Bulgarian proletariat, in its hard struggle, is counting on the support of the international proletariat and is firmly convinced that it will receive that support, as has been the case hitherto.

FOR LENINISM — AGAINST TROTZKYISM

Resolution of the Politbureau of the C. P. of Italy on Trotzky's and Zinoviev's Expulsion from the C. P. S. U.

The fractional activity of the Opposition carried on by Trotzky and Zinoviev within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, has become more and more violent since October 1926, i. e. since the oppositional leaders declared that "they considered the decisions of the 14th Party Congress, of the C. C. and of the C. C. C. as absolutely binding" and that they submitted to them "without reservation" and — as was inevitable — finally led to the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev and of a group of other comrades from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and from the Communist International.

That severe measure applied against the leaders of the Opposition, whose names are partly indissolubly linked with the glorious history of the revolution, was dictated by the dire necessity of defending the organisatory unity of the Party of the proletarian dictatorship, the Party which is the vanguard and the leader of world revolution.

The organisatory unity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is absolutely necessary in the defence of the first proletarian State and of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, and is a guarantee for the victorious development of the revolution in the other countries.

The defence of the organisatory unity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union cannot, however, be regarded as a formal and superficial necessity; it is, on the contrary, a consequence of the recognition of the correctness of the policy of the C. C. of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union both in the domain of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and in the leadership of the Comintern.

The Opposition Bloc displayed an absolute lack of principles. In all the fundamental questions of the Soviet Union's existence, the Opposition was not able to oppose any serious, concrete solutions to the policy of the C. C. of the Party, but was talking at random expressing criticism which were confused and full of contradictions and only showed their confusion and their disbelief in the capability of the Russian proletariat to build up socialism.

In the same way as in the domain of Russian politics, the Opposition revealed its complete ignorance in the field of international politics. The Opposition have ten times changed their views in the questions of stabilisation, of trade union unity, of the revolution in China, thus showing that they have no views at all. The Opposition pointed out the defeats which occurred at various sections of the front of the world revolution and used them as arguments for combating the C. C. of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the leadership of the Comintern instead of examining, by analysing the situation more thoroughly, whether or not the tactics of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern are correct.

The Opposition believed that they possessed the means for applying the strange theory of "permanent victory" and began to gather all the waste material and the refuse of the Comintern, all those who were guilty of an absurd militarist and pseudo-Leninist internal regime and of an ideological parching of the Communist Parties (a regime which the Comintern is now struggling to overcome and to correct) and are now trying to introduce them to the international proletariat as the pioneers of the demand for the "Leninist defence".

The Politbureau of the Communist Party of Italy declares that the whole of the Communist Party of Italy, is reacting like one man to the ideological and political demands of the Opposition and to their attempts to disintegrate the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern.

The relative stabilisation of capitalism which is characteristic of the present period of which it may be said that it lies between two victorious revolutionary waves is, on the one hand, multiplying and intensifying the deadly contradictions of capitalism and is, on the other hand, developing all the elements of defence of the ruling class. During this period, counter-revolu-

tion is turning to account any differences which arise in the Party of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to penetrate into the gaps which may result from such differences, to enlarge them and to split the united Bloc of the Leninist Party.

In a situation of this kind, any attempt on the organisatory unity of the Party is a crime against the revolution.

The leaders of the Opposition, who took up an openly hostile position against the Party and carried on a fight even outside the Party among the non-party masses and among the petty bourgeois intellectualists, placed the problem of power. In the country of the proletarian dictatorship, this problem, however, is identical with unchaining civil war, with counter-revolution. This is the reason why, in all countries, the bourgeoisie, Social Democracy, the Russian Monarchists and Mensheviks, the anarchists and those who have been excluded from the Communist International, are manifesting their sympathy for Trotzky, Zinoviev and their companions. The Opposition is backed by counter-revolution as a whole.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has waited two years for the oppositional comrades to return to the Leninist discipline; instead of doing so they struck out on adventurous paths by trying to organise various small groups of those who had been excluded from the International, of the anti-Communist calumniators of Soviet Russia. They tried to disintegrate the Communist Parties by handing over to the enemy the secret documents of the Party and of the State. They even tried to organise a public counter-demonstration in Moscow on the tenth anniversary of the October revolution.

The Politbureau of the Communist Party of Italy gives expression to its absolute solidarity with and unreserved consent to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in the name of the Italian Party. The Politbureau of the C. P. of Italy is convinced that, in expressing its solidarity with the vast brother party which is at the head of the first proletarian State, it is giving expression to the feelings of the Italian proletariat. No class-conscious Italian worker will ever forgive an attempt made on the unity of the C. P. of the Soviet Union and on the Soviet Power, or the revolutionary inheritance being squandered, that inheritance which the Russian workers, under the lead of the Leninist Party have understood how to multiply in order to put it at the disposal of the world proletariat.

The Politbureau of the Communist Party of Italy holds the view that every Communist Party should help the C. P. of the Soviet Union in the fight which the latter is forced to carry on against the Opposition. The Russian revolution and the Soviet State belong to the proletariat of the whole world, and the proletariat of the whole world should be entrusted with its defence.

The help which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union wants cannot be restricted to "declarations of solidarity"; that help ought to be and intends to be a support of the policy of the proletarian State by the world proletariat, a support which can only be substantiated by a wide-spread critical information on the problems of the Soviet State, of the Communist International.

Only if this is done, the fight against the Opposition and against all those who are not in solidarity with the latter, will, in the last instance, serve the purpose of making the comrades of our Party and of the international proletariat more capable for class policy; the solidarity with the C. C. of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will then be even firmer and more active.

The Platform shows immediately that the Opposition says nothing new and nothing that was not already made known in its fundamental features by the publications of the Russian Party and of the Comintern.

In order to set up this "Platform" — on which there have worked such diverse personalities as Trotzky and Zinoviev, Rakovsky and Kamenev — at all, the Opposition resorts at the outset to a concealment of facts; in the introduction it is stated:

"During the years which have elapsed since the death of Lenin, we have endeavoured again and again to call the attention of the central organs of the Party as a whole to the fact that, thanks to false leadership, the danger pointed out by Lenin has increased many times over: the machine is not going in the direction where the interests of the workers and peasants require it."

In the "false leadership" there took part two years after Lenin's death Zinoviev and Kamenev, against whom Trotzky made an onslaught; and Zinoviev and Kamenev were the chief spokesmen in the fight against Trotzkyism. At the conclusion of the Platform, Zinoviev, Kamenev and — Trotzky assert:

"It is false to say that we defend Trotzkyism."

But in the previously quoted sentence Zinoviev and Kamenev defend Trotzkyism; in fact they expressly associate themselves with it and even maintain that they have had an active share in it since the death of Lenin.

In another chapter (on the Party) the authors of the Platform again declare all attacks upon Trotzkyism to be wrong.

"For months and years there has been proceeding a poisonous polemic against the views of the Bolsheviki who are designated as the "Opposition".

One would like to ask who were the chief spokesmen of this poisonous polemic? Were they not Zinoviev and Kamenev?

The authors of the Platform themselves realise this glaring contradiction and endeavour to wipe it out with a phrase:

"We refuse... to 'cloak' the views of the Opposition which are represented in the Platform by pointing to former differences which existed between the groups of the years 1923 and 1925... The errors and exaggerations which were permitted by both groups of the Bolsheviki in the disputed questions in the years 1923 and 1924 as a result of a number of unclear conceptions regarding the state of affairs in the Party and the country, are now corrected."

A perfect example of diplomatic concealment! But the workers would like to know what "errors" in 1923/1924 were committed or "permitted" by both sides, that is by Zinoviev's side too. Who permitted them? How is it possible that such leaders who came forward so self-confidently at that time, just as they do to-day, could misjudge that "state of affairs".

The "correction" of the "errors" and "exaggerations" consists in that Zinoviev and Kamenev to-day stand wholly and entirely on the basis of a Trotzkyism that has become even more gross since 1923. That is what they call "not defending Trotzkyism", and at the same time adopt today, in all questions that were under discussion in 1923, precisely the same attitude as Trotzky (relation to the peasantry, rate and means of industrialisation, formation of groups and Party discipline). They must credit us with having memories as bad as that which Zinoviev and Kamenev possess with regard to their own past if they expect that we shall allow ourselves to be "taken in" by such phrases of the platform.

These few remarks on the political "character" of the authors of the Platform were necessary in order to characterise the superficiality with which these authors proceed to their criticism.

How do they criticise?

The Platform begins with a quotation from Lenin on the development of the Soviet Union. But when one compares the penetrating, critical attitude of Lenin with regard to Russian Party or the Soviet Union at any time with the Platform of the Opposition, which gives itself the pretentious title of "Leninist-Bolsheviki", one immediately perceives the tremendous difference that exists between him and the "Leninist-Bolsheviki".

The Platform of the Opposition.

By Ernst Meyer (Berlin).

The Opposition repeatedly asserts that were its views but known, then the masses would declare themselves in favour of them. Besides the counter-theses there now lies before us the Platform of the group of "Leninist-Bolsheviki", and all comrades can now ascertain for themselves whether the Opposition has really been unjustly dealt with. An examination of

With Lenin there is a thorough class analysis, a comprehensive presentation of the facts, clear, sober encouragement of the Party — with the **Opposition**, one-sided carping criticism, illusionist proposals, defeatist mood, profoundest mistrust of the Party.

Of the seventy pages of the Platform, scarcely more than seven lines are devoted to the successes of the Soviet Union; everything else is criticism and again criticism of the most malicious and demagogic sort.

Here also the authors conceal the former differences between the two "1923 and 1925 groups", i. e., between the old and the new Trotskyists. Trotsky, who already in 1924 prophesied the decay of the Soviet Union and was sternly called to account for doing so by Zinoviev and Kamenev and threatened with expulsion from the Party, gives his signature, together with Zinoviev and Kamenev, to the following sentence:

"After the two years, in the course of which the Stalin group has practically determined the policy of the central organ of the Party, it can be considered as completely proved that the policy of this group was incapable of taking precautions etc."

Here again it is intended by mutual indulgence and silence to conceal the differences existing among the authors.

In the Platform all the defeats of the Labour Movement are simply ascribed to the policy of Stalin: in most cases without the slightest attempt to prove responsibility. Only people who have no conception of the role of the Party can speak in such a way. What would Zinoviev say if anybody tried to cast on him the responsibility for the events in Germany in 1921 and 1923, in Reval and in Bulgaria? But in the same way, according to the Platform, every actual or alleged weakening of the foreign political situation of the U. S. S. R. is a consequence of wrong policy. As if the capitalist States had not had any development since 1923 and as if there had not been any conflicts with imperialist States before 1923, for example no war with Poland (1920)!

How demagogic is the Opposition and how much it reckons on a lack of criticism on the part of the reader is further shown by the way it compares an agrarian country like Russia with highly developed industrial countries: "The consumption of coal will (in Russia in the year 1931) be seven times less than that in Germany in 1926, about seventeen times less than that in the United States of America; the consumption of pig-iron will be fourteen times less than in Germany and 11½ times less than in the United States of America".

When on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution one presents such a thoroughly pessimistic plan, it means that one is really working against Socialism.

Here there is employed as a measure of the work of socialist construction not the efforts of the working population of Russia; here no account is taken of the resistance of the capitalist environment and the backwardness of industry in Russia, due to Tsarism and the civil war; here, precisely according to the pattern of the capitalists and social traitors, the industrial development of two of the most powerful capitalist States is compared with the painfully struggling Soviet Union.

This hostile attitude dominates the entire Platform. Everywhere there is only talk of the tardy progress and the shortcomings. All objective resistance and difficulties disappear behind the accusation of a false policy. It is no wonder therefore that the Russian working class, which has to carry on its shoulders all the difficulties of construction and which has experienced all the deprivations of former years, has rejected with indignation the criticism of the Opposition. The small and diminishing opposition vote, originating mainly from intellectual circles, which as a result of the retrenchment in the bureaucratic apparatus are being discharged, and from the ranks of unskilled unemployed streaming in from the village, who have not yet passed through the Marxist school of the life of an industrial worker.

The nature of the criticism is on a par with the proposals of the Opposition. Their tendency is, without paying regard to possibilities, so to develop industry that in the next few

years it shall catch up to such capitalist States as the United States, which has behind it a century of industrial development; as if Socialism was a kind of magic! For this purpose the whole policy of the Party and the State, in town and country, shall be directed towards the most speedy liquidation of the NEP, and the "energetic abandonment of the orientation towards an isolated socialist development". In order to veil this monstrous idea, which would entail the shattering of the alliance between the workers and the peasantry and the realisation of which would endanger the whole proletarian State, the Opposition only speaks of cutting away the excrescences of the NEP. At the same time the Opposition regards the NEP, itself as an "excrescence" and not, like Lenin, as a means for realising Socialism under the special conditions obtaining in Russia. If the "excrescences" are cut away in the way the Opposition desires, it will mean in the last resort to abolish the NEP, entirely, instead of, with the help of the NEP., systematically developing the socialist economic elements and ousting the capitalist elements.

The Opposition therefore demands on the one hand abolition of the NEP, and transition to a purely socialist economy, and on the other hand it declares itself to be against the "theory of isolated socialist development" or "of building up Socialism in one country". This classic contradiction shows the untenability of the whole argumentation of the Opposition. This leads to the Trotskyist theory of "closing a door in history", as at the time of Brest-Litovsk: rather perish than live by means of compromises. That sounds all very fine as a heroic phrase, but Lenin considered compromise to be necessary as a means of obtaining respite and to undertake new and more vigorous attacks. And the workers have more understanding for real politics and decide today, as then, for Lenin and against Trotsky.

The Platform shows further that its authors do not understand, or they forget the role of the Communist Party. It demands as a principle the right of organised action on the part of groups (fractions). The Platform demands the readmission of all the expelled members of the Opposition without regard to the content of their criticism and their demands and actions. Finally, the Platform makes use of that demagogic argument that the Party budget is too high and is based upon subventions, instead of only upon membership contributions. It is with this alleged democratic demand that Adolf Hoffman and Curt Geyer ended their treachery to the Comintern and the C. P. G. As if it would not be a matter of course and a pride for every Communist Party — instead of like all bourgeois and social democratic parties, to rely on help of capitalist money — to obtain support from the victorious Russian proletariat.

The same Opposition, which in the Platform as well as in all speeches and documents, allows itself to use most monstrous language which can only serve the enemies of the Soviet Union and of the Comintern, raises the sanctimonious demand:

"Polemics must be conducted in a strict comradesly and concrete manner, without bitterness and exaggerations".

At the same time the arguments of the Opposition exceed the hostility, maliciousness and distortions of those of the Communist Labour Party and of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. All the assertions regarding the alleged praise of Stalin by the bourgeoisie do not wipe out the fact that all the enemies of the Soviet Union are eagerly making use of the assertions of the Opposition.

The Opposition raises the claim to be the best defender of the Soviet Union. So soon, however, as it comes to a war of the imperialist States against the Soviet Union the Platform of the Opposition will form the chief argument of these States in the ideological fight against Soviet Russia. The bourgeoisie and its confederates are not quoting that which the leaders of the Opposition have written in the years 1918—1925, but what they have concocted since 1925. It is not the majority of the Party which forgets the services which certain members of the Opposition have rendered within the boundaries of the Party and of the Comintern; they themselves are causing their achievements to become things of the past. How could the revolutionary proletariat acquit the Opposition leaders on account of their former services, after they have taken the path of the enemies of the Soviet Power!

XV. PARTY CONGRESS OF THE C. P. S. U.

The International Position and the Tasks of the Communist International.

Report by Comrade BUCHARIN at the XV. Party Congress of the C.P.S.U.

(Detailed Report.)

I. QUESTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS AND THE CRISIS OF THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM.

It is a fact that is well-known to all of us that we are living in an epoch of wars and revolutions, an epoch, upon the whole, of the decay of the capitalist countries, although the curve of capitalist development in certain countries or groups of countries may be rising here and there. A certain "premonition" of this truth is even penetrating the minds of the most prominent representatives of bourgeois economic science, as e. g. Sombart.

Starting from such a general estimation of the situation of capitalism, we need yet not deny the fact of a partial stabilisation of the capitalist system. Indeed, it would be quite impossible to deny the existence of a whole series of sudden indications of business prosperity within the limits of this partial stabilisation. Undoubtedly an increase in production is noticeable. We cannot but recognise an extraordinary rapid technical reconstruction, especially in Germany. Similarly there is without doubt a — partial and temporary — political stabilisation in the main centres of the capitalist regime, effected in part with the aid of white terrorism, Fascism, and the destruction and extermination of the last remnants of democratic "liberty", and in part with the help of the Social Democratic parties, those main props of the capitalist system of the present day. But this partial stabilisation cannot conceal the fact, even to many bourgeois economists, that the epoch in general is one of the decay of capitalism, an age of progressive rot and dissolution. The partial stabilisation assumed various forms, which do not allow of a smooth progressive development of capitalist society. On the contrary, these forms are in themselves nothing but the outcome of the post-war crisis, and they embody such anomalies and suffer from such serious internal diseases that they are bound in their turn to produce further conflicts and crises. I shall stop to mention a few of these structural alterations in the edifice of capitalist economy.

In the first place, mention should be made of the shifting of the point of gravitation of economic life from Europe to America. I need but call to mind a series of well-known figures in regard to the United States. 60 per cent. of the world's steel output, 72 per cent. of the oil output, 53 per cent. of the copper production, 43 per cent. of the total of coal raised, and almost 20 million motor-cars out of the 24 millions of the total world's output, were produced in the United States, while more than half the total gold supply of the world is in American hands. This shifting of the point of gravitation to America involves a great number of additional difficulties for the capitalist regime and entails the danger of tremendous conflicts within world economy. Secondly, we have the decline of Great Britain. Great Britain has already become a country living on foreign investments, a huge parasite. Let me furnish some illustrations of this fact. In 1925 the profit from the entire British goods trade stood at 100 million pounds, the profit from capital exportation and other bank operations at 420 millions; in 1926, the year of the great strike, which shook the entire economic organism of the country to its foundations, the dividends of 1500 joint-stock companies figured at an average of 11.8 per cent., whereas in the preceding year, when there was no strike, the average dividend of the same companies was 10.5 per cent., or less than the dividend distributed

in the strike year. How can this phenomenon be explained, that the level of profit should not depend on the actual position of industry? The explanation is that British capital reaps its main profit not from industry but from the sale of the colonial raw materials, such as rubber, tea, and oil. Thus we see that Great Britain has turned into a parasite-country whose industrial enterprises, from its coal-mines downwards, are getting less and less profitable and whose exporting industry is experiencing a crisis, while the policy of large investments in industry has become impossible and there is no longer any basis for a technical reorganisation of industry. This decline in England is accompanied by chronic unemployment, which destroys all hopes of a reorganisation of British industry by means of capitalist methods. It is not unnatural that in such circumstances wide circles of the British bourgeoisie should entertain the idea of a wholesale removal of a section of the population to Australia, while Malthusianism is experiencing a revival.

Finally we must point out a whole series of contradictions in Central Europe, which have given rise to the well-known expression as to the "Balkanising of Europe". The point where all these European contradictions meet and intertwine is Germany, which in itself affords an example of almost all these anomalous circumstances. Germany, too, can point to a successful stabilisation such as no other country can record, and that in regard both to technics and to the organisation of capital. Thus initial costs have been greatly reduced and the competitive capacity of Germany on the international market has increased. On the other hand, the very same Germany is faced with serious difficulties and dangers arising from the Versailles distribution of the European continent.

Just at present the problem of the reparations payments has become very acute. The "Rheinisch-Westfälische Zeitung" of October 14th, 1927 states that no one in Germany knows how it will be possible to get 1250 million marks for reparations payments out of the new Budget.

Added to this, there is the question of the payment of interest on the State debts and of the actual indebtedness of Germany outside the reparations payments, which amounts, according to the calculations by the head of the Reichsbank, to 10,000 million marks. These payments render an increase in exportation essential, but Germany has a balance of payments which is even more adverse than was the case before the war, in which connection it must not be forgotten that the Germany of to-day is the mutilated Germany which was so greatly despoiled by the Versailles peace treaty. The contradiction between the capacity of German production and Germany's strength as a State are well illustrated by this small example. It must, moreover, be added, and this is a point of no small importance, that the class struggle arising from the further development of the stabilisation process and from the constantly increasing internal differences, is becoming more and more pronounced.

Germany is in this respect a classical example. Maximum achievements of stabilisation and at the same time the greatest possible difficulties undermining the said stabilisation. This is a good illustration of the present position. The stabilisation advances in forms which are the outcome of the war and post-war crises, and it is for this very reason, apart from a number of other facts, that the capitalist world presents such

a complicated aspect with such a tremendous number of internal quarrels and conflicts, inevitably involving other and yet greater conflicts and more and more serious conclusions. Added to all this, there are such "trifling" circumstances as the existence and development of the Soviet Union and the growth of the colonial movement in India, China, Farther India, etc., about which I shall have occasion to speak later on.

It is to be observed that of late the differences among the capitalist Powers have also been growing more pronounced. In the first place the differences between the European States and America. Secondly, also the differences which are particularly acute, between the capitalist States (before all Great Britain) and the Soviet Union. All this, again, entails among the capitalist States a tendency towards a control of economic life, a forced promotion of the process of concentration, and a centralisation of capital. I might sum this position up as follows: While on the one hand there is an accentuation of the conflicts among the capitalist State organisms in spite of all attempts at conciliation, this very development forces the bourgeoisie on the other hand to tighten the screws of a concentration and centralisation of capital within their individual countries. Or, again, in other words: At present the tendency of development is towards State capitalism under bourgeois dictatorship. I do not conceive this tendency in the sense of any important increase of the State functions of the bourgeoisie in the realm of economy, but yet there is a certain growth in the direction described. I have in mind the astounding growth, in post-war times in general and the last few years in particular, of the tendency towards the formation of great trusts (not mere syndicates or cartels, but pronounced trusts, i. e. the alliance of productive units of different types). The concentration and centralisation of economic life is advancing with seven-league boots. We might even affirm that there is taking place a "trustification of the State power itself", i. e. that the State power of the bourgeoisie is becoming more than ever dependent on the great and powerful capitalist concerns or combinations of concerns. There is a process of concrecence between the employers organisations and the State apparatus, though in the great majority of cases this process is not accompanied by any acquisition by the State of these "economic organs". Therefore we cannot yet speak of State capitalism in such a case. But there is a preparation for it, a tendency in that direction. As a matter of fact, this is not an altogether new phenomenon, though I must admit that as long as capitalism has existed these processes have never developed so far as is now the case, a fact which appears to me to be of great significance.

Let us take Germany as an example. In Germany 2500 millions out of the total 18,000 millions of share-capital of the joint-stock companies belong to the chemical trust and the steel trust, which latter controls two thirds of the steel output, "commands" the entire steel industry, and decides the political directives of the country.

The chemical trust has concentrated 80 per cent. of the entire chemical production in its own hands.

Four fifths of the output of electrical energy lies in the hands of the State. German industry has literally been wound into a single great knot, which is intimately connected with the home and foreign policy of the Government. This is one type of development, a type aiming at concentration and centralisation of capital, a type which shows the tendency of preparing for State capitalism.

Japanese economic life has to face no such complications as obtain in European countries. It is a characteristic fact, however, that there 30 per cent. of the industrial and banking capital, without even considering the railways, are immediate State property. Japanese imperialism is in irreconcilable opposition to the imperialism of the United States and Great Britain. Therefore, pressed from without, it strengthens the internal tendency in the direction of State capitalism. The fact that foreign political factors are forcing the capitalism of a whole number of countries in the direction of consolidation and organisation, is well illustrated by the example of Japan, which thus represents the second type of the fundamentally identical tendency.

As a third type we may take Italy. Here capitalism is undoubtedly developing into a curious form of State capitalism

and a special type of State power. What is the actual contents of the so-called "Magna Carta of Labour"? Mussolini calls it a "corporative State", which is ultimately nothing but the so-called "funcional democracy" of Otto Bauer. According to this theory, democracy consists of the representation of the different professions, classes, and groups, according to their function in social life. The employer conducts the work and gives orders, the worker works and obeys the employer, the consumer buys and the producer sells. If we take these different "functions", as Otto Bauer so delicately calls them, and their representation, we shall have, in his opinion, a peculiar non-Parliamentary type of State. The whole insipidity of Otto Bauer consists in the fact that he fails to solve the question of power or to decide the question as to whom this mechanism is to serve and who is to conduct it. But just that is the main thing. Mussolini has annulled Parliament, is building up his Fascist "corporative State", and would like even to recruit the workers for this task. He dissolves the proper trade unions and organises Fascist "trade unions", he places certain persons at their head, and then sets about building up his "corporative" State with the aid of "representative" delegations of the Chambers of Commerce, the industrial enterprises, the bankers, and the above-named Fascist trade unions. Seen from the standpoint of the economic tendencies, all this means nothing but a peculiar form of State capitalism, with State power controlling and developing capitalism. On the basis of a ruthless exploitation of the working class the policy of an industrialisation of Italy is to be effected. With the aid of the Fascist trade unions wages have been reduced, the working day prolonged, and "discipline" introduced into the works, while at the same time the prices of industrial goods are regulated. During the last two years the wages of the Italian workers have been constantly sinking and now figure at from 70 to 75 per cent. of the pre-war level. This is the foundation of the industrialisation of Italy. Here you have an example of the third type of tendency leading to State capitalism.

Finally I must make mention of the rather original form, we find in Austria, the form, if I may say so, of a "municipal capitalism". I have in mind the municipal enterprises in which the Social Democratic Party has so great an influence. These are the main types of this internal economic reorganisation, such as is in progress in the capitalist organisms of the most important countries.

Thus we have on the one hand a growth of the differences among the various capitalist States. On the other hand we see the further process of an organisation of capitalist forces within the countries, expressed in a tendency towards State capitalism. It is altogether absurd to draw the conclusion drawn by Hilferding, who completely exaggerates the process of the so-called organisation of capitalism within the countries and in doing so forgets the most important thing, viz. the class character of this process. He argues that the above-mentioned tendency is the transition to a state of capitalism devoid of all wars, etc. Just the opposite is the case. If the outer complications and conflicts favour this tendency towards the concentration of capitalist forces within the country, the comprehension of all capitalist forces in its turn will sharpen the conflicts among the capitalist States, since this development is naturally followed by increased competition and since it is accompanied by a growth of antagonisms in the establishment of adequate customs tariffs and so forth. Such an "organisatory" tendency brings with it "not peace but a sword".

This is not the expression of a peaceful "ultra-imperialism", which places on its head the peaceful nightcap of the League of Nations, but rather the expression of an aggravation of conflicts, leading inevitably to a catastrophe, the name of which is the "second round of war". The market problems are becoming more acute; likewise the problem of a fight against the Soviet Union. The pressure on the workers is increased. The danger of war was never so great as it is now. The State capitalist tendencies do not solve this problem but aggravate it. Conferences such as the disarmament conference are a pacifist fraud on the part of the Imperialists and Social Democrats. It is not worth our while to speak about it at our Party Congress. We have the prospect of further wars clearly before us. Such are the most characteristic traits of the new, or partly new facts which we have to record in regard to the relations of the capitalist States among themselves and of these States to the Soviet Union.

II. THE POSITION OF THE WORKING CLASS.

How does this development affect the position of the working class and how is it reflected therein?

If we take the level of wages as a criterion, we shall see that, except in the United States and some other oversea countries, the pre-war wage level has nowhere been reached. The position is as follows:

In Germany the real wages paid a skilled worker in July 1927 were 93 per cent. of pre-war, while the wages for unskilled labour were 100 per cent. of pre-war. According to other indications, the nominal wages for skilled labour in April 1927 stood at 135.8 per cent. and the index of prices at 146.4 per cent., so that from the standpoint of real wages there was a deficit.

In Great Britain the average wage is not more than 90 per cent. of the pre-war real wage. The loss is particularly great in the main industrial branches — textiles, coal, iron — with the prospect of a further decrease of wages. As regards France, in Paris wages at the end of 1926 were only in the case of compositors higher than in pre-war times, ranging in all other professions from 65 to 87 per cent. In Italy the workers are now in receipt of from 70 to 75 per cent. of the pre-war wages. In the United States there has been an average rise of wages of 30 per cent., for, as I already remarked, it is only in the oversea countries, and not in all of them either, that an increase in wages can be observed. But in the face of this average of 30 per cent., there are some tremendous discrepancies between various branches of production and various regions.

As to the attitude of the European capitalists, even where the pre-war wage level has not been regained, the present situation is considered altogether untenable and the necessity of a further reduction of the wage level is contemplated. There are, indeed, many "learned" economists, who openly advocate a further pressure on the working class.

Thus Professor Cassel gives utterance to a theory which is notorious for its insolence. He calls our age the age of monopolies. A monopoly, he says, is a very harmful thing, for it is only the free movement of men, money, and goods that can guarantee the greatest possible increase of productive forces. But now we have monopolies, and what monopolies too. We have employers' monopolies, says Cassel, which is very bad; but we have also monopolies of workers (trade unions), which is still worse. Now the trade unions, i. e. "monopolies" of the working class, are much stronger than the trusts, syndicates, etc., which represent the monopolies of the employers. Therefore, says this learned man, there is such a "use of violence" on the part of the working class and therefore wages are now so "high" as to entail all sorts of suffering and hardship. The main reason for unemployment, crises and the like, lies in Cassel's opinion in the high rate of wages! Hence unemployment. If lower wages were paid, more workers could be employed. And he suggests the destruction of the "inordinately great monopoly" of the working class and of the "excessive" wages.

This means: suppress and destroy those trade unions which exist; press yet harder on the wages and on the working day, without regard for such "achievements" as have been gained by the capitalist world in this respect.

The conclusion may therefore be drawn that a partial stabilisation of capitalism is in progress on the basis of greater exploitation of the workers; its champion is the trust form of capital; it rests on the presumption of the destruction of the workers' organisations. It is a significant fact that the formation of trusts and cartels is always accompanied by the creation of anti-strike funds.

Thus, in his book on the steel trust, Ufermann reports that in the course of a year 176 million marks pass through the hands of the European Steel Trust and that, according to paragraph 7 of the statutes, 4 dollars are paid for every ton of steel produced short of the stipulated quota, even in the case of a shortening of production by reason of a strike.

The report of a correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt", a Liberal bourgeois witness, on the conditions in the Leuna works confirms our conclusion that capitalist stabilisation and rationalisation really ensue at the cost of the working class by reason of its merciless exploitation.

It must be admitted, however, that German capital has succeeded in absorbing the unemployed to a considerable degree. This must be recognised. Unemployment was enormous

in Germany. No very long time ago it amounted to millions, some went back still to 100,000; at present it is well below that figure. The development of German industry has led to a sharp reduction of unemployment. In this respect there is vast difference between Germany and Great Britain, where unemployment has become stabilised and has remained at the level of more than one million, in which connection it should be pointed out that this total represents only industrial workers and not new comers from the open country.

III. THE COMPOSITION OF THE WORKING CLASS AND THE TYPES OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT.

By reason of the manifold nature of the present situation of capitalism in the various countries, we may observe different types of the labour movement and distinguish various methods employed by the bourgeoisie in order to control it. I should therefore like to say a few words as to the attempts made to "Americanise" the labour movement.

We have at present a virtual monopoly position of the United States in international economy, a position perhaps of greater significance than Great Britain ever occupied. Therefore the working class of the United States is still immeasurably more bound up with the American bourgeoisie than was formerly the case in Great Britain.

A glance at any small survey of wages will immediately show us what is here at issue. If we put the average real wages paid in London in 1925 at 100, we shall get the following figures for other important towns: Philadelphia 221, Paris 71, Rome 48, Warsaw 47, Prague 58, Brussels 57, Vienna 47 (Woitinsky: "The World in Figures"). The European average is thus between 40 and 50, the average in America 220! That is the proportion between this aristocracy of the international working class and the broad masses of the European workers. And if we take the wages of the Chinese coolie or of the worker in the African diamond fields, or any other colonial group of workers, it is obvious what a tremendous difference we should find between a coolie and an American worker. But even in America itself there are, as I have already remarked, different classes of the American proletariat, even official sources showing the difference, at times a very considerable one, between these individual groups.

On the one hand there is therefore within the proletariat of the United States a labour aristocracy and on the other hand the lowest grades of the working class, people who have become blunted and indifferent and are more or less in the condition of slaves. But these lowest grades of the working class consist of negroes and immigrants who were yet worse off in other countries before coming to America. As regards the negroes, they are even within the limits of the working class considered as second-rate citizens. The entire organisation of the working class is such, that the capitalists keep the workers in hand with the aid of certain groups among them.

The organised forces of the working class are so built up as to be opposed to any form of revolution. The total number of workers, without the employees, is about 25 millions, of whom 3 or 4 millions are organised. Of the total number of these organised workers, about 75 per cent. are members of the aristocratic "American Federation of Labour", so that every labour union organisation in the working class has a purely upper-class character. The American Federation of Labour comprises the aristocratic strata of workers. Its leadership is in the hands of labour union bureaucrats of a type which lies beyond the comprehension of our working class. I do not intend to speak of the methods of theft, corruption, bribery, the embezzlement of funds of the labour unions, and the like. But what salaries do these leading bureaucrats receive?

Stone, chairman of the engine-drivers' union, gets 25,000 dollars pay plus another 25,000 for representative purposes, hence a total income of 50,000 dollars or 100,000 roubles (Sensation among the Audience). This means an average of 8300 roubles monthly. And that is a "labour-union leader".

But besides this organisation there is another form of organisation in America, the so-called "company unions", a sort of common body uniting employers and workers of the same enterprise. The object of these bodies is what is known as "industrial peace", the elimination of class differences; they work most jealously and have succeeded in subjecting certain sections of the working class to the influence of the capitalists. Let me cite a well-known example. On the Baltimore-Ohio

Railway there is a sort of company union. By recruiting the workers to economic co-operation and subjecting them to the capitalists, it was found possible between 1924 and 1926 to double the dividends of this company.

What then are the organisatory principles of these company unions? The organisation only exists within the limits of the enterprise. It is supported by the employers, who in return secure a double dividend. In these enterprises all other forms of labour unions and all class struggle organisations are strictly forbidden.

The energy of the working class is employed for the purpose of creating surplus values, for inventions and other mental labour in favour of capitalist exploitation.

Another type of organisation is to be found in the shape of the labour banks. The workers carry their savings to the "labour banks", which invest this money in shares of various enterprises, companies, or trusts. In this way the workers contribute their hard-earned savings, which, when accumulated, supply the bourgeoisie with a very considerable amount of additional circulating capital. At present there are about 37 such labour banks, all of which dovetail into the total mechanism of capitalist society.

On this basis a complete theory is built up. The well-known bourgeois economist T. N. Carver has published a complete book called "The Current Economic Revolution in the United States" (Boston, 1925). There is much talk, he says, of various revolutions, but they do not amount to anything. There have been political revolutions in Germany, Austria, etc., but the real revolution is the economic revolution which is to be found in one country only, in the United States. Carver argues as follows:

"The only economic revolution in the world is that now progressing in the United States. It is a revolution which is doing away with the barrier between workers and capitalists by making the workers independent capitalists and the majority of the capitalists workers in one form or another for the very reason that they are not able to live on their capital. This is something altogether new in the economic history of the world." (P. 9-10.)

The channels of this revolution, according to Carver, are the following:

"Firstly, the rapid growth of investments, secondly, the capital investment of the workers by the purchase of shares in the trusts, and thirdly, the increase in the number of labour banks. (P. 11.)

In its essential points, this ideology of Carver is the same ideology on the basis of which stands the whole international Social Democracy. There is no fundamental difference between the two.

What is it, therefore, that we see in America? The lower strata of the working class are foreigners and negroes. Their fighting methods are often very revolutionary and the fight they put up is brutally suppressed. On the other hand a large section of the American working class is an aristocracy of labour. This organisation is embodied in the American Federation of Labour. Then there are the company unions, the labour banks, and so forth. Over all these we have the capitalist organisations, the powerful employers' associations, the banks, industrial concerns and trusts. By means of the intermediate organisations they have the entire working class in their hands.

These methods of the American bourgeoisie the international Social Democracy and the leaders of the reformist trade unions would gladly transfer to Europe, though they forget that while in America these methods have a certain foundation in the monopolist position of the country, they are without any such basis in Europe. In certain countries they would be altogether ridiculous.

Let us take Great Britain, for instance. Its predominant position has disappeared, although in regard to the colonies the British Government manoeuvres, makes concessions, and gains a certain respite, postponing the hour of its downfall. But the main tendency is downhill, which may be seen in the first place by the tremendous chronic unemployment. A further offensive of capital evokes such events as a march of the miners on London. The revolution in China and the revolution in other colonial countries shakes the entire British Empire. The lower strata rise; there are strikes and lock-outs. Therefore American methods can find no employment here. Nevertheless, the capitalists are attempting, with the aid of the Labour Party leaders and the trade unions, to introduce the notorious "indu-

strial peace" here too. Thus Spencer has founded a company union on American lines among the miners.

In Germany too it is difficult to find any basis for the American methods. The German bourgeoisie, however, endeavours to promote anything leading in this direction.

The attitude of the Social Democrats and trade union leaders is quite in keeping with Carver's "philosophy". Though they pretend to be opposed to the founding of company unions, they themselves work in the same direction ideologically, and politically. The Social Democrat Erdmann has openly declared that the trade unions are an element in capitalist economy. And their entire directives consist in permitting as few strikes as possible, though under the pressure of the masses they are forced at times to conduct such strikes. But they, too, are fully taken up with the idea of industrial peace.

But though the American methods are greatly favoured by the social democratic and trade union leaders, and although these leaders are striving so that stabilisation and its further development in Europe shall proceed without any great social conflicts, the whole idea, in the case of Europe, is a bourgeois-reformist illusion, especially for such a country as Great Britain, since for the introduction of the American methods one "trifle" is wanting, the transfer of the American economy to Europe, an operation which would prove "very difficult" to say the least of it.

As regards the colonial periphery of the capitalist world, we must record the awakening of the working class as an independent force. Naturally, in the colonies too, every possible conceivable method is employed, such as the yellow organisations of Chang-Kai-Shek, the "Union of Mechanics" in Canton, attempts of the British reformists to keep the trade union movement in India in check, and so forth. In general, however, we can say when speaking of the type of movement to be found in the colonial countries, we are for the first time entering upon an epoch in which the working class is becoming conscious of itself as an independent force in the movement, and in which it is not infrequently the main basis of the revolutionary movement. Such a state of affairs we have never had before. Very naturally it is extremely difficult for the bourgeoisie to employ the method of corrupting the working class, seeing that there is absolutely no basis for such an attempt.

IV. THE ACCENTUATION OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN EUROPE.

If we regard the events of the most recent times from the social class standpoint, we see in the first place the continuation of the offensive against the working class, i. e. Fascism in Italy and Poland and the germs of Fascism in England. We see a very cruel and systematised policy of white terrorism, which keeps down the proletariat by the destruction of the labour organisations. We have the unexampledly cruel rule of white terrorism in the Balkans; Italy, where regular man-hunts have been organised of late and thousands of workers arrested for the purpose of fishing out two or three Communists; then similar circumstances in Poland, and so on. We see a policy of destruction, and that even of the docile trade union associations. The history of the British "Bill" against the trade unions is well known. We have here a continuation of the attack of capital on wages and working hours along the whole line. Obviously there is in Europe a certain combination of Fascism on the one hand and the attempts on the other to transplant to Europe the "American" methods.

But at the same time, and partially on the basis of stabilisation itself, which is the decisive moment for the entire European position, we may see that the working class of Central Europe is rising again after serious defeats. There is an incipient revival of the labour movement, an accentuation of the class struggle on the part of the proletariat. We are experiencing a certain redistribution in the proportion of class forces, an undeniable inclination to the Left, the revolutionising of the proletariat in the main centres of European capitalism.

This process is developing in various directions.

In the first place we witness a growth of the Communist votes at elections in the great and decisive centres of the European continent. This increase in the influence of the Communist Party reflects far-reaching processes, which we may sum up under the head of a "turn to the Left".

The second symptom is the influence of the Communists in the trade unions. There is doubtless a growth of the influence of the Communists and of the revolutionary trade union opposition in a number of countries, e. g. Germany (particularly in Berlin, Hamburg, Halle, and other large towns). In Italy, despite the destruction of the trade unions and despite the raging of the white terror, the Party is fighting successfully for the restoration of the trade union organisations. In Czechoslovakia we have also an increase, albeit not very large, of Communist influence in the trade unions.

A third phenomenon is the open stand made by the proletariat. Under this head we have, in part at least, the great British strike, then the rinsing of the Vienna workers, which is of great importance as a characteristic of the situation in Europe. Mention should finally also be made of the resounding echo awakened in all the world by the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti.

Lastly we have also an undoubted revival of the strike movement in a number of countries. After a series of lost defensive fights, there is a certain upward curve of the strike wave in Germany, France, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and other countries.

Besides all this, there are a number of other symptoms, which may also be enumerated among the open actions of the working class. The Toulon mutiny of the French sailors, the unrest among the naval reserves in those parts, the great anti-Fascist street demonstrations in France and Germany, a series of street demonstrations in various countries in connection with the attacks on the Soviet Union, thus in France, Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Poland (in regard to which country special mention should be made of the great demonstration in connection with the murder of Comrade Voykov), then the Red Front-Fighters Day in Germany, and so on.

We must be quite clear as to the character of these phenomena.

They are not the remnants of the defensive fight put up in answer to the offensive of the capitalists.

They are not the "gradually abating last resistance" in connection with the fights formerly waged by the working class.

No, they mark the beginning of a new period, based on the fact that the working class has got over the worst part of the depression following on its former defeats, that it is newly recruiting its forces, and that, in view of the increasing differences accompanying stabilisation, it is preparing for a renewed and increased class struggle.

I do not wish to say that we are already faced with an immediate revolutionary situation in Europe. Things have not yet progressed that far.

Matters have, however, so far developed that, after a certain interruption and depression in the labour movement, we are faced with a decided turn in the direction of a mobilisation of the forces of the proletariat and with a reversion to active struggle.

The worst time is over, the working class is reviving, it is beginning to mobilise its forces, it is entering into the struggle afresh. There is undeniably an intensification of the class struggle on the basis of the development of internal contradictions arising from stabilisation.

V. AMERICANISM, THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATS, AND AMSTERDAM.

In examining the inner life of the European countries, we must register this fact as decisive for our entire estimation of the approaching period.

The task of the Communists, as the vanguard of the working class, lies in giving all-round support to this same process. It is up to us to place ourselves at its head and to elaborate the proper tactics to be adopted in these new circumstances of an accentuated class struggle. In this fight for the working masses, in this fight for the leadership of the working masses, in this fight for the accentuation of class action, we encounter in the first place the Social Democracy and Amsterdam.

The danger of international conflicts, the increasing menace of war between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union the swing to the Left on the part of the lower strata of the working class in Europe, the colonial revolutions on the one hand and the mobilisation of the forces of capitalism on the other — all these facts are accompanied by a pronounced swing to the Right on the part of the heads of the Second International and

of the International Federation of Trade Unions. I believe that since the inception of the Social Democratic parties and of trade unionism there has never before been such a "consolidation" of the theory and practice of the Social Democratic parties on the basis of a complete capitulation to bourgeois ideology.

The train of thought followed by the reformist leaders may be summed up as follows: "We" must transform the present factories into "constitutional factories" and democratise the factory conditions in a peaceful way. Karl Renner, one of the most prominent ideologists of the Social Democracy, calls the tariff-contracts concluded between employers and workers a "socialisation of wages". Hilferding writes in one of his articles that, without being aware of it themselves, the magnates of capital are really accomplishing a Marxist work by developing in the direction of organised economy and thus preparing the way for Socialism. The Social Democratic theorists have issued as the main slogan the slogan of "economy democracy". At the same time an attempt is made to console the workers by the statement that this process must last for centuries, as Karl Zwing also points out in his book on the sociology of the trade union movement.

Hilferding recently set up the thesis that it was impossible to speak of the prevalence of a bourgeois democracy in Germany, Austria, and certain other countries. In his opinion it is stupid to speak of a bourgeois democracy. There is merely a democracy pure and simple, and by means of it the working class is "democratising" the entire State. This theory was too much even for Hilferding's colleague, Max Adler. But the whole Social Democracy accepted it with "vociferous" applause. This theoretic and practical attitude goes yet further. If it is possible peaceably to democratise the factories, the banks, the trusts, and even individual States, it will and must be possible also to democratise the League of Nations. This task of democratising the League of Nations is therefore represented as the main objective of foreign politics, whereby the last touch is put to the "American" idea of a class working community. A highly characteristic utterance was made in this connection by Albert Thomas in the periodical "The Employer". He writes in praise of the idea of a mutual approach between employers and workers, and even goes so far as to applaud Mussolini for being "anxious" to bring about an understanding between labour and capital.

A favourable attitude towards the trusts, towards the constructional development of capitalism, towards the banks, towards the State, and towards the League of Nations, accompanied by a timid and at the same time deceptive advocacy of a "peaceful" democratisation of the apparatus in the hands of the deadly enemies of the working class — that is the "programme" of the Social Democracy of to-day.

I may still mention that of late various great Social Democratic parties have zealously engaged in the question of an agrarian programme, by "making use" of the "Russian experiences" in their own way. A whole series of parties accepted new agrarian programmes. The essential point about all these programmes is the introduction of the peasants into the general process of the development of capitalism, within the limits of an apology of the capitalist order in its entirety.

It is obvious that this positive attitude in relation to capitalist rationalisation, the capitalist enterprises, the capitalist States, and the League of Nations must undoubtedly lead to a positive attitude not only in the small daily questions of the class struggle, but also in the big questions of the present day, particularly the question of war.

VI. THE QUESTION OF WAR AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE LABOUR MOVEMENT, THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND AMSTERDAM.

Thanks to the aggravation of the class struggle and the undoubted growth of sympathy for the Soviet Union, the radicalisation of the working class, the accentuation of colonial problems and the force of the pressure brought to bear by the broad working masses on the social democratic leaders, the latter find themselves under the necessity of "manoeuvring". Of late we have noticed on the one hand a very definite and constantly growing orientation to the Right in the circles of the Amsterdam International and the Second International and at the same time an obvious "Left" manoeuvre in the operations of the Social Democracy against ourselves. One of the theses employed against us in this connection by the Social

Democrats is somewhat as follows: Not against the Soviet Union, but against the Communists. What does that mean? In reality it means nothing but a social democratic "reproduction" of the policy now pursued by Chamberlain. Chamberlain tells us: "We have no objection to doing business with you, but be so kind as to close down the Comintern". The Social Democrats say, "Pardon us, we were at all times in favour of your magnificent attempt to build up Socialism. But have the kindness not to spread the infection of your Communist and despotist methods to our countries."

What does this mean? Either, give "your" Communist Parties instructions to cease their work, or else, make an immediate end with the Comintern. That is what it all amounts to. It is now difficult to rail openly against the Soviet Union, since the broad masses will not stand for that. Therefore they coquette with the Soviet Union. At the same time, however, they attack Communism with all their force. In this way the sense of the manoeuvre is only too obvious.

There is another highly interesting factor. Of late the Social Democrats even attempted to seduce the Comintern. We received a letter from the Independent Labour Party of Great Britain, containing a query as to the possibility of combining the Second and Third Internationals. These people want to pretend not to be aware of the fact that the Communists would never agree to a union with the traitors. The President of the German Reichstag, the Social Democrat Löbe, recently made a declaration containing much the same statement as that published by the "Vorwärts", to the effect that the Soviet Union is a Socialist attempt which the German workers would also undertake, though with different methods. In Austria, Otto Bauer made a speech in a similar sense.

It is a matter of course that the Communist Party can but answer to such manoeuvres with a strengthening of its counter-attacks on the Social Democracy, for, I may repeat, the main point about this manoeuvre lies in the fact that it is a repetition of the capitalist manoeuvre. This is all the more necessary, since they also spread abroad the most shameless lies in regard to the Soviet Union, their "sympathies" for which are feigned from beginning to end.

Let us imagine that in the case of a war Germany were to side with our enemies, which is the more probable eventuality. What will the German Social Democracy do then? Does it not result from its entire attitude that it will feel called upon to defend the "democracy" of Hindenburg against the "despotic methods" of the Bolsheviks? That is as clear as daylight. Seen from this standpoint, all talk of sympathy for the Soviet Union is an open and malicious deception of the broad masses. In the matter of war, the heads of the Social Democracy will in all probability employ all sorts of democratic "theories" in excuse of the fact that they are engaged in a policy directed against us. They will say: "There is an international organisation called the League of Nations, which certainly possesses various shortcomings; it is not any too democratic and "we" might very well make it more so; at the same time it embodies the love of peace of all nations; on the other hand that despotic Asiatic oligarchy of the Bolsheviks, which, as Trozky, Smilga, and Zinoviev themselves affirm, is decaying and corrupted, will not submit to the League of Nations. Whom shall we support? The peace of the world known as the League of Nations, or that corrupt oligarchy, the Soviet Union?"

Thus they will be able to go against us with a "clean" conscience. There can be no doubt but that in so doing they will meet with resistance on the part of "their" workers. But their entire attitude towards the capitalist State is a weapon of the counter-revolution against Socialism both within the country and in international politics. This line of action is now more and more decidedly opposed to the attitude of the working class itself, for never were the sympathies enjoyed by the Soviet Union so great as they are now and never before was the idea of a defense of the Soviet Union so popular.

At its last plenary session, the Communist International raised the question of a possible war with considerable emphasis and elaborated various definite theses in this connection. The main principle set up for the moment was not the principle of peace but rather that of the defence of the Soviet Union and the defence of the Russian and Chinese revolutions. No abstract pacifist peace catchwords, but very concrete slogans of bellicose activity. Our slogan for the soldiers of the imperialist armies does not limit itself to embodying

a spirit of "defaitism" in regard to their "own" native country, but rather sets up the principle of a direct desertion of the imperialist ranks in favour of those of the Red Army, seeing that the fight at issue would be one between the imperialist States and the Soviet Union in its character of a dictatorship of the working class. We set up explicit directives for the work of the Communist Parties in this connection, and we are certain the Communist Parties will succeed this time in placing themselves at the head of great masses of the working class, if the bourgeoisie should risk an attack on the Soviet Union. And just in this question of a preparation for action, a preparation which must be started at once, which has indeed already been started, which is going steadily forwards and must be continued, in this question, I say, there have been and will still be serious conflicts with the Social Democrats, whose whole attitude, theory and practice are in the service of the capitalist regime and represent the greatest obstacles we have to overcome.

VII. THE FIGHT FOR THE MASSES AND THE UNITED-FRONT TACTICS.

Of late a redistribution has taken place in the European working class, with the result that both we and the Social Democracy have grown.

Where are the roots of Social Democratic influence to be found? They are to be found in the stabilisation of capitalism, in the circles of employees, in the labour aristocracy (particularly in the trustified industries), in the periodically recurring hopes of expansion and prosperity on the part of "their own" national industries, in the pacifist hypocrisy of the Social Democracy, and finally in the Social Democratic play at oppositions.

The roots of Communist influence, on the other hand, lie in the contradictions of stabilisation, in the danger of coming wars in general and of the war against the Soviet Union in particular, and finally in the "rightward" development of the Social Democratic leaders.

This process places us in front of the inexorable problem: Shall we continue the united-front tactics just as they are at present, without changing them by so much as an iota? Shall we employ these tactics in exactly the same way as two years ago? Or shall we make any new additions to them, transfer the emphasis to other points, and draw definite conclusions from the various alterations in the objective position and out of the various changes in the working class? We are of opinion that it has become necessary to effect some such change of emphasis, and these changes lie in the direction of a more intensive fight against the Social Democratic leaders and the Amsterdam International.

Thus the peculiarity of united-front tactics at the present moment lies in the decided necessity of employing them, so to say, from the bottom upwards. It is there that the main emphasis must be applied. The basis is now provided by the labour movement; for combinations among the leaders there is now far less occasion than heretofore, since these leaders are, notwithstanding certain antics towards the "Left", actually tending more and more towards the "Right". The general line to be observed in united-front tactics, however, must be more than hitherto a reliance on the broad masses of the membership, towards whom our tactics must be directed.

United-front tactics must and will develop in various directions. In the matter of a fight against the danger of war, they must take the form of a more vigorous struggle against the Social Democracy of a struggle against pacifism, which is a serious menace and which unfortunately has a strong hold on the working class; furthermore, of a development of the campaign for the support of the Soviet Union, of propaganda in non-party mass organisations of every kind, making use of the successes of the recent Congress of the Friends of the Soviet Union, work in such organisations as the Anti-Imperialist League, the institution of congresses in individual districts in favour of defence and of the protection of the Soviet Union; then of an exploitation of the recent diplomatic step taken by the Soviet Union at Geneva. This is our foremost task. The organisation of non-party mass-meetings, congresses, committees, wherever the situation makes it advisable — all this must be part of the great programme of our united-front tactics.

In the first place we must lay down a line of action for our work in the trade unions. You will know that in a number

of Communist Parties we have not only been obliged to admit that we are doing little or no work in the trade unions, but that there is often the added disadvantage that our comrades are unaware of how Communist activity ought to be carried on in the trade unions, of what points merit the most attention, and what should be made the main object of this work in the reactionary trade unions.

It appears to me, comrades that what I have just said shows quite definitely that the Communist attitude must be directed against the idea of class harmony and against the entire counter-revolutionary Social Democratic ideal, the policy of "industrial peace".

Our attitude is one of **intensified class struggle**, against trust capital, against all co-operation with capital, against a policy of the factory councils, which take part themselves, and thereby involve the working class, in the task of building up capitalism, against enforced arbitration agreements, and against everything that binds the hands of the workers; at the same time it is in favour of strikes, in favour of an extension of the class struggle, in favour of an inexorable determination as regards the wage question, in favour of a vigorous policy in the question of unemployment, in favour of a definite stand in the question of the working day, in favour of an intensification of strikes, against all tendencies of industrial peace; and against all slogans which would hint that we are following in the wake of the Social Democracy.

At the same time I may remark that it is altogether wrong that certain comrades — it is not a question of very many — should now raise the question of a "control of production" as a matter exhausting our entire trade union activity. That is a **wrong** attitude. In a **revolutionary** situation the demand for the control of production by the workers is correct if it is also a demand for the occupation of the factories and the like; but if there is **no** immediate revolutionary situation, any such proposal has an air of being borrowed from a musical comedy on "economic democracy" or from an opera on the evolutionary seizure of the works. That is **wrong**. Neither nationalisation for the capitalist countries, nor municipalisation, nor yet a transition from the hands of private capital to those of the State, neither a programme of control on the part of the workers, nor the entire complex of State-capitalistic programmes is immediately acceptable from the standpoint of the Comintern. That is how the problem was expressed by the 3rd Congress under the immediate guidance of Lenin. We must not strike such notes as these.

From an organisatory standpoint, the aspect of our Parties must be such, that in the face of the development of powerful capitalist organisations we must demand in the first place the combination of trade unions according to spheres of production and their comprehension in adequate trade-union cartels. In this connection we must also pay attention to a decided augmentation of the work in the trade unions, for these are the strongholds and at the same time the main "transmission bands" of the Social Democracy. We must direct our attention towards strengthening our own organisations, the Red Trade Unions, wherever they exist. We must direct our attention to **organising the unorganised** and to working among such of the working class as are not included in the trade unions. Even in such countries as France there are very many of this kind. They are a yet untouched reservoir for purposes of propaganda. In such a country as Czechoslovakia there are very many such workers, as there are, too, in such a country as Germany. Here we must increase our efforts to the utmost.

Similarly, we must increase the struggle for **international unity of the trade union movement**. It is our duty to aid the work of the Red International of Labour Unions and to regulate the relations between A. U. C. T. U. and the R. I. L. U. We must keep in mind that we have certain experiences in this relation at our disposal and that we can attain a number of results.

The British opportunists have dissolved the Anglo-Russian Committee. In this connection Comrade Kamenev said to us: "The Anglo-Russian Committee died a miserable death, which is solely owing to you". Well, and if we had destroyed it during the British strike, would its death have been **more honourable**? I cannot understand that. That would also have been a miserable end (for the British opportunists). If we reason after the manner of Kamenev, it means starting on the basis of the hopes entertained by Zinoviev, according to which we might have got the better of "reformism in Europe" by the aid of the A. R. C.

We must put our own hands and all the levers we can into operation. We must use all means for the purpose of strengthening the R. I. L. U. and intensifying the work of the Soviet trade unions so that they in their turn may work, both inside and outside the R. I. L. U. and contribute to strengthening its position.

We must conclude political "friendship treaties" with other trade unions, remembering all the while that the **chief weight** must attach to the work of comprehending the broad masses.

In a whole series of countries we have "**unity groups**", but they are not connected with one another, nor are they subject to a central leadership, since each works for itself. That is not the right state of affairs and it must be altered. We have now got into touch with a whole series of trade unions in Eastern countries. The accentuation of the international fight in the direction of trade-union work is the result of the present position. Before all, it is an outcome of the international position, and the Party Congress must pay special attention to this circumstance.

Finally, comrades, we must draw certain conclusions for the approaching election fights.

As I already pointed out, we are now faced with a series of election campaigns, in Great Britain, France, Germany, and Poland. Here it is a question of a fight for the united front. Must any changes be made in our attitude towards the Left bourgeois and Socialist parties in view of the international position and of the particular circumstances of the present moment? The idea might very well arise that, in view of the complicated international position of the Soviet Union, we should show **greater leniency** in our relations with the Social Democratic Parties. But the entire analysis of the position, as rendered above, points in the direction, that our electoral campaign must be exploited for the purpose of showing the workers that the Communist Party is the **one and only** revolutionary party of the working class.

Let us take **Great Britain** as an example. There the Conservatives are fighting with desperate obstinacy. A bloc between the Liberals and the opportunist Labour Party is not inconceivable. In a whole series of important questions the Labour Party has capitulated to its bourgeois partners.

Some British comrades argue that in his "Infantile Sicknesses" Lenin spoke of the necessity of helping the Labour Party to power. In this connection I may point out that it is a great mistake to assume that Lenin imagined it would be sufficient to vote for the Labour Party and nothing more. On the contrary, he suggested a compromise, a division of seats, etc. But now it would not do to make use of these arguments of Lenin, seeing that the situation is now quite different. It can now hardly be said that we must "push" the Labour Party to a position of power, since the Labour Party has been already in power. When Lenin wrote those words, he had in mind the possibility of **unmasking the Labour Party**. But we must not pass over facts which belong to the past. On the contrary.

We must do our best to expose the leaders of the Labour Party on account of their treacherous attitude in such questions as the struggle of the miners, the Chinese revolution, the question of the Soviet Union, and the Trade Union Bill. Applying the principles and tactical directives belonging to a past age to a fundamentally different situation does not mean realising Lenin's testament, but merely indicates a lack of understanding in regard to his tactics. We must now so arrange our tactical position that we can confront the candidates of the Labour Party with candidates of our own in a number of places and thus appear as an independent party with an aspect of its own. We must do our utmost to expose the leaders of the Labour Party.

In France it is a question of life or death for the Poincaré Cabinet. Here, too, it might be argued that we should support the "Left cartel", seeing that a Conservative regime would be a menace to the Soviet Union. Such an orientation would be **wrong**.

We must rather prepare our French Party for a decided fight. It has never been under fire, but it will soon be under fire. It is faced with the prospect of a hard fight, and we must so conduct this election campaign in France that the French Communist Party can show the entire working class of France that it is a fight between the bourgeoisie and its Social Democratic henchmen on the one hand and the Communist Party, the only revolutionary party of the working class, on the other.

It is obvious that this does not preclude suggestions for the formation of a united front and in some cases for the support of a Socialist candidate if there is the danger of the reactionary candidate winning the seat. But it would be a mistake, for example, to vote for the Left bourgeoisie. That cannot be permitted.

In Germany we shall have to unmask the Social Democrats who are even now preparing for the "great coalition".

In Poland we must not approach the leaders of the Polish Socialist Party with suggestions of a united front. I am of opinion that there should be no question at all of applying to those depraved adherents of Pilsudski, in whose souls there is not an atom of anything proletarian left. We must rather address ourselves to the broad masses of the Polish Socialist Party members.

In our efforts for a united front we must therefore transfer our attention to the broad membership, increasing our struggle against the Social Democrats in general and against the so-called "Left" Social Democratic leaders in particular. We must direct all our agitation towards linking up the every-day demands of the working class with the great political issues, especially the question of war and towards bringing the masses closer to the main principle, that of the dictatorship of the working class.

VIII. THE COLONIAL QUESTION AND THE COMINTERN.

If the capitalist world is at present experiencing an urgent want of markets and if the question of a redistribution of colonies has again become acute, this means that the crisis of the entire capitalist economy is centring at the moment upon the colonies. A whole series of colonial risings, the revolt in Syria, the movement in Egypt, the revolt in Morocco, the great rising in the Dutch East-Indies, the ceaseless unrest in India, and finally the great Chinese revolution, all these events bring the capitalist world face to face with the colonial question.

Under this head we should also mention a whole series of conflicts and antagonisms between the powerful capitalist countries and those semi-colonial countries which form an object of their colonial policy. In particular there has of late been a series of such differences between the United States on the one hand and Mexico, Nicaragua, and other Latin-American countries on the other hand. Coolidge has considered it opportune to point out the particularly "pacific" rôle of the United States, which consists in the fact that, both by force of arms and by other means, the United States suppress all emancipatory movements in the countries of Central and South America.

Already at the time of the war, certain of our comrades, particularly such as had joined our Party from other camps, suggested, in opposition to Lenin, that in countries subjected to colonial oppression on the part of imperialism our policy should be the same as in the imperialist countries themselves.

During the war, Radek published an article on the rising in Ireland, in which he pointed out that at the head of this movement there was not the proletariat but part of the Irish bourgeoisie, so that the entire movement was a matter of little interest to us. Lenin most vehemently attacked this standpoint, declaring that a renunciation of the support of such national emancipation-movements represented an assistance of the imperialism of the dominant nations. As a matter of fact, the attitude of Radek was neither more nor less than a Social Democratic deviation in a national question, since it is just the standpoint of the Social Democrats to refuse to support national-revolutionary and colonial movements under the pretext that very frequently, and especially in their early stages, such movements are not under the leadership of the working class, and that therefore proletarian revolutionaries should have nothing to do with these national bourgeois movements.

In his polemic against Piatakov, who at that time wrote under the nom de plume of Kiyevsky, Lenin cites a whole string of arguments against the principles advanced by the former, who had declared that in the epoch of imperialism there could be no question anywhere of national community, that the cry for national self-determination was tantamount to a recognition of the right of defending national frontiers, that the standpoint set up by Lenin was nothing but the realisation of a national bloc between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and that this standpoint must inevitably lead to social patriotism.

Piatakov was of the opinion that we ought never to make common cause with the bourgeoisie, that we should never support a comprehensive national bloc, that this would mean the arousing of national hatred as distinct from class hatred, and that it would never do to pursue one policy in the imperialist countries and another policy in the oppressed countries, since this would be in contradiction to what he called the "monism" (i. e. uniformity) of our policy. This standpoint Lenin opposed in the following terms:

"If national risings are impossible in an imperialist epoch, Kiyevsky makes a mistake in mentioning them at all. If they are possible, there is no foundation in all his remarks about 'monism' or in the assertion that we 'invent' instances of self-determination under imperialist rule. Kiyevsky is defeating himself.

"If we actively oppose the suppression of a national rising — an eventuality which Kiyevsky himself assumes to be possible — what does it mean?"

To this question Lenin replies:

"It means that the result will be a 'Dual action' (to employ the same philosophic phrase as our writer selects), firstly an action on the part of the nationally oppressed proletariat and the peasantry, together with the nationally oppressed bourgeoisie against the oppressor nation, and secondly an action on the part of the proletariat of the oppressed nation, or at least of the class-conscious portion thereof, against the bourgeoisie and any support the latter may find in the oppressor nation." (Vol. XIII, p. 371/72.)

This formula is highly significant. Let us apply it to China in the first stage of the development of the Chinese revolution. In China we were faced with the fact that the national bourgeoisie was engaged in a fight against British imperialism. What tactics had therefore to be employed according to the principles of Lenin? Naturally such tactics as would lead to a "dual action". In the imperialist countries, e. g. in Great Britain, the proletariat was to oppose the bourgeoisie; in the oppressed country, in this case China, the proper policy was that of action of the nationally oppressed proletariat and peasantry together with the nationally oppressed bourgeoisie.

If therefore the Opposition declares that Lenin always and in all circumstances excluded a common action of the nationally oppressed proletariat with the nationally oppressed bourgeoisie, that this was a Menshevik principle, such assertions on the part of the Opposition have really nothing in common with the Leninist attitude. Indeed, Lenin points out that it may in given circumstances be necessary to act in union with the nationally oppressed bourgeoisie. This is what Lenin wrote on the subject, and it is altogether a blow in the eye to the arguments of the Opposition.

"The endless phrases employed by Kiyevsky against the national bloc, against national illusions, against the 'poison' of nationalism, or against the awakening of national hatred, and the like, have proved to be mere nonsense, for, in advising the proletariat of the oppressing countries actively to oppose the suppression of the national rising, the author (who, we must remember, considers this proletariat a force worth taking into consideration) is himself arousing national hatred and supporting the "bloc with the bourgeoisie" on the part of the workers of the oppressed countries." (Vol. XIII, P. 372.)

Lenin therefore not only admits the possibility and advisability of making common cause with a nationally oppressed bourgeoisie in certain stages of an emancipatory struggle, but also speaks of the possibility of the suppression of such a "bloc with the bourgeoisie" of the oppressed countries. It is quite natural that this is not an infallible general rule applicable to any stage and any epoch even of a colonial revolution. That is a matter of course. In speaking of the possibility of a "bloc with the bourgeoisie", Lenin attached a whole series of conditions to any such union. And in another place, which we have repeatedly cited, he formulated these conditions most precisely. In the first place, they are conditions presuming an actual struggle of a national-revolutionary bourgeoisie against imperialism; in the second place they are conditions presuming a real freedom of organisation on the part of the working class and the peasantry and of our Party on the basis of revolutionary tactics, a revolutionary programme and revolutionary activity.

If such conditions obtain, all that applies which Lenin said in this connection, if they do not obtain, the situation is altogether different, with another distribution of the classes, another array of forces, another relation between the classes, and another tactical programme. That is how the problem must be envisaged. And if we take into consideration that such a powerful revolution as the Chinese revolution, which confronted us with a whole series of fundamental questions of colonial policy, could last for years, it is only obvious that in the course of the development of this revolution we should have various distributions of forces and classes and therefore also various tactical changes on the part of the Communist Party and the working class. It seems to me that these most important presumptions have now been sufficiently explained, and that we can safely say that the fundamental reasoning employed by the Opposition against the tactics of the Communist International and of our Party, will not stand criticism. It represents a return to the standpoint of Radek and Piatakov in past times and is anything but 100 per cent. Leninism, as our "friends" of the Opposition attempt to make out.

This is altogether obvious, all the more so as we have observed that when they were in the Political Bureau and solved all these problems in a former stage of the Chinese revolution, our Oppositionists never said a word against such tactics. Not even Zinoviev, then chairman of the Chinese Commission, opposed them. No objections were made, and everybody was in favour of the support of the national-revolutionary Chinese bourgeoisie.

Now we have another stage of development. The bourgeoisie has long ago gone over into the counter-revolutionary camp. The grouping of the classes is altogether different. Now there can only be a question of a fight on the part of the working class, the peasantry, and part of the petty-bourgeoisie of the cities against the combined forces of the foreign imperialists, the feudal class, and the national bourgeoisie which has now turned into a counter-revolutionary factor. The bourgeoisie enjoyed the support of the urban petty-bourgeoisie and at one time also of the peasantry and the proletariat, but this grouping of forces entailed the development of such a powerful agrarian movement and of such a powerful movement on the part of the working class, that the terrified bourgeoisie fled into the camp of the counter-revolutionary forces and must now inevitably make smaller or greater concessions to imperialism.

Let us dwell on the present situation in China. Far from having died, the Chinese revolution appears to me, in all probability, to be on the eve of a new and active stage of its development, a stage characterised by a new foundation, new forces, and new activity on the part of the peasantry and the proletariat. The probability of a new rise of revolutionary activity is afforded by the situation which has now resulted in China. A few words, in the first place, as to the imperialists. Have the imperialists succeeded in subjugating China and in solving the Chinese question in their own imperialist sense? Have they succeeded in putting down the anti-imperialist movement? The question need but be put in this way to make the answer obvious. They have certainly not succeeded in suppressing the Chinese revolution.

It is true the imperialists have occupied very important strategic and economic positions and scored certain successes. The British have again obtained their concessions at Hankow in spite of the agreement concluded by the British representative O'Malley with Eugene Chen, the former representative of the Wuhan Government, while Japan has quietly gone over to the conquest of Manchuria and the interior of Mongolia, where it has greatly strengthened its positions.

It seems to me that of all the imperialist groups Japan has made the greatest conquests in China. Japan has at all times been very careful; the Japanese diplomats have disclosed surprisingly little and have made practically no significant or presumptuous gestures, but in effect it is Japan that has secured the largest booty in China.

In spite of this it may be said that the imperialists have not succeeded in solving the entire Chinese problem. They play the rôle in China of a hostile force, they have torn China to pieces, they have their fleets there, they have occupied various places, but they can hardly be said to have "pacified" the country by imperialist measures or to have broken the back of the Chinese revolution.

Has the Chinese problem, meanwhile, been solved by the formerly national revolutionary and now national-counter-revo-

lutionary bourgeoisie? It seems to me that they have not only failed to solve it, but that the development of the objective differences between the bourgeoisie on the one hand and the workers' and peasants' movement on the other has rendered it impossible for them to solve the Chinese problem according to their wishes and has indeed caused the Chinese bourgeoisie, which has become dependent on the semi-feudal militarist apparatus, to grow yet weaker, to split up into groups, and no longer to act as a united class force. We are now witnessing a position in which the various military groups under their different political leaders have split, up to some degree in semi-independent cliques, which renders it possible to speak of a certain decline of the power of the national bourgeoisie.

And what is passing meantime in the depths, in the masses of the working class and the peasantry? Though our Chinese comrades instituted demonstrations on the occasion of the execution of Sacco and Vanzetti by the white terror of America, they have "accustomed" themselves "at home" to a monstrous and quite unparalleled white terror, such as it is hard even to imagine. There tens of thousands of our adherents have lost their lives. There we have witnessed the physical destruction of a tremendous number of our comrades, members of our Party and such as are in intimate touch with it. It is impossible to describe in words the cruelties and horrors of the white terror, such as are now characteristic of the fighting methods of the Chinese counter-revolutionaries.

But the most wonderful thing about it is that nevertheless it would be absolutely untrue to speak of a throttling of the Chinese revolutionary movement. On the contrary, of late there have been signs of a revival of the movement. The movement has expanded among the peasantry. We have a ferment in quite a number of different provinces, while in the Kwantung province the power is in some parts in the hands of Soviets of the peasantry. For the first time in the history of the Chinese peasant movement, a Soviet power has been formed on a rural basis, a system which has already started a veritable war of annihilation against the big landowners. There from 300 to 400 landowners have lost their lives. (Applause. Cries of "Too few. There must be more.")

In this district, which has a population of several millions, the big landowners have been practically exterminated.

Finally, we are now faced with a very critical position throughout the province of Kwantung and especially round about Canton.

Judging by a number of different indications, we may well say that China is on the eve of very serious events.

Attempts have been made to oppress and divide the working class not only by means of the white terror but also by means of yellow trade unions, controlled by "leaders" appointed by Chang-Kai-Shek and other generals. Here again it is a matter worthy of our admiration that the Chinese workers have evinced the greatest heroism in sacrificing a great number of their sons and in continuing to defend their own organisations most desperately against the yellow leaders in spite of the cruellest forms of white terror. The bitterness of the fight is so great, that the wholesale butchery of our fighters is answered by the direct physical extermination of the yellow "leaders". (Sensation.)

That is an approximate picture of the state of affairs in China.

In summing up we cannot but draw the following conclusion:

In the first place, the imperialists neither have solved nor can solve the Chinese question. Secondly, the national bourgeoisie is not only not approaching the solution of this problem by its own methods of suffocating the working class and compromising with the imperialists, but it is itself more and more split up as a political party. It has now divided its authority among those cliques that have now come to play such an important rôle and who are now waging a competitive struggle for the immediate sources of their existence, seeing that they must live and support their various armies, which are fairly large. All this calls for considerable means, which can only be obtained by a very substantial pressure on the population.

There remain two great classes, the peasantry and the working class, for whom the national question is in no way opposed to the question of the class struggle. There remain two social class forces which are not destroyed, in spite of the great losses they have suffered. These class forces are now developing, growing, and organising, and therefore it seems to

me that we have no reason to be pessimistic in regard to the prospects of the Chinese revolution.

As regards the political or party-political expression of all these processes, I need but say a few words. The Kuomintang with all its groups has long ceased to represent a revolutionary force. That is a fact, I believe, that calls for no further comment. But the Kuomintang has also ceased to play any considerable part as a counter-revolutionary force, not because it has abandoned its counter-revolutionary crimes but because the point of gravitation now rests with the military groups, which merely make use of various remnants of the Kuomintang as a cloak for their real objects. This is the state of affairs at present. And that is why a once powerful organisation, which has failed completely as a revolutionary force, will also fail completely in the counter-revolutionary sense.

It is obvious that the main thing for us at this juncture is the promotion of the Soviets, the importance of which will increase with the development of the revolution.

Most importance attaches for us to the question of a consolidation of the Chinese Communist Party, which has been through a number of very painful stages of its development, which have been torn from its ranks, is engaged most heroically of the intellectual, petty-bourgeois elements accompanying it, and which, despite the loss of tens of thousands of its members which have been torn from its ranks, is engaged most heroically in welding together its organisation. The Party now numbers about 20,000 or 25,000 members, with an additional 15,000 in the Young Communist League. Quite recently we witnessed the purging of the Communist Party leaders, when Tang-Ping-San in particular was excluded on account of his opportunist attitude in the agrarian question. I repeat: in spite of the gigantic difficulties facing the Chinese Communist Party, there is an undoubted internal consolidation of the Party. Naturally the future will not be devoid either of a certain amount of friction; there will be partial defeats and the like; but the grouping of class forces and the internal organisation of the Party are now such that, as I repeat again and again, we have no reason to feel pessimistic as to the prospects of the great Chinese revolution.

It is not only from the standpoint of the further successful revolutionary fight in China that the experiences hitherto made in the Chinese revolution are valuable for us. In the first place the Chinese revolution confronted us with the colonial question in all its significance. We have often approached this problem in former times. The colonial question was apparent to all of us from the standpoint of its fundamental importance, but the entire complication of the social class entanglement, the great difficulty of the tasks connected with the conduct of such a tremendous colonial revolution, only faced us quite recently in grim reality. In our experience of the Chinese revolution we got to know a whole series of problems of colonial revolutions in general, and at the same time this experience showed us quite clearly, how careful we must be in the determination of our concrete political tactics and how necessary it is to take all the peculiarities of development in each individual country into account.

And now, as a parallel to the Chinese revolution, I should like to say a few words about the problem of the revolution in India, a problem which will in a short time acquire paramount importance for the Comintern and for our entire Party. India is also a colonial country, India is also subjected to British imperialism, in India there is also a national emancipatory movement. It would, however, be extremely rash, were we mechanically to transfer the experiences of our Chinese tactics to

India and to the determination of our tactics in regard to that country. Why would this be rash? Because there we have a different relationship of the classes to one another and because we should there from the very beginning be faced with a different position to that with which we were confronted from the very start of the Chinese revolution.

The British Government has manoeuvred very cleverly in regard to India of late years. It has certainly not succeeded in winning over the broad masses. But the British Government has of late made a number of concessions to Indian industry. Formerly India exported raw materials and imported manufactured goods from the "mother" country, Great Britain. It was the former policy of Great Britain towards India to leave that country the rôle of a purveyor of raw materials, without permitting it to develop its own industry.

But under the influence of the development of the Russian revolution, the Chinese revolution, and the entire capitalist crisis and particularly under the influence of the movement in India itself, the British Government permitted the introduction of special customs tariffs in India and thus somewhat widened the sphere of development for India's industry. It proceeded to get more and more into touch with the leaders of the intellectuals and of the Indian bourgeoisie in regard to self-administration and managed to persuade a considerable portion of the once very revolutionary Indian bourgeoisie to form a bloc with the British imperialists, so that the Indian bourgeoisie has in many cases taken up the fight against the "agents of Moscow", acting on the argument that the old master (Great Britain) is better than the "unknown new" (Moscow).

Is it, again, out of the question that the Indian proletariat and peasantry should make common cause with the national bourgeoisie? In my opinion, it is not. Is it impossible for us Communists to form permanent blocs after the manner of the Kuo-Min-Tang in India? As I see it, such an understanding is out of the question for us to attain. Can there be a question of temporary co-operation or a parallel activity in individual cases? Assuredly so. Can there be any question of a more lengthy support of the Indian bourgeoisie on our part? By no means. For this bourgeoisie, or at any rate a considerable part thereof, fails to fulfil those conditions which Lenin laid down.

In the first place, the Indian bourgeoisie is not prepared to wage any lengthy fight against British imperialism. Secondly, and this is also an important point, it carries on an active fight against the Communists, to whom it refuses to grant freedom of action in anything like an adequate degree. On the contrary, even now it treats us like an absolutely hostile force. That is a proof that we must adopt different tactics in this case. The relationship of the classes is different in this country and therefore the whole position is different, although India is also a colonial region.

If I were to take a country like Egypt, Persia, or indeed any other such country, I could easily demonstrate that in each of these countries there are special typical features in regard to social relations, which would force us to analyse concretely the situation in that particular country most attentively without contenting ourselves with any general theses on the colonial question. This last is in any case not the right thing to do.

Therefore the Executive Committee of the Communist International has resolved (as a provisional resolution which will probably be ratified by the plenary meeting of the E. C. C. I.) that the colonial question in its entirety be placed on the agenda of the Ordinary Congress of the Communist International.

(To be continued.)

The Discussion on the Reports of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

(Full Report.)

Comrade KRUPSKAYA:

I shall not speak of the big political and organisatory mistakes, which the Opposition has made. Enough has already been said on this subject. I believe that the chief reason for these mistakes lay in the fact that the Opposition had lost the

instinct, the feeling, for what animates the working class, what animates the leading strata of the working class, what they experience. (Manuilsky: Quite right!) The Opposition has lost all sense for the huge tasks at present confronting the Party. That is the Opposition's misfortune.

We are now faced by the actual split. I believe that within the last five years the Party has grown to such an extent and has struck its roots so deeply into the masses that it has begun to express what the masses feel and experience and that it will also survive this difficult moment. But, naturally, we must not close our eyes to the fact that we are confronted by the actual split, and, in case the Party has to live through a difficult moment — and there will naturally be such moments during the fight — the platform published by the Opposition may serve to gather together elements who set no value upon the things for which the Party is fighting. This difficulty must be borne in mind.

In the year 1909 Lenin wrote that when we have a group composed of very different elements, the group cannot act frankly, there is always something false about its actions, and I therefore believe that a number of untruthful statements which the Opposition has made have attracted to the Opposition elements which drag the Opposition after them and cause it to make mistakes which go beyond all bounds.

When we consider whether conciliation at present is possible between the Party and the Opposition, I believe that there is no basis for such conciliation. The Opposition, as a whole, cannot come to terms with the Party, because the whole is composed of very different elements. One cannot deny that in the Opposition there are comrades who already dimly perceive the errors which have been committed and would like to return to the Party, would like to co-operate with the Party, but there are other elements who believe that it would suffice to make believe they belong to the Party. For this reason, the Opposition, as a whole, naturally has not a uniform attitude and there can therefore be no agreement worth achieving. But I am of the opinion that the Party must facilitate the return of all elements, who honestly admit the mistakes they have made, feel that they were in the wrong and are prepared to work shoulder to shoulder with the Party. The Party is not strong on account of its numerical force but on account of its inner unity, and one cannot talk of internal unity if a portion of the members only keep in with the Party because they must.

Determination is necessary in this case; indeed, we are now more than ever in need of determination, for the Party is at present confronted by a number of extraordinarily grave problems. We have now approached very close to Socialist construction. When one hears, what the masses say, one sees constantly new experiments, Socialistic in spirit, and a number of fresh tasks before us, which can only be fulfilled by working together for the common end.

While I am dealing with this painful question I should like to touch upon a problem with which our Party is now confronted and which cannot be solved without active work on our part.

Many speakers have mentioned the tremendous growth of culture, and the thirst for knowledge observable in the masses. We have all noticed this and it is quite comprehensible. In economy we have reached a level at which further economic development, constructive work in which the masses participate, the questions of rationalisation, all call for a much higher level of knowledge than the masses possess. For this reason, it is just among the masses that we find the desire to learn.

Let us take agriculture, the new methods of agricultural activity — all these demand a much higher level of knowledge.

Finally, the Soviet construction, the more intense work in the Soviets, the organisation of the masses through the Soviets, all require knowledge on the part of the members of the Soviets. All these things taken together call forth that effort which inclines us to assert that we are on the threshold of a cultural revolution.

But it is unthinkable to us that the cultural revolution can come about apart from the Soviet Power, that the masses can attain without the help of the Soviets the knowledge which they need, which they can apply in the work of Socialist construction.

There is need here of considerable help from the Soviet State, but when we examine how matters actually stand we see that they are in a certain measure very unsatisfactory.

Our system of means of political enlightenment in this country is very bad. We know that in governments like the Government of Pskov, a frontier government, suddenly the idea crops up to dispose of all the libraries, that in a number

of governments schools are closed, that in some cases even lower-grade schools are closed; we know that education develops slowly and at an awkward and irregular pace, but life requires from us something different. We have tried very hard to reduce staffs. It was our desire to bring the leadership and the masses closer together by means of inspections, but the inspection is not yet organised and there is lacking in the work the Communist influence, which should flow through the education system.

Our Communist-Party influence upon the teachers must be greatly extended. In this regard it is necessary to do a great deal of the work of which Lenin spoke, namely, to infect the teaching staff with our enthusiasm, a thing we have not yet done.

We observe a certain regression in the feeling of the teachers. We must put our backs into this work. When we speak of economic construction everybody understands that capital outlay is necessary. The same is the case with our cultural development; that, too, cannot proceed without outlay of capital. Thrift in this matter and especially thrift in relation to the lower forms of public education, is inadmissible. Every Party member must fight in every way against this. Nor can we continue at the slow pace at which our educational development is at present proceeding.

In the matter of cultural development specific tasks must be set, and these must be carried out by the Party officials with the assistance of the broadest masses. Such is the state of affairs with us: the 1905 class of recruits has more illiterates than the preceding years. Our comrades from the army will tell us whether or not this is right. (Shouts of: "That's so!" Diegtiev: "That's not so!") The fact is, however, that this compels us to consider the feasibility of providing for all young illiterates between the ages of 11 and 18 one year's schooling to teach them to read and write. This is now possible both materially and in regard to the teaching staffs. Of this point we must make a definite task to be executed by the staffs of the Soviet apparatus with the help of the broad masses of the population.

There are also several other tasks, for instance, the question of the schools in the industrial districts. In this relation the position in a number of industrial districts is unfavourable. Some working districts have not even an elementary school, let alone the seven-year elementary schools. The elementary school is, however, the one which must be built up from the work school. The work school is erected on a low level; it does not achieve the results which it must achieve; it does not train the qualified workers required by modern industry. Further tasks of a similar nature must be considered on every hand.

A Party Conference has been arranged for February to consider the questions of the educational system. I believe that we should seriously prepare ourselves for this Party Conference. It is not possible that this Party Conference should degenerate into differences of opinion between the R. S. F. S. R. and the Ukraine as to when a start should be made with professional training; on the contrary, it is necessary that this Party Conference should elucidate all the educational questions which are in dispute. The question of the cultural revolution, the question of arming the masses with knowledge, is one of the essential questions of Socialist construction.

That is what I wanted to say in regard to the subject which I know best. (Prolonged applause.)

Comrade RAKOVSKI:

Comrades, the question of foreign relations is such that it demands the highest degree of unity in the Party. The enemy abroad is the most dangerous of all the enemies of our Party and of the proletarian dictatorship. (Shouts of: "Is that your reason for destroying the Party?" "You should have thought of that earlier!" "You should have thought of that on November 7th!") If we occupy one sixth of the globe, our enemies occupy five-sixths. They have the power of State in their hands, they have capital in their hands. They have a highly developed technique in their hands, they have great political experience in the exploitation of the proletariat of the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

In the plenary session of August the minority of the Party made a declaration, which I to-day (Shouts of: "Not minority, a handful splinters!") repeat in substance.

Against the enemies abroad, who make an attack on the Soviet Union in its entirety, upon the proletarian power and upon the worker and peasant government (Cries of: "You are making the attack!") we shall indisputably and without reserve give our support to the leading officials of the Party and of the Comintern. (Noise, laughter, shouts of: "It's a disgrace that you've gone so far!" "And the Clemenceau thesis?" "Your support is a halter to hang us!") This is quite apart from the fate of the collective or individual minority... (Cry of: "Of a handful, of a handful, not of a minority!") Comrades, as, however, the external danger is a very grave one for us, we, just as every other Communist, every member of the Party, are in duty bound to give warning when the leaders make mistakes and oversights.

Permit me, Comrades, first of all to explain a legend which has been formed around my appearance at the Party Conference of the Moscow Government. (Cries of: "Counter-revolutionary appearance... But in Charkov?") Laughter.)

There was attributed to me a nonsensical, idiotic thought, namely, that I made the proposal to respond to the provocations of Shanghai, Paris, and London by declaring war. (Noise.) I take the liberty, Comrades, of quoting that sentence from the uncorrected stenogram which formed the starting point for the creation of such a legend:

"Comrades, if our adversaries perceive our weakness, this will not avoid or delay war but precipitate it. If, however, we were to speak the truth, nobody here would listen to us. If the relations of forces were different, in different circumstances, the half of what we have done would long ago have sufficed to provoke a war.

When we were driven out of Peking, when we were provoked in London, do you not believe that this under other circumstances would have been occasion to respond with appropriate revolutionary resistance? At this point somebody asked me the question: Or with war? Yes, Comrades, also with war. (Laughter, Noise, Cries of: "And have you changed your mind?") For we are a revolutionary, proletarian State and not a sect of followers of Tolstói."

Comrades, yesterday there appeared in the "Isvestija" a declaration of a Communist, a member of the French Parliament, Comrade Cachin, who said that peace was preserved only on account of the "patience" of the Soviet State. We must say to the bourgeois world: "Your provocations are such that, under different circumstances, if we did not observe our present policy and if we had not so much patience, they would have led to war." When Comrade Rykov said in Charkov that the complications in our foreign relations have become so acute that a moment had arrived when military conflicts were to be feared, he said practically the same thing.

I will return to my main theme. When I heard the speech of Comrade Stalin and those of other of our Comrades of the C. C., I was convinced that the C. C. was repeating at the XV. Party Congress the very mistake, which we had made at the XIV. Party Congress, in estimating the international position. What was it we assumed at the XIV. Party Congress? In the resolution of the XV. Party Congress the following is said:

"In the matter of international relations there exists a strengthening and further extension of the "respite", which has been converted into a period of so-called peaceable relationship between the Soviet Union and the capitalist States."

Only a few months had passed after this estimate of the situation had been made, when a vehement and rapid development in the Chinese revolution set in, only to end in defeat. This defeat resulted in rupture with England. Furthermore, we had a conflict with France, and now we read every day of the inevitability, or, at least, probability, of serious military complications in our immediate neighbourhood, which might change the actual relations of forces in a situation which is extraordinarily unfavourable for us. (Levandovski: "You make matters worse!")

As the time at my disposal does not permit, I shall not revert to the speeches of Comrades Rykov, Tomsky and Bukharin in Charkov, Leningrad and Moscow. I shall only deal with Comrade Stalin's speech, which, unfortunately I did not hear well on account of bad acoustic relations. (Laughter.) I heard it and can quote from it as far as I was able to catch it.

First of all, I find Comrade Stalin's view fundamentally false. On the one hand, he recounts the successes of the last two years and closes with the liquidation of the affair with Switzerland; on the other hand, as though setting one off against the other, he speaks of the rupture between Great Britain and the Soviet Union and of the last conflict with France.

Comrades, I contend that these two matters cannot be compared and that, if in one sector of our international policy we had achievements even greater than those we actually had but in a second sector the rupture with England and the conflict with France, a conflict of which various estimates are made by the majority — the "Bolshevik" describes it as a threshold, as a preliminary step, as a real step towards rupture — the second sector is many times more important than the first. And I would further say that, even if we had maintained diplomatic relations with England, even if we had not had the conflict with France, the defeat of the Chinese revolution has created such an unfavourable situation for us that we might say that this defeat outweighs all the positive achievements in our foreign policy. (Noise.)

Comrade Stalin very rightly brought up the question of the attitude of the working class, of the world proletariat, to the Soviet Union. Yes, the working class is our axis in Party and Comintern policy as well as in State politics. We all understand that the exploitation of the contradictions between individual bourgeois groups and petty-bourgeois groups in various capitalist countries, which is one of the means of diplomatic manoeuvring, is of a relative character compared with this chief matter of the attitude towards the working class. I must, however, say that I do not agree with Comrade Stalin's optimistic prognosis and estimate of the situation. (Cries of: "That would be a fine thing!" Voroshilov: "You wouldn't be a member of the Opposition if you agreed with them!") In this regard we heard the following sentence: We ascertain steady growth of the sympathy of the working class towards the Soviet Union. In this general form that does not give us a proper idea of the changes which are taking place abroad. That can only lead us into confusion.

I said: if the sympathy grows in extent (Goloshchekin: "Ruth Fischer has no sympathy for us") but the efficacy of this sympathy diminishes, this is the most disquieting fact in our international policy. Let us take England. In the year 1923 we had a conflict as a result of the Curzon Note. In the year 1924 we had serious disputes with England and we had a conflict with England in the year 1927. (Postyshev: "And we'll have one in the year 1930.")

And everybody who has observed what is going on in England must have noticed the passivity, the indifference, of the masses in regard to the last conflict with England, which terminated in the breaking off of diplomatic relations. And that is the most disquieting fact, which portends a growth of Social-Democratic influence. While acknowledging an increase in the number of votes of the Communist Party, we must recognise a decline in the activity of the working class (Felix Kon: "The insurrection in Vienna!"), this fact, which is most disturbing: the decline (Voroshilov: "But the conclusion to be drawn?") of the efficacy, of the activity of the working class. And in view of so disturbing a fact I am not content with a general declaration of the growth of sympathy towards us. What is happening at present?

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution the bourgeois Press opened on the proletarian dictatorship a raging ideological fire (Bukharin: "Your demonstration of November 7th took place!"). One of the papers which are allegedly friendly towards us, the "Kölnische Zeitung", stated in its weekly edition, which is intended for Germans living abroad, in connection with the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution (I would say from the beginning that I naturally do not subscribe to this, but it is a disquieting fact) that Soviet Russia is spoken of not as an ideological enemy but as one might speak of any other State. (Noise in the hall.) The Soviet Union has ceased as far as the capitalist countries are concerned to be an ideologic danger. (Bukharin: "Why do they attack us?" Noise. Cries. Kaganovitch: "Is the "Kölnische Zeitung" a bourgeois paper?") Rakovski: "A bourgeois paper!" (Goloshchekin: "Now we've got it!") A bourgeois paper, but I warn you of this disturbing fact. (Noise. Cries: "You warned us in the year 1917. We can get along without these warnings.") That is a new phenomenon in our international position. Never

before did the Communist Party and the Soviet Union have to stand an ideological fire of this kind.

And how does the capitalist world regard our Party dissensions? I have some interesting documents on this point. (Noise.) I have in my possession a copy of a publication of the London Institute for Commercial Research. This number is devoted to the Soviet Union; it does not bear the writer's name, but it appears from the document that it was written by an English spy, who says that he was for two years in a position to observe unofficially what was going on in the Soviet Union. I must remind you that this brochure appeared in December of last year. (Noise.) What is asserted therein?

"From the study of events in Russia it appears that the fate of the country is at present decided by two diametrically opposed forces. On the one hand, doctrinaire Communism still endeavours to uphold the ideals and principles of the Bolshevik revolution of the year 1917 (noise, laughter), while, on the other hand, the hard facts of life compel all, with the exception of the most fanatical Communists to accept one after another the principles upon which Western civilisation is built."

Comrades, I have not the time to dwell long upon what the bourgeois papers write. I will turn to the "Arbeiter Zeitung", from which Comrade Bukharin often quotes, a Labour paper published by Otto Bauer. (Interjection: "Your relations with Bauer are indeed touching!") It will suffice to read the beginning (Noise and cries of indignation). In the numbers of November 16th and 20th (reads):

"The criticism of the Opposition has undoubtedly made it difficult up to the present time for Stalin to be consequential, to keep to the more realistic path in the matter of economy and foreign policy and to avoid falling into utopian illusions."

The same again on November 20th. At the same time, the American press states (Bukharin: "Feeble, feeble!" Solz: "That's right, look in the bourgeois press for justifications for your line of action!")

I have here the "New York Times". It writes:

"To maintain the Opposition amounts to preserving the explosives which undermine the capitalist world." (Laughter, noise, shouts, and cries of protest and indignation.)

A disquieting agreement. Here they say: A blow at the Opposition! — and abroad they also say: A blow at the Opposition! (Noise, cries of: "That's the way, your friends, Ruth Fischer and Maslov, speak! They want you abroad to disintegrate the Party!")

A second point, Comrades! The majority or, at least, many of the reactionary papers say that the course being taken with the Opposition is right but it is not severe enough. (Kossior: "It looks as though you read nothing but bourgeois papers!") I also have the "Temps" of November 8th, in which is stated in relation to Comrade Stalin's answer to the questions of the international delegation:

"In spite of a certain deceptive appearance, the Soviet regime cannot develop properly, and Russia cannot look for salvation except through the complete and final destruction of the proletarian dictatorship." (Noise in the hall.)

Comrades, I have read to you an insignificant portion of what is written daily. In addition to those which say "Right but not severe enough" I have quoted those which say "We need other proofs". (Solz: "You represented the opinion of the bourgeoisie!") Wherein lies the disquieting aspect of this phenomenon? This is the newest phenomenon in our international situation, impudent attempts on the part of world imperialism to interfere in our internal dissensions to back the majority.

It is characteristic of our present situation that our international position is becoming worse. At the same time, the whole endeavour of world imperialism, supported by the deviation of the Party towards the Right, the whole endeavour of the world bourgeoisie, is to isolate us ideologically from the world proletariat (Noise) to separate us ideologically from the world proletariat. Comrades, we of the Party all remember Lenin's advice (Cry of: "You don't remember anything; you've forgotten everything! Mensheviki, you're agents of the world bourgeoisie!") as to how we should manoeuvre in international politics. The capitalist States often reproach us with speculating on their antagonisms. (Noise.) Among themselves, however,

they employ this method. And we must make still greater use of it. As a proletarian State we live under extraordinary and incredible difficulties. But in manoeuvring, we must proceed from two main premises. Above all, it is necessary to know the limits of such manoeuvring. (Cry of: "What are you thinking of doing next? Let's hear about that!")

Comrade Tomsy regretted in Leningrad that the Opposition prevented the Politbureau from drafting comprehensive and deliberated resolutions and that in order to get freedom of movement the Party would have to get rid of the Opposition. (Shouts of: "Quite right!" Noise.)

I would ask you: "If the left wing of the Party is lopped off" (Cries: "Get out of the Party and have done with the matter! Away with the Mensheviki from the platform! The platform isn't intended for Mensheviki. Not the left wing, but the Menshevist sector. The conference demands its removal! Get down! Get down!" Noise. Chairman's bell.)

Chairman: Who is in favour of prolonging the time allotted for Comrade Rakovski's speech? — Nobody.

Comrade RUDSUTAK:

Comrades, Marx somewhere says that it is not necessary to be a small trader in order to give expression to the feelings of the petty bourgeoisie. (Shouts of: "That's just what Rakovski has done." Applause.) I believe that Comrade Rakovski's attitude is an excellent proof of this idea (Shout: "Hear, hear!"), because the whole of his speech was characteristic talk of a small trader, although I believe I can give you assurance that Comrade Rakovski is not yet a greengrocer (laughter). According to his statement, the danger from abroad is the greatest danger. It would have been of great advantage both for Comrade Rakovski and for the Party if he had understood this truth only a month or six weeks ago. But it is not long since Comrade Rakovski and Trotzky and all the other leaders of the Opposition were of a different opinion. They were of the opinion that the greatest danger in our country was the C. C. of our Party. (Cries of "Shame!")

It is only now, at the XV. Party Congress, at which, instead of the majority they one year ago expected to have, they are not represented by a single vote, they wish to manoeuvre so that they may still save something, still retain some little thing or other. But it doesn't amount to much to say now at the XV. Party Congress that the danger from abroad is the greater danger and to declare "We will give our support". The only thing lacking is that you should stand up here and say that you will not support the Party and the working class against the attacks of the bourgeoisie. (Cry: "Then we should not have let you into the hall.") A fine Communist who at the Party Congress stands up and declares that he will support the Party and the working class against the attacks of the enemy. (Shouts of: "Shame!" Applause.) On this point we heard from non-party workers, who stood up and greeted the XV. Party Congress, speeches which were much more to our liking. (Cries of: "Quite right!" Applause.) And therefore it is very strange and ridiculous to hear Rakovski say that the Opposition will support us. But how have they supported us up to the present against this same bourgeoisie, of whom Comrade Rakovski has just spoken so fervently? I have here a quotation from yesterday's paper reading as follows:

"In spite of repeated denials from the telegraphic agency, the foreign Press continues to publish from dubious sources, chiefly from reports from Roumania, news of the fight being carried on by the Opposition in the Party, as also concerning insurrections and revolts in the Red Army, said to have taken place in Ukraine, and which, according to these reports, could only with the greatest effort be put down by the 'loyal' troops of the Red Army and of the G. P. U."

That is a result of that "support" from the Opposition; that is among other things the result of Comrade Radovski's attitude in Charkov, where he declared before foreign delegates that there are Fascists in our Party. (Radchenko: "That's the way Rakovski educates the workers!" "Shame!")

It was in this way that Rakovski, Trotzky, Zinoviev and the others supported us until the XV. Party Congress, and we have to thank this "support" for a large measure of the increased pressure which the bourgeoisie is bringing to bear upon us. We have to thank them, if the danger of an intervention is in-

creasing, because this is the case in consequence of such "support" from the Opposition, who support the cry of the bourgeoisie about our internal weakness, our internal collapse and our destruction, and in this regard it is the best support of all bourgeois calumnies against the Soviet Union, for up to the present it has been the aim of the whole conduct of the Opposition and of the fight, which they have carried on against the Central Committee and against our Party, to weaken the Central Committee and the Party.

It is, therefore, all the more ridiculous for Rakovski to declare that the showing of our own weakness does not signify a diminution of the danger of war but a further step towards war. And what have you been talking about the whole time? About our strength? Since the XIV. Party Congress you have been proclaiming through the streets that our economy is breaking down, that the position of the working class is becoming worse, just as is the position of the peasantry, that the Kulak danger is growing and that Fascism is developing in the Party. You said all this in spite of the fact that we have been growing and getting stronger. For this reason, it is most ridiculous for Rakovski here to declare that we are making a parade of our weakness, in that we did not declare war on France, only because Rakovski was not wanted there. It was Rakovski himself who made the proposal at the time to allow no conflict to arise, and now you see that it means making a parade of one's weakness not to declare war on France for Rakovski's sake. For two years now he has been constantly telling us that with us everything is going to ruin and that it would be an easy job to set about us and finish us off. Does that not mean that you are conjuring up fresh danger of intervention? You have contributed more than anybody else to the creation of this danger. You are the people who have so prepared the ground abroad, that the opinion can be held that the Soviet Union is now weak, that a new military attack upon it would involve no great danger and that the defeat of the Soviet Union might be counted upon. Is it not a fact that all the calumnies in the foreign Press and the preparation against us for military intervention are in a great measure fed by the constant supply of information and false reports spread against our Party and our country by the Opposition?

As you see, Comrade Rakovski was unable to make any important comment on the statements made by Comrade Stalin, because in the place in which Rakovski sat the acoustics were not particularly good. I believe there are special Opposition maladies (Cries of: "He's as blind as he's deaf!" "He has lost both hearing and sight!"), for it is not only from this one speech of Comrade Stalin that he has heard what the Party's opinion of the Opposition is and what measures are to be used to cure this Opposition disease. The whole Party has been talking of the matter for about two years. Are Comrade Rakovski's ears really so weak that he cannot hear the voice of the Party and is it for this reason that he does not know what opinion of the Opposition the Party holds? Beyond this petty-bourgeois twaddle, which he has set before us, has he nothing to say to the Party? (Shout: "Blind as a bat!")

How does the Opposition think of curing this slight indisposition? Possibly with the help of the twaddle which Comrade Rakovski has just served up — this "defence against the bourgeoisie?" We are not in need of that. And we must rid ourselves of this defence, no matter at what cost. (Applause.) Not long ago the Opposition reproached us with being nationally narrow-minded in the question of construction of Socialism in a single country. And to-day Comrade Rakovski says: "When Comrade Stalin says that sympathy for the Soviet Union is growing abroad, I cannot share his optimism." Rakovski says that relations there towards the Soviet Union are constantly growing cooler. That, Comrade Rakovski, indicates your utter bankruptcy.

If you have gone so far as to assume that we can no longer base the slightest hope on the sympathy of the West European workers, that means that our revolution, our Party and our working class have got into a cul de sac and that in this case our revolution has no prospects. For one cannot accuse us yesterday of being nationally narrow-minded because we believed in the possibility of the development of Socialism in our country, and then tell us to-day that the West European and American workers will give us no support. You have no faith at all in the solidarity of the working class. I do not believe that your agitation abroad has taken root to such an extent that the sympathy of the West European workers towards us, the Party

and the Soviet Union — have been alienated. You, Comrade Rakovski, know as little about the life of the working class and workers' organisations in this country as you do of those abroad. You do not perceive the tremendous changes which are taking place both here and abroad. You do not see how upon the basis of the economic changes, which are happening abroad, a new wave of the revolutionary movement is arising. Is not the danger of a war against our Union a sign that the foundations of the stabilisation of the capitalist world are shaking? That fresh subterranean shocks are being felt there, not only from the attacks of capital, but also from the new wave of the revolutionary movement. If we do not base any hopes upon the solidarity of the working class of West Europe — can we still continue to talk of developing Socialist economy and the Socialist State? Can we still talk of the world revolution? Comrade Rakovski has to-day brought all this to our notice. That with which he reproached us yesterday no longer exists for him. We observe similar confusion in Comrade Rakovski when he talks of foreign estimation of the Soviet Union. In the "Kölnische Zeitung" or some other bourgeois paper appears the statement: "In connection with the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution, Soviet Russia is not spoken of as an ideologic enemy but only as one State might speak of any other State." And immediately after that and almost before he has turned over a page of his paper he says: "Never before was Russia exposed to such an ideologic cannonade as it is now directed against us." What is the matter, Comrade Rakovski; what has happened to you? If things are so bad, why not bring with you for your next opposition address an old washerwoman instead of your newspaper? (Laughter.)

I should now like to touch upon the new document, which the Opposition (Shout: When will they come to an end of their rubbish?) has submitted to the commission elected by the Party Congress to investigate the question of the Opposition.

This document is so imposing that even before the commission issues its report to you we cannot pass it over in silence. I am of the opinion that this is the most mendacious, the most hypocritical and the most villainous deed the Opposition has yet committed, and it is just with this document that they come to the 15th Party Congress. (Applause.) First of all, it is unspeakably ridiculous confusion for them to say: "Furthermore, the recent development of the internal Party fight has exposed our Party to manifest danger." You lie! If 4000 intellectuals leave a party which is a million strong, that does not constitute a splitting of the Party. (Shouts of: "Hear, hear!" Applause.) Our Party renews itself and cleanses itself constantly and incessantly, throws out unsuitable elements and enlists new cadres.

This renewal continues throughout the year, not merely within a limit of 4000 but of tens of thousands. But is the Party not thereby cleaned and strengthened? It grows daily in volume and improves in quality, for in its practical work and with the help of its political experience it cleanses itself of the dirt which lodges in its pores. And just now the Party is being cleansed of 4000 unfit and thoroughly decadent intellectuals. Does that mean the disintegration of our Party? (Applause.) And therefore, worthy Opposition, do not frighten anybody again with your terrible phrases about the threatened splitting of our Party. There is no split and there will be no split. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

They further say: "In the fight for our views we are taking the path of fractional work." It is not true that you are taking the path of fractional work. You are taking the path of the reactionaries, because your work, especially in the last period before the Party Congress and before the discussion preparatory to the Party Congress has nothing in common with an ordinary fraction fight. It was a typical fight against the Party and, finally, against the Soviet State. (Cry: "Quite right!") And, therefore, your declaration that you took the path of fractional fighting is only an unsuccessful attempt to hide your traces. But that will not now help you to disguise facts. The facts which we have in hand give evidence which is much too convincing. Nobody ever did our Party so much harm as you have done through your work. If you acknowledge your error, come to the XV. Party Congress, give things their proper names and confess your mistakes.

They further say: "We are forced into this path only by the deep conviction of the correctness and the Leninistic character of our views." (Laughter.) I ask you, who are sitting here:

Should these people really have believed in the accuracy of their statement, according to which the Central Committee desires to enter into an alliance with the kulaks and the Nepmen? Should they really believe in the correctness of their views, when they say that our economy is steadily breaking down and that we are growing into capitalism? You regarded these views as right? Never! If you had believed in their correctness, how could you have changed them a dozen times in a year? Did not Trotsky say towards the end of 1925 in connection with the construction of the electric power station on the Dnieper: "The kulak is a blessing when he sells his grain to the Soviet State, which with the foreign values it thus gets imports mechanical implements"? How is it that Trotsky's views have changed so in the course of two years? Have the theories, which you two years ago believed to be right, changed to such an extent? How is it that people like you, who are so "rich in ideas", change your views and your ideology as often as you change your shirts. You believe that we are growing into the Thermidor and that we are becoming the party of the Thermidor? How so? If you believe all that, then all your statements to the effect that you have no differences of opinion with the Party on matters of programme are an abominable lie. Either one or the other? Either you believed what you said, in which case you calumniated the Party in the lowest manner, or you do not speak the truth when you say that you have no differences of opinion with the Party on the matter of programme. And your platform, all your literary creations of the past years — what of them — do they not constitute a new programme? Do you not there contrast the views of our Party with your own? I believe that Comrade Stalin puts the question quite rightly: "And in what way do you agree with the Party? Are there any points at all on which we agree? No, not one, not a single point, either theoretic or practical." The matter goes so far that the Opposition, who previously put forward the demand that 30 per cent. of the village poor should be exempt from taxation, declared after the Manifesto had declared 35 per cent. of the village poor exempt from taxation, in the person of Zinoviev at an illegal meeting in Leningrad: "And now we will demand that 40 per cent. to 50 per cent. be exempt from taxation!" (Laughter.) And now you know what your declarations are worth. Whatever the Party and the Central Committee say, you will say the opposite.

And after that they come with perfidious documents, which from the standpoint of the Opposition are supposed to be documents of peace; after that they come with mendacious statements to the effect that there are no differences of opinion between the Opposition and the Party on questions of programme. Between you and the Party there is not a single point of agreement. That is the truth of the matter.

They further say: "We have never attempted to and do not now intend to make non-party people judges of the internal quarrels of the Party" (Cry: "Nobody will believe you!") Is that possibly true? (Interjection: It's a lie!) And now look at the document for yourselves. At the foot of this document there are forged signatures. I quote from memory. Vuyovitch — a member of the party for twelve years. But if my memory does not deceive me, he is non-party. (Laughter.) So you have come to the 15th Party Congress along with non-party people in order to prosecute the Party, and then you say in this document that you never attempted to and do not now intend to approach non-party people to be judges in the disagreement between the Opposition and the Party. (Interjection: "And the demonstration on November 7th?") And the forged signatures of those, who sign as members of the Party, although they are not members — you have several dozen such signatures at the foot of your documents. (Interjection: They have their own Central Committee and do not recognise ours!) But your street demonstrations, which you did not make exclusively for non-party workers but for the people from "Krasny Riad" and "Ochotny Riad" (squares in Moscow), for the petty bourgeoisie? Whom are you addressing? (Interjection: "They are looking about 'Ochotny Riad' for support!") It is just there that you are looking for support, because you have completely lost the support of the working class. In order to find any support at all you had to brush together all the dirt in the street. And after that you give such a lying explanation as: "We do not intend and never intended to get non-party people to decide in regard to our disagreement with the Party."

Worthy Comrades, we have no intention of starting a legal quarrel with you. We are not the accused! We have not yet con-

fessed before a court, while you are now appearing before the Party Congress to answer for your activity in the course of two years.

Furthermore, in their declaration they give the same assurance as Rakovski gave: "As regards the international bourgeoisie, who are speculating on the splitting up of our Party and are constantly preparing more pronouncedly for war against the Soviet Union, we consider it our duty to do everything we can to strengthen the fighting unity of our Party." (Interjection: "Even to demonstration!") That is a lie and a hypocrisy. You ought not to approach the bench of the XV. Party Congress with such statements. Your whole activity and all the lies and calumnies which you spread abroad through your traitors and renegades with the help of Ruth Fischer, Maslov and similar calumniators — does that strengthen the fighting front of the Soviet Union against the foreign danger? Have all these lies and calumnies, which you have started in our country, which you have used up abroad 'against the world bourgeoisie? Is that which you publish in foreign countries in the form of rumours, is the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie not led to the weakening of our accusation that we are Thermidorians and are converting ourselves into Nep people contemplating an alliance with the kulaks, is this your reinforcing of the united proletarian front against the world bourgeoisie and against the united front of capital? How can you dare to face the XV. Party Congress with such vulgar lies and say: "We are prepared to strengthen the power and the forces of the Soviet Union against the world bourgeoisie!"? There is nothing left for you to do except to speak in face of the bourgeoisie, because you would be ashamed to appeal to the working class!

"We consider it our duty to do everything necessary to strengthen the fighting unity of our Party." Rakovski's speech is the first (Interjection: "Hypocrisy!") word for the fighting unity of our Party. What has he done towards the strengthening of the unity? Beyond petty-bourgeois panic and bourgeois twaddle he has offered us nothing. Comrade Rakovski, should have come here and said: "Here you have our C. C. to which this and that comrade belongs: we are liquidating it, our district committees, to which so-and-so and so-and-so belong are being dissolved; the printing works at such and such a place, which had not been discovered, we have closed down, and we will pass them over for the use of the respective Soviet officials." (Interjection: "Into the archives!" Laughter.) In that case I could understand that you had come with the honest intention of restoring the fighting unity of our Party. But you have appeared with lies and deceit. On such a basis there can be no peace. (Interjection: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

Further, it also sounds most hypocritical when you say in your declaration: "We declare to the Party Congress that we are giving up all fractional work, liquidating all fractional organisations and, in addition, requesting all our adherents in the C. P. S. U. and in the Comintern to do the same." (Comotion in the hall.) It reminds me somewhat of the parrot that said when taken of its cage: "At last I've got out!" (Laughter.) Now that you are utterly beaten, it is easy for you to say that the fraction is dissolved and the fight liquidated. Where would you still like to fight and against whom? You have no army. None exists. All that remains is yourselves and the famous "In the eyes of the world bourgeoisie" — that, and nothing more. These faces, which we see before us (He points to the delegates to the Party Congress), that is the face of our working class and there is the face of the world bourgeoisie. Where do you stand? Certainly not with us. And where you will be later, we do not yet know.

In any case, these assurances do not indicate that it is really your intention to return to us.

I believe that it is the task of the Party Congress not only to clear up the question of how the work of our Opposition during the last two years should be estimated; we are also confronted by the task of finding out what circumstances must be created for peaceable and fruitful work in our Party and in our C. C.

And I think that there is only one answer to that: Penitence. The Opposition must really repent and dissolve their fractions, show their cards, surrender all their illegal organisations, acknowledge all their mistakes; for it is not enough for them to give assurance that they are dissolving the fractions, while they still continue to defend their views in the manner

in which they have previously defended them. I believe, we are entitled to say: Your views are incompatible with our Party. (Interjection: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

I believe that we should recall to your minds the words of one of our former "dear" comrades, Comrade Kamenev, uttered at the XI. Moscow Government Party Conference with regard to the Troizky Opposition. When several comrades made the suggestion that it was necessary to accept an armistice and an alliance with the followers of Trotzky, he painted a picture of this Opposition, which he described as an iridescent and bushy tail; whereupon he drew the following conclusion: "If we were to embrace this bushy tail, the ensuing kiss would not be particularly appetising. Would it therefore not be better to proceed as we have always been advised to: First of all pull this bushy tail off and then embrace it." I believe that Kamenev has had tremendous experience in the matter of embracing tails. (Laughter and applause.) I believe that during these two years his kisses have often been placed not only on the tail but also underneath. (Applause.) But I believe that in this case we should not proceed in the Kamenev manner. I think we should pull the tail off, but not embrace it. (Prolonged applause.)

Comrade YEVDOKIMOV:

(Comrade Yevdokimov reads his speech from the manuscript.)

In response to the speeches which demand immediate exclusion of the Opposition members from the Party, I should like to say a few words as to my estimate of what the working class expect from our XV. Party Congress. One of the most important events of the last two years is that the whole or practically the whole of the working class have taken an interest in the internal disputes of the Party. (Solz: "Not taken an interest in them, but understood them.")

This is comprehensible. There were on the agenda not questions relating to some purely theoretic thesis, which would interest only a small circle of people (Loud noise), but questions which affect the most vital interests of wide circles of workers. The quarrel relates to such questions as the wage question, the question of the seven-hour working day. (Interjection: "You voted against it!") and the question of the kulaks. This last question affects living reality in the industrial towns, in the cuing up for foodstuffs. The dispute turns upon the question of what measures are to be taken to obviate the shortage of goods.

It is not only a matter of internal questions but also of such questions as the question of the Chinese revolution and the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The question of the approaching new war naturally also interests the broadest masses of the workers and most of necessity interest them. This question was also touched upon in our disputes, although in the form that there are Party members who are upholders of "defence under certain conditions".

To-day, the workers, the poorest peasants and the middle peasants know from the theses which have been published in the newspapers, at least what the contention is at present really about and whether there are in our Party "supporters of defence under certain conditions".

What does the working class really want? Each of the contending sides (Skrypnik: "What kind of side is that!") naturally maintains that the working class wants what the particular side wants. For instance, it is maintained here at the Party Congress that the workers demand our expulsion from the Party. (Shouts of: "Quite right! Quite right!") That is not true. There are few workers who will believe that such Party leaders as Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotzky (Interjection: "Particularly such leaders!") could be enemies of the working class, the Party and the Soviet Power. (Loud noise. — Interjection: "Plechanov was also a leader and he is missing.")

It is necessary to avoid all self-deception. You have repeatedly witnessed how fairly large circles of workers have shown their sympathy towards the Opposition. (Laughter. — Shout: "At the Yaroslav Station?") Comrade Lenin taught us to look reality straight in the eye. Broad working masses are also interested in the question of the possibility and the danger of a split in the C. P. S. U.; it is their chief wish that the unity of our Party should be preserved. (Interjection: "That exists and will continue to.") At the same time, the workers naturally wish the majority as also the minority to have the possibility of expressing their opinions. (Interjection: "It's a Menshevist minority.")

The workers naturally do not want a split — they are against two parties. (Interjection: "And the Opposition probably wants it?") Every worker knows that two parties imply the danger of interference from a third force. The interference of a third power, however, means that the danger of war is greater, means new privations, such as those our working class has already experienced, and it is our duty to see that our working class never again enters upon this dreadful, thorny path, except in the case of extreme necessity.

The working class wishes that unity be preserved within our Party; but you cannot make upon us demands, which the working class could never regard as just — the demand to give up our very selves — to jettison our own views.

The working mass know very well the comrades who are expelled from the Party — not only the prominent ones but also the simple workers from the Opposition. Several hundred, perhaps thousands of adherents of the Opposition have been expelled, workers at the bench. They live among the working masses, the workers know them as comrades who are faithful to the Labour movement and to our Party.

The working masses can also understand that in the heat of the fight before the Party Congress, in the fever of the quarrel, reprisals were resorted to. But the Party Congress — the head of the Party and, moreover, of the Party which conducts the first proletarian State in the world — must put an end to the acrimony of the fight and restore true unity. We are prepared to do everything necessary for this purpose. Let us do what the whole of the working class really wants. Those who believe that peace and quiet can be restored by the method of chipping off and mass-expulsion are very much mistaken. It is our desire to do with united strength all we can to justify the hopes which the working class attach to the work of our XV. Party Congress.

Comrade KIROW (Leningrad):

First of all, I must say a few words about the estimation of the general policy of the C. C. A good deal has been said about it, and a good deal has been said at the government and district Party conferences about the policy of the C. C. There is not the slightest doubt that in spite of all the malevolent predictions of the Opposition, the last two years have seen the consolidation of a large portion of that historical work, on which we have already been labouring for ten years.

I understand the nervousness of the representatives of the Opposition. To my mind many of our comrades here have allowed bald injustice to be done to them. It is not during the last three months, let alone the last month, before the Party Congress or during the discussion itself, but two years ago that they predicted the inevitable collapse of our Party and of its policy.

After waiting with so much tension and much avidity for these specially serious difficulties and for this fate for the Soviet Union and our Party, have they come to the Party Congress to tell us anything? I understand Comrade Rakovski. He is an experienced, thoroughly well-bred man; but when he mounted this platform he began to tell us about things, about which we are fairly well informed. How did he begin his speech? "Comrades, the earth has the form of a globe (Laughter.); of this globe we occupy a sixth part, while our enemies occupy five-sixths. Just think what advantage the enemy has over us in number, capital and the like." (Laughter, Applause.)

If I am not mistaken, Rakovski knows not only Western but also Eastern languages, and he must know that one can by no means simply compare the one sixth arithmetically with the remaining five-sixths. That is just the secret, most worthy diplomat; that we constitute the sixth part, face up to five-sixths and still win.

How can we explain this helplessness on the part of the Opposition? Purely and simply by the fact that nothing can be said against the achievements of the line taken by the Party. We must, nevertheless, grant the representatives of the Opposition precedence in one thing: they naturally know the needs of the working class immeasurably better than do all the rest of us put together. Think a moment, you are assembled here in a magnificent palace, while Zinoviev languishes in a working district, in the workers' dwellings. He knows exactly which shoe pinches and where. And through the mouth of Yevdokimov he has proclaimed that, for instance, wages, the seven-hour day, against which, as you know, they voted, and the

shortage of houses, etc. — that all these things are important matters which are hardly surpassed in urgency. But what has become of all that which was explained by the representatives of the Opposition in that famous evangel, called the platform of the Opposition.

And what are they dishing up for us now? Where are now the speeches to the effect that we are Thermidorians, that we are this, that and the other? They get up here and begin with philosophical contemplations of wages and of the seven-hour day. How is this at all? The fact of the matter is that your bankruptcy at the XV. Party Congress is complete, absolute and decisive.

Alongside the declaration, of which Comrade Rudzutak spoke to us, there lies at the chairman's table another declaration bearing the signatures of persons who are no longer members of the Party. In this declaration they declare themselves in full agreement with the contents of the declaration of the 121, and beg the Party Congress to readmit them to the Party. Within themselves they will certainly think that the working class will be moved to its depths in case this should not come to pass, that the revolution would be exposed to fresh danger, etc., etc. Trotzky is not present, but we must call him to mind in this connection. He was a great artist in making similar things appear different. It seems to me that this art would apply exactly in this case. Recently, eighteen months ago the Opposition had done so much for the Party, for the working class, for the proletarian dictatorship, that the way out of the Party is a very short one, while the way back into the Party is endless. (Applause.)

And while the internal fight in the Party has been in progress we have grown accustomed to many things. We are in no way affected by such things as Lashevitch's "Sermon on the Mount" in the forest; we close our eyes to the fact that Smilga was carried into the railway carriage on the shoulders of the "leaders", etc., etc. In the meanwhile the thing has flourished greatly. To-day you can hear them shouting even here: "If Lenin were still alive, this and that would not happen." But Lenin would have fought ruthlessly for the annihilation of the Opposition, and, I believe, that the representatives of the Opposition would have been outside the Party sooner than has been the case without Lenin. (Applause.)

At the present time Safarov is in Leningrad; while they were writing the application, of which Comrade Rudzutak spoke, and in which they appeared so "concerned" for unity, Safarov held an illegal meeting in Narva urban district, stirred up the public and said: "Our leaders have different kinds of backbones; some of them wish to go whole hog, while there are others who are not so daring. They can write all kind of things, but when it comes to action they miss fire, even though there are among them long-service men who were once pupils of Lenin. Therefore, in order that nothing unexpected may happen, a democracy must be organised, and this democracy must advance from here, from Leningrad, against Moscow and force the leaders to this ultra-Oppositional action."

So that's the way of it with the unity of deeds and words on the part of the worthy Opposition!

When they appear here and quarrel with us as to whether we are building up Socialism or only making a mess of things, this is merely not comprehensible to every non-Party worker, it even affects him in the most intimate manner. The Opposition has for this reason approached the theme with caution and has not at once produced its specification in relation to the building up of Socialism in our country. When they enter factories in which their presence is "yearned for" the workers say to them: "Don't disturb us at our work. Put your harmful Opposition literature in your pockets again. Don't confuse us. We can do without your molestation — we have difficulty enough as it is in establishing Socialism in our country." The workers understand this full well; it is only the Opposition which has not yet grasped it. It is still subject to the law of inertia, which plays an important part not only in physics but also in politics.

We train and organise our Party in accordance with the testimony of Lenin on the basis of internal Party democracy, and these simple things are not understood by the former leaders. We are trying to create working cadres as large as possible, so that every nuclei, every limb of our Party, our tremendous, complicated Party life and Soviet life may supply

fresh powers in this or that manner to our chief organs, and raise up new strata within the Party. We are developing tremendous politico-educational work among the masses. This makes the dictatorship in its entire daily work comprehensible to the worker. We, therefore, feel at very step of the work how these new cadres are growing, and we believe that the Opposition should in no way count upon the law of inertia in this regard.

Comrade Minin has just expressed his astonishment at the facility with which the Leningrad organisation has severed itself from the Opposition and taken the path of the Leninist leadership of the Party. It should here be remarked that one of the factors which previously promoted this work was that Trotzkyism was nowhere else so badly beaten, that nowhere else was Trotzky's ideology so thoroughly analysed in detail, as in Leningrad in particular. There the matter was worked upon for years and was analysed in the requisite fashion. This same Yevdokimov (at that time wrote excellent compositions (they are readable even to-day), in which he stripped Trotzkyism of its flourishes and explained its essence and the nature of its individual parts. But quite suddenly and unexpectedly there came the celebrated fraternisation of Zinoviev and Trotzky. This step appeared to the Leningrad organisation to be consummate sorcery. For years they had been coached therein; for years the principles of Trotzkyism had been explained to them; what was the meaning of this sudden happening? It is true, that it soon became completely clear to the workers where their former leaders had landed. Only yesterday they had agitated in every way against Trotzky; to-day they carried him shoulder high into Leningrad as a weighty argument.

The worker understood what was afoot, and the Party member, too. And therein, Comrade Minin, lay a part of the secret of that truly remarkable change which took place in Leningrad.

We did not join the Party yesterday. And we did not get to know Trotzky only yesterday; we know him no less than Zinoviev knows him. The print in Zinoviev's books about Trotzky is not yet dry; how then would it be possible to crown him in the name of Leninism? No matter with what complications they may try to intimidate us, no matter what they may tell us will happen, if the Opposition is once separated from the Party, all we have to say to them is: "Arrange that matter among yourselves."

Such is the position of affairs to-day. We must proceed with the utmost energy in the work of consolidating democracy in the Party, the trade unions and the Soviets. This is the greatest organisatory task at the present stage of our work, as we are approaching in the most immediate, comprehensible manner the construction of Socialism in our country.

Every worker understands that when he talks to us of the shortcomings and mistakes in the practice of our work, etc., this affects us about a hundred times as much as it does our comrades of the Opposition. But we know, just as well as the workers do, that the disorder, poverty, privation and starvation of five years ago are giving place to progress and every possible achievements.

It is not a mere accident that just at the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution we are obliged to do a little weeding in our Party. Within the past ten years we have made a tremendous swing in the direction of Socialist construction. During this transformation, pressure has been brought to bear by the petty-bourgeois scum upon certain members of our Party. On account of several fresh strides and a new movement of the great revolution, the Opposition lost its nerve and gave way to panic. In order that our work may be successfully continued without interference, that which was not carried out at the XIV. Party Congress must really be executed at the XV. Party Congress. The Opposition must be weeded out in the most decided, thorough and ruthless manner. (Applause.)

This is expected by our Party, this is expected of us by the working class of the Soviet Union, this is also expected by the international proletariat. The Party, the founder of the Comintern, the Party, of which the world revolution was born, the Party which builds up Socialism — this Party must really remain united. Whoever impedes us, whoever vacillates, whoever doubts must vanish in the historic abyss, but the path of us all leads only forward and to victory. (Great applause.)

Comrade KAMENEV.

Comrades, my only object in mounting this platform is to find a way of conciliation between the Opposition and the Party. I have listened to Comrade Andrejev's speech; from this the conclusion could be drawn that the way to conciliation has already been blocked, that it has ceased to exist. In view of the fact however that the Party Congress has already discussed this question several days and has elected a special commission, I nevertheless think that Comrade Andrejev, who is a member of that commission, has been too hasty in maintaining that all avenues have already been explored, that everything has been completed and that nothing is left to do for the Party Congress except to write down what has already been resolved upon. (Interjection: "That will depend on you!").

I should like to hope this is not so. The Opposition forms a minority in the Party. It cannot, of course, make its terms to the Party. It can only inform the Party of the conclusions it is drawing for itself from the history of the two years' struggle and reply to the questions put to it.

Two years ago, at the XIV. Party Congress, we disagreed with the majority with regard to a number of fundamental questions of our revolution, important, serious questions, such as the question of the direction in which to fire, of the growth and significance of the anti-proletarian elements in our country, chiefly in the village, of the methods of combating those elements, of the estimate of the international situation from the point of view of permanent stabilisation, and in connection with these, also with regard to questions concerning the policy of the Comintern. The struggle raging round these questions has become so embittered in the past two years that we are all faced by the question of choosing between two ways. The first of these two ways is the formation of a second party. Under the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship, this way is fatal for the revolution. It is the path of political and class degeneration. This way is closed to us, prohibited, out of the question owing to the entire system of our views, to all the teachings of Lenin on the dictatorship of the proletariat. We cannot lead those who share our views on to that path and we do not wish to do so.

There is the other way. That way means that we should submit fully and entirely to the Party after having carried on an embittered, obstinate, vehement fight for our views. We chose this way because we are firmly convinced that a correct Leninist policy can only be victorious in the Party and by means of the Party, but not outside the Party. To enter on this path means that we have to submit to all the resolutions of the Party Congress no matter how hard it may be for us to do so. (Interjection: "Formally!").

In doing so, we act in a Bolshevik manner. If, however, we should add renunciation of our views to this unconditional and complete submission to all the resolutions of the Party Congress, to the complete abolition, to the complete liquidation of any fractional struggle, in all forms and to the dissolution of the fractional organisations, our behaviour would, in my opinion, not be a Bolshevik behaviour. The demand that the members of the Party should renounce their own views has never been made in our Party. If we should now declare our renunciation of the views which we defended only a week or two ago, it would be hypocrisy and you would not believe us. If I came here and said: I renounce what I published in my theses two weeks ago, you would not believe me and it would indeed be hypocrisy on my part; such hypocrisy, however, is not in place. This hypocrisy would only introduce putrefaction into the core of the thing, into the foundation, the foundation stone of this reconciliation. I am sure no one wants that on either side.

I refer of course to those views which are our actual views... (Voroshilov: "We demand a renunciation of your Menshevik views!"), those which are laid down in our documents, in the platform, in the theses signed by us, but not to the exaggerations which are often ascribed to us.

In recent times, a number of responsible Party leaders have quite openly discussed with the Party the serious difficulties by which the Party and the country are faced. We hold the view that these difficulties can certainly be overcome, but it is a necessary preliminary condition for overcoming these difficulties, to criticise our own mistakes, to be prepared to correct them, to re-examine our policy on the basis of facts

and, if necessary, to change it. We are of the opinion that our criticism, which we pledge ourselves to exercise only strictly within the limits of the Party statutes, will benefit the Party all the more in that our views with regard to a number of questions have been confirmed by life itself and as, in a number of cases, the Party adopted our views to some extent.

Tell me then what is the good of demanding that we should renounce our views? Is it possible to demand that we abandon our views with regard to the Anglo-Russian Committee? Can you demand of us that we renounce our views on the Chinese Revolution?... (Interjection: "What then do you abandon?"). Is it possible to demand that we should abandon our views in the question of the differentiation of the peasantry? Is it possible to demand that we abandon our views in the question of the backwardness of industry in comparison with the general rate of development of our country?...

Has not the Anglo-Russian Committee died an ignominious death without justifying the hopes set on it? Has not the course of the Chinese revolution proved that the hopes set on the Right and on the Left Kuo-Min-Tang have been a mistake? Does not the present economic situation confirm our views that the predominance of the Kulak in the village is annihilating our State plans, our plans of exports and consequently also our plan of capital investment? Has not the growth of the shortage of goods again become the main economic problem?

This is a truth of which the Party leaders speak to you. It is not my own wisdom, nothing of my invention; it is something that every economist can tell you. Comrades, in these conditions it is absolutely impossible to comply with the demand that we should renounce, abandon our views.

I shall only give you another example which is of particular significance at the present moment. The chief question in dispute at the XIV. Party Congress was the question of the relations between our socialist and our peasant economy. You know that it is just this question in which our opinions differed both before and after the 14th Party Congress. You blamed us for raising this question and accused us of distrust, scepticism and panic with regard to the Kulak, and of scepticism with regard to the construction of Socialism. We, on our part, maintained that the views expressed with regard to those questions were inspired with unjustifiable optimism, with glossing over the N.E.P. and underestimating the capitalist elements in the village, and that the direction in which to fire was also dependent on that. This is therefore one of the most important and decisive questions in our dispute. A few months ago, one of the most responsible leaders of our economy and of our politics expressed himself with regard to this cardinal question in the Politbureau as follows:

"... I must state that we have succeeded in getting the peasant elementary processes, the peasant corn market entirely into our hands, that we are in a position, at any given moment, to raise or reduce the price of corn, that all the levers to influence the said market are in our hands, and that for the reason that the peasants are not backed by anyone who would interfere with us." From Comrade Mikojan's report on the reduction of retail prices. Stenographic report of the Meeting of the Politbureau of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. January 3rd, 1927, page 4.)

Has that not been refuted by actual facts? Is that not an erroneous estimate, a wrong perspective? Do not the facts of our present economic situation prove that the starting point was a wrong estimate? The wrong policy, however can also be traced back to this wrong estimate of the relations between the classes. This wrong policy again did not result in a removal of the difficulties, but in an accumulation, growth and intensification of these difficulties. That policy concealed the true prospect by which we are faced to-day and which must be abolished in some way or other. But that is no individual mistake of this or that comrade.

This mistake is due to a wrong valuation of the relation between the classes in our country. We, Marxists, disciples of Lenin (Interjection: "ex-disciples!") know that a wrong estimate of the classes inevitably results in a wrong policy and wrong tactics. So long as such estimates are possible in the Party, estimates which form the basis of an erroneous practical policy, we cannot abandon our criticism of such views and

our endeavours to correct them and to warn the Party, nay, even to raise cries of alarm on the occasion of such estimates.

I am convinced that a policy of this kind, which is carried on within the limits of the Party statutes, within the limits established by the fact that our Party is at the helm, is helping the dictatorship of the proletariat, is protecting the dictatorship of the proletariat from difficulties and concessions. It is impossible, it is impermissible under these conditions to demand that we should abandon our views. We are under the obligation to bring these views to bear and to defend them strictly within the limits of the statutes, within the limits of the Party decisions.

If you demand anything different, you accumulate artificially the obstacles on the way to the pacification of the Party which we entered on whole-heartedly. (Interjection: "That is only a manoeuvre!") You can only make such demand if you have made up your mind to bar us that way. If that is what you have resolved upon, you may of course make any demand whatever in order to make it impossible to comply with it.

I now proceed to discuss the second question. You appointed a commission for the disarmament of the Opposition. You demand that we should guarantee that disarmament. That is quite natural. In politics nobody is obliged to trust mere words. If you do not believe us, only one method is left to you, that of investigating yourselves into our activities. (Interjection: "We have investigated for the past two years!") There is no other way to get a guarantee. What guarantee do you mean? You will probably not take my word for it. (Laughter and interjection: "We put no faith in your word!") Comrades the Party can therefore only test the truthfulness and firmness of our declarations by making it possible for us to prove them by deeds. There is no other alternative. (Interjection: "Lay down your illegal organisation on the table of the Party!") I do not carry the illegal organisation in my pocket and therefore I cannot put it on the table. From the moment when we say at this Party Congress that we have decided to capitulate to the Party and to hand over our whole fractional equipment, from that moment we have no secrets to keep from you.

Those who share our views have signed publicly a number of documents which we directed to the C. C. of the Party. (Interjection: "Even without having read them!") The declaration of the 83 bears about 3000 signatures. This declaration is in your possession. In the discussion, those who share our views stood up openly in all the nuclei in defence of our Platform. You may think their views to be wrong, you may think that they got entangled in errors — but they behaved after the manner of brave revolutionaries... (Interjection: "It is a shame the way they behaved! Counter-revolutionaries do such things!")

Solz: The Mensheviks also defend their views with great courage and have been imprisoned for them.

Kamenev: ... have stood up for their opinion and placed it higher than their existence. They were prepared to give up their position for those things which were wrong in your opinion which you may condemn, but which they believe to be right — without considering what awaited them.

Conditions which make it possible that persons like Mratchkovsky are detained in prison (Interjection: "Because they founded printing works!"), whilst we go about freely before their eyes, are untenable. We have fought side by side with these comrades, we are also responsible for their deeds. We now appear before the Party together with them and suggest that you should make it possible for us to liquidate that period of the Party's history. It is impossible to separate us from them. If you try to separate us, you cease at the same time to have any respect for us. (Interjection: "Our respect has already ceased to exist after October 16th.")

Our point of view with regard to the alternative — a second Party or a return into the Party — is clear: back into the Party at any price. We ask the Party, unless this Party Congress wishes to be recorded in history as a congress of splitting and not as a congress of pacification, to help us in this respect.

Do not make it more difficult for us by making demands which cannot be fulfilled and which are unworthy of Bolsheviks. The working class wishes for reconciliation. In spite of all the differences of opinion, in spite of the severity of the struggle, we have the same interests as you, i. e. the preservation of the unity of the Party as the fundamental lever of

the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is feasible on the basis of our submission to the resolutions of the Party Congress, which we guarantee. (Cry of: "We are unbelieving!"). It must be achieved in the interest of the work which Lenin began. (Disturbance.) I am finally convinced that, in spite of all that has happened, the Party Congress will do so. (Disturbance, cry of: "Earn the confidence first!")

Comrade RYKOV.

Comrade Kamenev concluded his speech with the statement, that he did not dissociate himself from the oppositionals who are in prison. I should like to begin my speech with the statement that I do not dissociate myself from those revolutionaries who have imprisoned some adherents of the Opposition because of their activity which was hostile to the Party and to the Soviets. (Frenetic applause cry of: "Long live the Leninist C. C. The delegates rise from their seats and applaud.) Comrade Kamenev's speech is the only speech made by a member of the Opposition at the 15th Party Congress which is, at least to a certain extent, devoted to the subject which every member of the Opposition ought to discuss at the 15th Party Congress. What does the Opposition intend to do now? It must be stated most emphatically that Comrade Kamenev's declaration cannot in the least degree satisfy the Congress, the Party itself.

The decisive point in Kamenev's speech is his assertion that it has never been demanded of anyone in our Party that he should renounce his views. For this reason it is impossible, he says to demand that the Opposition should abandon its views. That is not true. In order to refute Comrade Kamenev's assertion I remind you of the resolution passed by the 10th Party Congress of the R. C. P. concerning the question of the "syndicalist and anarchist deviation in our Party", of which the Labour Opposition was found guilty. After an enumeration of the erroneous views held by the Labour Opposition and after an analysis of its ideas, point 6 of that resolution runs as follows:

"On the grounds of all that, the Party Congress emphatically rejects the above views which express a syndicalist and anarchist deviation, and resolves:

1. It considers it necessary to carry on a relentless and systematic fight against the said ideas
2. It considers the propagation of these ideas incompatible with membership of the R. C. P."

You see, Comrade Kamenev, that the traditions of Bolshevism go so far as to prohibit that Party members defend ideas which have been recognised as hostile to the Party, as anti-Bolshevik. (Cries of: "Do you hear? There you have it, Comrade Kamenev!")

I repeat, Comrade Kamenev: The 10th Party Congress rejected the ideas of the Labour Opposition and declared the propaganda of those ideas to be impermissible in the ranks of the Communist Party. This referred to the syndicalist and anarchist deviation. It must now be repeated — we have much more reason to do so — with even greater clearness and decision with regard to the deviation in the direction of Menshevism. I recall the resolution of the 10th Party Congress to your mind in order to keep the traditions of Bolshevism alive in contrast to Comrade Kamenev's attempts at distorting them in a liberal fashion.

The fact itself that the members of the Opposition do not mention that resolution and try to evade it, is the most convincing proof of how far they have withdrawn from the Party ideology. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!")

The 10th Party Congress, with the active participation of the present leaders of the Opposition, declared any propaganda of the views which were advocated by the so-called Labour Opposition at that time, to be incompatible with membership of the Party. After a long period of an unexampled, acute struggle of the Opposition against the Party, carried on in an unprecedented form after repeated categorical resolutions passed at Party Congresses and Party Conferences which described Trotsky's views, which the whole united Opposition has now adopted, as Menshevik views, — the Party is now freed by the task of declaring the propaganda, the defence of those views to be incompatible with membership of the C. P. S. U. The 15th Party Congress cannot but pass a similar resolution

with regard to that question as did the 10th Party Congress with regard to the Labour Opposition. Only such a way of putting the question will be in accordance with the traditions of Bolshevism, with the traditions of the proposals made by Comrade Lenin at the 10th Party Congress. Anyone who now — as does Comrade Jevdokimov — regards the demand of the Party made to the adherents of the Opposition, that it should renounce the propaganda of Menshevik views, as a ‘superfluous obstacle’ in the way of the dissolution of the fraction, anyone who has a feeling that this demand prevents him from finding his way back to the Party, has ceased to be a Bolshevik. His way is not the way of our Party.

Kamenev is not a new member of our Party, and he nevertheless forgot in speaking about the “freedom of conscience” in the C.P.S.U. to mention “a trifle”, i. e. the resolution passed at the 10th Party Congress with his active participation. This forgetfulness of Comrade Kamenev is no mere coincidence. It is part of the Opposition’s strategy and only a new manoeuvre for achieving its end.

The Trotzkyist Opposition recently went out into the streets of Moscow, Leningrad and other towns under the flag of: “Down with Ustrialovism, down with the Thermidor!” What does this mean? The Opposition went to the working class with the accusation against the C. C. of carrying on an Ustrialov policy, that the Thermidor had commenced in the country, that the C. C. was betraying the revolution, the working class. Did Comrade Shliapnikov ever do anything of the kind? Did he ever display flags against the Party in Moscow or in Leningrad? Did he make an open appeal to the masses? The Labour Opposition never did such things. Kamenev however and his collaborators went out into the streets to gather the people round the slogan of the overthrow of the C. C. (Cries of: “Shame!”)

Yes, it is indeed an appeal to overthrow the C. C., an open fight against the existing Soviet Government. (Cries of: “Hear, hear!”).

Comrade Kamenev, that was only a month ago. You declare to the Party Congress that you only take on yourself the responsibility for those views which have been laid down in the documents signed by the members of the Opposition. You will not succeed however to sneak out of the responsibility, for instance, for the attempts at organising public demonstrations hostile to the Party. In the documents handed in to the C. C., you have indeed evolved some of your ideas which are hostile to the Party (this is the reason why the C. C. has not published these documents), but you pursued another aim with these documents, that of preserving a legal ground on which to carry on the fight against the Party and in the interest of your illegal activities, which of course were carried on “without signatures”. We hold you responsible for all your actions without exception. (Laughter, applause.)

The Opposition has adopted the following habit: It hands in to the C. C. those documents in which it defends that which it considers necessary and possible to defend “within the limits of the Party statutes” and within the limits of Party legality. At the same time it issues proclamations in an illegal way and unfolds the banner of the fight against the Party and against the Government. They have the audacity to appear before this Party Congress declaring that they have never accused the Party and the C. C. of a Thermidor, of degeneration, that they have never held the view that our State has ceased to be a workers’ State etc. I have before me a collection of quotations from speeches and declarations made by members of the Opposition, in which those accusations against the Party and against the State are raised quite categorically and with full clearness. I shall not read them out to you as they are known to all the delegates to the Party Congress. They begin with expressing doubts as to the socialist character of nationalised industry, with assertions that the building up of socialist society in the Soviet Union is impossible in consequence of the technical backwardness of national economy, and conclude with the assertion that our State, our Power and our Party are degenerating into a bourgeois system and that the central organs of the Party are the representatives of this degeneration. Just these accusations reveal with the utmost clearness the Menshevik basis of their whole ideology. It is just these monstrously mendacious accusations which raise a barrier between the Opposition and the working class, between the Opposition and our Party.

The Trotzkyist party took these declarations, this fundamental attitude as the starting point of its activity, when it sent its partisans out into the streets and open places under the flag of “Down with Ustrialovism!” These flags have certainly not been unfolded in opposition to some professor or other in the Far East, but against the Party, against its central organs, against the Soviet Government.

Only yesterday you called upon the people to join in the fight against the Party, against the C. C., against the Soviet Government, with the help of the illegal party, by means of your proclamations and flags. To-day you write in your declaration to the 15th Party Congress:

“We have never held the view and we do not hold the view now that our Party and its C. C. have become Thermidorian or that our State has ceased to be a workers’ State. We maintain now as we have always maintained, and we shall defend this point of view, that our Party has been and is the organisation of the proletarian vanguard and that the Soviet State is the organisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (Declaration of the Opposition, handed in to the Presidium of the 15th Party Congress.)

That comparison alone suffices to prove the mendacity, the complete inadequacy of the declaration made by the Opposition to the 15th Party Congress.

How can this duplicity be explained? It can only be understood as an attempt on the part of the Opposition to conceal and facilitate the work of their illegal party which is really hostile to the Party and to the Soviets. They have legalised their illegal party in foreign countries and there, in their foreign papers, they are publishing openly what they are spreading in an illegal way in the Soviet Union.

The difference between the behaviour of the Trotzkyist Opposition and Shliapnikov’s behaviour is that the Opposition has tried in recent times to contrive a movement in the country and to carry it into the streets in order to fight against the Party and the Soviet Power, whilst Shliapnikov has done nothing of the kind. That is the difference. (Cries of: “Hear, hear!”).

After all that, they are playing the naive, pretending that it has never occurred in the history of the Party that it was prohibited to anyone to defend his views. In the first instance, we have interdicted the defence of certain views and we shall do so in the future. Secondly it is here no longer a case of views but of deeds, of open actions against the Party. Deeds which are hostile to the Party and to the Soviets have sprung from the anti-party, Menshevik views of the Opposition. The present Party Congress would therefore have been compelled to issue a resolution of that kind, in view of the fact that your “views” are far more dangerous than those of the Labour Opposition; even if we did not have the experience of the fight against anti-party views which was carried on at the 10th Party Congress under the leadership of Comrade Lenin. We can all the less dispense with such a resolution, as the leaders of the Opposition, after all the actions they have committed, are now declaring that they cling to their views, that they intend to defend them within the limits of the Party statutes” and that they declare their solidarity with those who are in prison and who will remain in prison.

Comrade Kamenev fails to understand just a trifle. He fails to understand the significance of the gulf which exists between the dissensions in the Politbureau and the C. C. on the one hand and, on the other hand, the dissensions in the streets and in public meetings. The Opposition describes the change from votings in party bodies and at party congresses to an open fight as “the path of fractional struggles”, “the use of means which, in a number of cases, infringe Party discipline”. (Declaration of the Opposition to the 15th Party Congress.) The problem of the Opposition has ceased to be an everyday question of party relations within the C. C., within the Party. We are faced by the question of a gigantic political struggle in our country. — The Opposition has tried in this struggle to organise demonstrations of its own and openly to unfold the banner against the C. C. etc. All that, Comrade Kamenev, has sprung from your Thermidorian and Clemenceauist views. I do not believe that after all that, you yourselves could have expected a reconciliation with your views. The Party cannot allow such views to be legalised in the ranks of the

Bolsheviks. A compromise is out of the question. There is no room for such views among the Bolsheviks. **Either the Party or the defence of such views.**

The Opposition evidently does not wish to understand that. Comrade Kakovsky arrives at the Party Congress and tells us all sorts of things, with the exception of those which would be of interest to the Party regarding its relation to the Opposition. Comrade Jevdokimov wasted the time of the Party Congress with idle talk. I did everything in my power to make it possible for him to expound his views — in spite of the indignation of the majority of the delegates to the congress — in order to show on an example to what baseness these people have sunk. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!")

The content of Comrade Kamenev's speech is the result of the resolution passed by the illegal C. C. of the Trotzkyist party. It is evident from his speech that the central organ of the C. C. of the Opposition resolved not to capitulate and to try to retain its legality in our Party (at the same time preserving the inviolability of their Menshevik ideology), and that for the purpose of masking their illegal work. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!")

This is the only sensible explanation of Comrade Kamenev's speech. His pointing out that he himself and the other leaders of the Opposition only regard themselves responsible for the views laid down in the new document signed by them, shows that they are not prepared to abandon their whole Thermidorian and Clemenceauist ideology on which the activity of the illegal party is based, that they refuse to acknowledge that ideology to be harmful and fatal. The flags with the slogan "Down with Ustrialovism!" "Down with the Thermidor!" are also documents, and that no less important documents than are the declaration on which Comrade Kamenev puts his signature in order to hand them in to the C. C., the C. C. C. or to the Party Congress. Comrade Kamenev is an ex-member of the Government. He possesses a certain amount of political experience and he should not complain about the fact that some persons have been arrested in consequence of the extremely sharp, open fight of the Opposition against the Party, but he should appreciate that, in comparison with the "situation" which the Opposition has tried to create, **only too few arrests** have been made. I think we cannot guarantee that we shall not be compelled to increase the number of the inmates of the prisons in the near future. (Enthusiastic applause. Cries of: "Hear, hear!")

In its relation to the Opposition, it is impossible for the Party to proceed from the document which Comrade Kamenev deigns to sign, the document he did not sign or the document he intends to sign.

The Party directs the State and is responsible for its administration and for the socialist development of an enormous country. In view of these problems of the proletarian revolution, all those diplomatic declarations and signatures taken together are a mere nothing. The Party and the revolution will easily get over them.

There are persons who maintain that under Lenin it was not the habit to exclude anyone from the Party because of his views. That is not true, in his time, the Labour Opposition would only faintly have tried to organise a few hundreds among those who shared their views, to equip them with flags for a demonstration on the Red Square with the slogans of: "Long live the Labour Opposition! Down with the C. C.!" (Cry of: "We would have shot them dead!") What do you think? Do you think Lenin would have pampered them as we have pampered you? Have we not checked Mjassnikov in a twinkling? Is not the threat of Kamenev and of those who share his views a thousand times worse than everything we witnessed with any Opposition since the foundation of the Party? Under Lenin, the Party would never have permitted the development of a scandal such as we witnessed it in the form of the unprecedented anti-Soviet actions of the Opposition.

We — the members of the Opposition say — are honest. Comrade Kamenev, if you honestly believe that fractions are harmful — yours indeed is no fraction but an independent party — if you consider the existence of an illegal party to be detrimental to the proletarian dictatorship, why do you not secede from it? Who prevents you from doing so? When the workers exclude the partisans of the Opposition from the nuclei, the latter separate from our Party at your orders with marked indifference and accept fighting posts in your illegal party in order to fight against us. Why could not you secede from your

Trotzkyist party in the interest of the revolution? In your document you say: fractions are detrimental. Why then are you members of a fraction to the present day? If your opinion that fractions are harmful were honest, every single one of you ought to come and say: I have finally broken with the fraction; every single one of you would speak like an enemy of the Trotzkyist party, that Trotzkyist party which exists to-day without your concealing the differences of opinion which prevail among you and especially between you and Trotzky. If the comrades of the Opposition were honest when they declare that they regard their fractional fight against the Party to be detrimental to the proletariat, their second party and their fractions would have ceased to exist long ago. They would then appear at the Party Congress, not as a united Opposition Bloc but as individual members of the Party.

The united Opposition is however continuing its policy of the three chambers to the present day; first every group meets in two separate chambers, and after that they unite... (Cry of: "Hypocrisy!") Then they dissolve, they meet again and so on, and finally they appear at the Party Congress as a special, uniform party. This shows that even to-day, when they are on the edge of an abyss, they continue to value their fraction discipline higher than the discipline of our Party, that they are addressing the Party Congress on the basis of two parties. This is how things are, Comrade Kamenev. To the present day you have left a door open for the fight against the Party, in order to try once again to carry the flags of the fight against the C. P. S. U. into the streets with the help of your illegal party. We think that it is absolutely necessary to close that door, to knock that weapon out of your hand.

The Opposition therefore proceeds with great clumsiness when it speculates on reprisals on account of ideological differences. It has exceeded the limits of a divergence of opinions admissible in a Party. It is evident from Comrade Kamenev's speech that he understands this very well and that is why his argumentation about reprisals sounds so hypocritical. Matters went so far that Bakajev who has been excluded from the Party is addressing us in the name of several hundreds of persons. He signs for instance for Serebriakov who is at present living in America and could not even have made himself heard so quickly with broad-casting. You see that it was not even necessary to inform him. Bakajev is authorized to put his signature for the others, to decide in their name. The members of the Opposition do not act like members of our Party, but like members of a new, hostile party. What notary has attested Comrade Kamenev's authority that he may speak in the name of 2000 to 3000 members of the C. P. S. U.? Are those people naive enough to believe that we are bound to accept that attestation? These declarations alone prove that the Opposition has developed into a completely new party with views of its own and a discipline of its own. Comrade Kamenev spoke about sincerity and hypocrisy. Well, pardon me, there are two sorts of sincerity in the Opposition. The first is that of illegality, the other is adopted for legal use, for us. Who is to know of which sincerity he spoke? The "sincerity" of his declaration, the content of every single sentence of that declaration has originated, not from his own opinion, but from the resolution of the C. C. of the illegal Trotzkyist party. We have to do with a fresh manoeuvre as was the case on October 16th last year and on August 8th of the current year.

Comrade Kamenev, either one thing or the other: either you continue your manoeuvres, but outside the Party, or you are honest, not in words, but in deeds. If Comrades Kamenev and Jevdokimov were in the least degree honestly convinced that they value the interest of our Party, the interest of our working class above everything, they could not for a moment remain in another, in a Trotzkyist party. They appear before us, however, as the advocates of the Opposition, they link their fate with that of the new, illegal party whilst writing that they are against two parties.

Just now Comrade Kamenev took that stand, just now he himself signed a document in the name of 100, 200 to 300 persons, he signed a document in the name of a collective body, in the name of a new, second party. The Party demands that you condemn unreservedly and unconditionally with every clearness and determination all the things you have done, all the mistakes you have made in respect of fundamental questions, i. e. your assertion with regard to the Thermidor, with regard to degeneration, to the necessity of a breach with the middle

peasants and to all those things about which you talked an incredible lot of nonsense. (Bukharin: "They must condemn the Clemenceauist thesis!")

Condemn your thesis on Clemenceauism, which you began to put into effect at the very moment when you became a point of attraction for the third power — that is long ago. Own up that the inevitable consequence of your thesis on Clemenceau is your standing up for the necessity of a coup d'état. Tell the Party of how you intended to drive the "Thermidorians" from the C. C., from the Government.

Picture to yourselves, comrades, what would have happened, had the Opposition really won over a few thousand persons to its side after its appeal to the street. They would have come here as masters of the situation! They would have said that they are backed by the people, by the large masses. They would then not have talked about reconciliation, but about the formation of a new, "anti-Thermidorian", of a "Clemenceauist" Government. Only when their demonstration had shown in a telling way whom the working class is supporting, when Zinoviev was almost given an opportunity to try — in the Moika Channel — how he likes swimming against the current under the dictatorship of the proletariat (laughter), only then he came to us with the so-called conciliatory speech. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

In all the talk to which the Opposition has given vent on this platform, their is neither lucidity nor sincerity, at least in my opinion. (Bukharin: "We all are of the same opinion".) Not a single Party delegate puts his confidence in the leaders of the Opposition, as to whether those who have been admitted to the Party Congress with advisory vote, say what they actually mean. That interjection of the delegates who said that they put no confidence in Kamenev is indicative of the opinion of the whole Party. It is not only the last year that Kamenev and Trotzky have taken an active share in politics. Do they fail to understand that all those things — when they went out into the streets with appeals against the Party, against the Government, is equivalent to an attempt at preparing or organising a coup d'état? (Cries of: "Hear, hear!") Did they try to win over the masses for their demonstrations? Yes, they did. Zinoviev reported to the Plenary Meeting of the C. C. on this very platform on the Leningrad demonstration. If they had succeeded in winning over to their side 10,000 persons out of the hundreds of thousands and to carry them along in the demonstration — would there have been a fight in the streets of Moscow and Leningrad — or would nothing have happened? Yes, with absolute certainty. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!") That is what is usually called organising civil war. After all that they come to the Congress and act with diplomatic intrepidity according to the resolution of their illegal central committee, as did Comrade Rakovsky, saying: "No capitulation now, pretending: My name is Haase, I do not know anything about it." (Laughter.) They pass over in silence all their deeds against the Party, they refuse to own up their crime against the dictatorship of the working class. They do not, decidedly and unreservedly break away from the ideology of Clemenceauism and Thermidorianism and similar things, but declare before the Party that they do not intend to change their aims and their tactics.

They evidently hatched the following plan: "Let us continue with our attack, possibly we shall be the next time able to gather more people round our flags than we succeeded in the past. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!") If their declaration had been honest, the first thing Comrades Kamenev and Jevdokimov ought to have done, would have been to say on this platform what they, being members of the Party, are thinking, not what Zinoviev and Trotzky, who are excluded from the Party, prescribe to them. (Applause.) They demand that the Party should deal with them seriously, they raise claims, they, who have been convicted of constantly arranging illegal meetings with their leaders who are outside the Party, who are deliberating with them upon every word, every sentence with which to throw dust into the eyes of the Party Congress and of the whole Party. They are terribly miscalculating when they believe that the Bolshevik Party will tolerate that and carry on negotiations with them on that basis.

I think that, in the first instance, it is necessary to enlighten all the Party members about the untruthfulness of the assertions put forward by Comrade Kamenev and by the Opposition. We should not proceed in a Bolshevik way if we did not

demand of them the renunciation of the defence of their anti Party views. Under Lenin, the Party laid down strict norms with regard to the propagation of views in the Party which do not agree with the Party resolution, even if these views are less dangerous to the revolution than are the present views of the Opposition. Under Lenin's lead the Party resolved that the defence of anti-Bolshevist views is incompatible with the membership of the Party. We are bound to repeat the resolution passed at the 10th Party Congress in view of the Menshevist views of Trotzkyism. The speeches made by Jevdokimov and by other leaders of the Opposition are fresh evidence of the necessity of that resolution. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!") They should all be turned out!" Applause.)

In the second place, all the Party members should be told that we do not simply enjoy ourselves here with friendly discussions but that we are passing definite resolutions in our position as political functionaries. Kamenev should be as clear about the fact as I am and as each of you is, that the declaration "on my word of honour!" is worthless in politics. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!") In the political struggle, the word of honour of this or that functionary does not suffice, but absolutely accurate and unconditioned guarantees are necessary. It is a case of the responsibility of political functionaries in the period of one of the most important stages in the history of our Party and of the revolutionary movement.

The Opposition is responsible for its entire ideology, both for the ideology of the "signed" documents and for the ideology which bears no signature, for their entire activity, both legal and illegal. The leaders of the Opposition should not declare their solidarity with those on whom the Soviet State inflicted reprisals, the Soviet State which, according to their own declaration to the 15th Party Congress, is the State of the proletarian dictatorship, but they must render an account of their infringement of the laws of this dictatorship.

Comrade Kamenev will not succeed in laying at the door of the Party even the shadow of the responsibility for the fact that a few members of the Opposition have been arrested. I maintain that Comrade Kamenev and the other leaders of the Opposition are responsible for that. It is they who instigated them. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

The Opposition must altogether get it out of its head to lay any responsibility for that which the Opposition itself has done at the Party's door. Comrade Kamenev will not succeed in representing himself as an inexperienced member of an elementary political training school. He is an old politician and is fully responsible for every step, he is also responsible for the end towards which his steps lead him. It is possible to say about the young ones, about inexperienced Party members, that they have made some mistake or other from inexperience or even against their own will or because someone persuaded them to do so. But the systematical anti-Party actions on the part of the Opposition leaders represent tactics "at long sight" which they are trying to conceal with speeches which do not apply to the subject under discussion. When Trotzky says: "I should not have gone out into the streets with the slogan "Down with the Thermidorians" but I am not satisfied with the internal regime of the Party, it is to split with laughter.

I confess that, in one respect, we are responsible for the behaviour of Trotzky, Zinoviev and Kamenev; — in that we are only now putting an end to their activity, that we have ventured too much when we made it possible for them to organise their illegal party and to appeal to the country.

We cannot find an issue from the political situation which has resulted, unless we pass a radical resolution. The interest of the working class, of the proletarian dictatorship and the defensive capacity of the country demand it. It is necessary in the interest of the victorious socialist construction and of the development of the proletarian revolution!

Comrade Kamenev concluded his speech with the declaration that he did not isolate himself from those members of the Opposition who infringed the laws of the proletarian State and have been subjected to reprisals. I reply to that: The present Party does not isolate itself from the working class, from the international revolution which demands a final, unreserved disarmament and liquidation of the second party, the party of the Opposition Bloc both with regard to their organisation and to their ideology. (Enthusiastic, continued applause. The delegates rise from their seats and sing the "International".)

Concluding Speech of Comrade Stalin at the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

(Full Report.)

Comrades! After the speeches of a whole number of delegates, there is not much left for me to say. There is nothing essential to add to Comrades Jevdokimov and Muralov's speeches, as they offer no material for that. Regarding them, I can only say: May Allah forgive them their sins, they know not themselves what they are babbling. (Laughter, applause.) I should like to concern myself with the speech of Comrade Rakovsky and more especially with Comrade Kamenev's speech, because the latter is the most pharisaical and untruthful speech among all the speeches made by the Opposition. (Cries of: "Quite true!")

1. ON COMRADE RAKOVSKY'S SPEECH.

a) **On Foreign Policy.** In my opinion, Comrade Rakovsky broached the question of war in foreign policy without any foundation. It is a matter of common knowledge that Comrade Rakovsky only talked nonsense about the question of the war at the Moscow Conference. He then came here and began to speak, evidently with the intention to correct his nonsense; but he blundered even worse than before. (Laughter.) I think it would be to Comrade Rakovsky's advantage if he kept silent on the subject of foreign policy.

b) **On the Right and the Left.** Comrade Rakovsky maintains that the Opposition is the Left section of our Party. Comrades, that is enough to make a cat laugh. Such assertions are evidently intended to console the political bankrupts themselves. It is an established fact that the Opposition is the Menshevist wing of our Party, that the Opposition has objectively become a tool in the hands of the bourgeois elements. All this has been proved, nay, more than proved. How then can anyone still talk about the Opposition standing on the Left side? Has anyone ever heard that a Menshevist group which has objectively transformed itself into the third Power, the power of the bourgeois elements, is standing on the Left side of the Bolsheviks? Is it not clear that the Opposition is a Right, Menshevist wing in the C. P. S. U.? Comrade Rakovsky evidently got confused and does not know where the right side is and where the left.

c) **On the Help of the Opposition.** Comrade Rakovsky stated that the Opposition is prepared to come to the assistance of the Party should the imperialists attack us. We have no confidence in your assistance and we do not need it, comrades of the Opposition! We only ask you one thing: do not interfere with us, cease to disturb us! We ourselves shall accomplish everything else, you may be convinced of that. (Cries of: "Quite true! Applause.")

d) **On the "Signalisers".** Comrade Rakovsky further stated that the Opposition is signalling to us the dangers, difficulties and the ruin of our country. Nice "signalisers", nice saviours of the Party from ruin, who are themselves shipwrecked and in need of rescue! They themselves can hardly stand on their legs and want to succour others! Isn't it ridiculous, comrades? (Laughter.) Just picture to yourselves a small boat that is struggling to keep above water and is near sinking, and on the other hand a magnificent steamer proudly ploughing the waves and steering with full confidence its course towards its destination. What would you say if your little boat were to make attempts to rescue the gigantic steamer? (Laughter.) Indeed, it would be ridiculous beyond words. This is the position of our signalisers from among the Opposition. They signal to us peril, difficulties, shipwreck, anything they chose, whilst they themselves are going under, nay, whilst they fail to notice that they have already arrived at the bottom of the sea. By describing themselves as the signalisers, they are raising a claim to the leadership of the party of the working class, of the country. The question is on what grounds do they raise that claim? Did the members of the Opposition ever prove in practice that they are capable of leading anything

whatever, not to talk of the Party, the class, the country? Is it not a fact that the Opposition has led its group for the past two years with such men at its head as Trotzky, Zinoviev, Kamenev? Is it not a fact that these leaders of the Opposition directed their group so brilliantly that they drove it into a final collapse? Is it not a fact, that, for the last two years, the Opposition has guided its group from defeat to defeat? What else does this prove but that the leaders of the Opposition are unfit, that their lead is a lead to defeat and not to victory? If the leaders have therefore proved to be unfit for the control of a small thing, what reason can we have for supposing that they will prove capable of directing a big thing? Is it not clear that nobody will entrust a big matter such as the guidance of the Party, the working class, the country, to persons who have suffered bankruptcy when leading a small group? This is what our signalisers refuse to understand.

2. ON COMRADE KAMENEV'S SPEECH.

I pass on to Comrade Kamenev's speech. This speech is the most untruthful, pharisaical, hypocritical and knavish speech among all the speeches of the Opposition which have been made on this platform. (Cries of: "Quite true!" Applause.)

a) **The Janus head.** The first thing with which Comrade Kamenev concerned himself in his speech was that he tried to wipe out all the traces. The representatives of the Party spoke here of the achievements of our Party, of the successful results of our construction, of the improvement of our work etc. They further spoke of the Menshevist fall of the comrades belonging to the Opposition, of how those comrades have sunk down to Menshevism by denying the possibility of a successful building up of socialism in our country, by denying the existence of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, the efficiency of the policy of the alliance between the working class and the middle peasant, by spreading calumnies about the Thermidor etc. They finally decided that the said views of the Opposition are incompatible with membership of our Party and that the Opposition must abandon these Menshevist views if it wishes to remain in our Party. What was the result? Comrade Kamenev knew no better than to evade these problems, to cover up the traces and simply pass by. Questions concerning the most important problems of our programme, of our policy, of our construction have been addressed to him. He simply passed them over, as if they were no concern of his. Can this behaviour of Comrade Kamenev be regarded as a serious attitude towards the problem in question? It is evidently impossible to do so.

How can this behaviour of the Opposition be explained? There is only one way to explain it; it is its wish to deceive the Party, to lull its vigilance and to get the better of it. The Opposition is Janus-headed: it has a pharisaical, amiable face and a Menshevist anti-revolutionary one. It is turning its pharisaical amiable face towards the Party when the Party exerts pressure on it and demands that it should renounce its fractional manoeuvres, its policy aiming at a split; it shows its Menshevist, anti-revolutionary face when seeing about to call on the non-proletarian forces, to make an appeal to the street against the Party, against the Soviet Union. You see just now its pharisaical, amiable face turned on us with the intention of deceiving the Party once again. This is the reason why Comrade Kamenev made every effort to wipe out the traces and to evade the most important questions of our dissensions. Shall we continue to tolerate this double-dealing? It is clear that we cannot tolerate it any longer, even for a minute. Either the one or the other: the Opposition will either have to talk seriously to the Party and take off its mask, or it intends to maintain its Janus head — but if the latter is the case it will have to stay outside the Party. (Cries of: "Quite right!")

b) **On the Traditions of Bolshevism.** Kamenev asseverated that no case is known in which it was possible to demand that a party member should renounce some of his views which were incompatible with our party ideology, with our party programme. Is that true or is it untrue? Of course it is not true. More than that, comrades, it is a lie. Is it not a fact that we, including Kamenev, excluded Miasnikov and his adherents from the Party? Why did we exclude them? Because their Menshevist views proved to be incompatible with the views of the Party. Is it not a fact that we, all of us, including Kamenev, excluded a section of the "Labour Opposition" from the Party? Why did we exclude them? Because their Menshevist views proved to be incompatible with the views of our Party. And why have we excluded Ossovsky and Dashovsky from the Party? Why have Maslov, Ruth Fischer, Katz and others been excluded from the Comintern? Because their views proved to be incompatible with the ideology of the Comintern, with the ideology of the C. P. S. U. Our Party were no Leninist party were it to think the presence of anti-Leninist elements in our organisation to be permissible. Why then should we not admit the Mensheviks in our Party as well? What should we do with persons who, while being members of our Party, are gliding down to Menshevism and propagating their anti-Leninist views? Comrade Kamenev calumniates our work, breaks away from the traditions of our Party, from the traditions of Bolshevism and is of the opinion that persons who proclaim and preach Menshevist views can be suffered to remain in our Party. The Party is raising the question as to whether the Opposition is prepared to renounce its anti-Leninist views, just for the reason that Comrade Kamenev and with him the Opposition as a whole are treading the revolutionary traditions of our Party underfoot.

c) **The alleged Firmness of Principle of the Opposition.** Comrade Kamenev protests that he himself and the other members of the Opposition find it difficult to renounce their views as they are in the habit of upholding their views in the Bolshevik manner. He says that it would be a lack of principle on the part of the Opposition were it to yield up its views. It has thus come to light that all the leaders of the Opposition are possessed of an extraordinary firmness of principle. Is that true? Are their principles, their views and their conviction really so dear to the hearts of the leaders of the Opposition? There is something wrong in this, comrades. There is something wrong if we consider the history of the formation of the Opposition Bloc. (Laughter.) It is exactly the other way round. History, facts show that no one ever jumped so easily from one principle to another, that no one ever changed his views with such perfect ease as did the leaders of the Opposition. Why are they just now not in a position to abandon their views, just at the moment when the interest of the Party requires it?

I should like to give you a few examples from the history of Trotzkyism.

It is a matter of common knowledge that Lenin, when he collected the Party, convoked a conference of the Bolsheviks in Prague in 1912. It is a well-known fact that this conference was of the greatest significance in the history of our Party, as it drew a line of separation between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks, and welded the Bolshevik organisations throughout the country into a united Bolshevik Party. It is a well-known fact that in the same year, in 1912, the Menshevist meeting of the August Bloc took place, with Trotzky at its head. It is equally well known that this meeting declared war against the Bolshevik Conference and called upon the labour organisations to liquidate the Leninist Party. What accusations did the meeting of the Trotzkyist August Bloc raise against the Bolshevik Conference in Prague? An accusation of all original sins. It accused the Bolshevik Conference of arrogating rights to itself to which it was not authorised, it accused the Conference of sectarianism, of overthrowing the State and goodness knows of what things besides these. In its declaration addressed to the 2nd International the meeting of the August Bloc expressed itself as follows with regard to the question of the Bolshevik Conference:

"The Meeting declares that the Conference (the Conference of the Bolsheviks in Prague in 1912. — J. St.) represents an open attempt on the part of a group of persons who drove the party deliberately into a split, to

usurp the flag of the party, and expresses its deep-felt regret that a few party organisations and comrades have fallen victims to this deception and have thus promoted the dividing and usurping policy of the Leninist group. The meeting expresses its confidence that all the party organisations both in Russia and abroad, will raise a protest against the coup which has been accomplished. They will refuse to acknowledge the authorities elected by the Conference and will demand with the use of all the means at their disposal that the unity of the party be restored by convoking a party conference which really includes all the members. (From the declaration of the August Bloc addressed to the 2nd International, published in the "Vorwärts" of March 26th 1912. Ed.)

You see, nothing has been missed out, neither the Leninist group nor usurpation and the overthrow of the State (Thermidor!).

What happened after that? A few years passed by, and Trotzky disclaimed those views he held at that time with regard to the Bolshevik Party. Not only did he renounce them but he wriggled into the Bolshevik party on his stomach, entering it as one of its most active members. (Laughter.)

What, after all that, is the reason why we should doubt that Trotzky and the Trotzkyites will once again know how to renounce their views with regard to the Thermidorian inclination ("overthrow of the State") in our Party, about usurpation etc.?

Another example in the same domain. Everyone knows that Trotzky published a brochure entitled "The Lessons of October", at the end of 1924. It is a well-known fact that, in his brochure, Trotzky characterised Kamenev and Zinoviev as the Right semi-Menshevist wing of our Party. It is equally well known that Trotzky's brochure gave rise to an extensive discussion in our Party. A year passed by, and Trotzky abandoned his views and announced that Zinoviev and Kamenev do not represent the Right wing but the Left, revolutionary wing of our Party.

One more example, this time taken from the history of Zinoviev's group. There is no one who is not acquainted with the fact that Zinoviev and Kamenev have written a regular rat's tail of brochures against Trotzkyism. It is a matter of general knowledge that even in 1925, Zinoviev and Kamenev, together with the Party as a whole, stated the incompatibility of Trotzkyism and Leninism. Every one knows that Zinoviev and Kamenev, together with the whole of the Party, passed a resolution on the petty bourgeois deviation of Trotzkyism both at the Congresses of our Party and at the 5th Congress of the Comintern. Hardly had a year gone by however, and they abandoned their views and proclaimed that Trotzky's group was a genuine Leninist group, was the true revolutionary group of our party. (Cries of: "Mutual amnesty!")

These are the facts, comrades, to which an indefinite number could be added.

Is it not clear then, that the eminent firmness of character of the leaders of the Opposition, of which Comrade Kamenev is speaking here, is a tale which has nothing to do with reality? Is it then not clear that no one in our Party relinquished his principles so easily as did Trotzky, Zinoviev and Kamenev? The question is: what reason have we to suppose that the leaders of the Opposition, who have already abandoned their principles, their views several times, will not again understand how to disclaim them. Is it not clear that the leaders of the Opposition cannot find it so hard to fulfil our demands as Comrade Kamenev tries to put it, when the Opposition has already dropped its Menshevist views? (Laughter.) It is not the first time that they are compelled to renounce their views, why should they not do so once again? (Laughter.)

d) **Either the Party or the Opposition.** Kamenev asseverated that it is impossible to demand that the Opposition should rid itself of some of its views which have become incompatible with the ideology and with the programme of the Party. I have already pointed out how little serious this assertion of Kamenev can be if one takes into consideration the attitude of the Opposition in the past and at the present moment. Let us however, for a moment, assume that Comrade Kamenev is in the right. What is the result? Can the Party, our Party, renounce its views, its conviction, its principles? Is it pos-

sible to demand that our Party should abandon its views, its principles? The Party has formed the absolute conviction that the Opposition must abandon its anti-Leninist views or be turned out of the Party. And if it is not possible to demand of the Opposition that it should abandon its conviction, why should it be possible to demand that the Party should yield up its conviction and its views with regard to the Opposition? Kamenev however represents things as though the Opposition could not possibly yield up its anti-Leninist views, whilst the Party would have to do so, the result being that it is impossible to allow the Opposition to remain in our Party if it does not abandon its anti-Leninist views. Where is the logic of all that? (Laughter, applause.) Comrade Kamenev maintains that the members of the Opposition are persons full of courage who defend their conviction consistently. I do not set much faith on the courage and the firmness of character of the leaders of the Opposition. I doubt particularly the courage of—for instance Zinoviev and Kamenev (laughter), who denounced Trotzky yesterday and are billing and cooing with him to-day. Let us however for a moment suppose that the leaders have preserved a last trace of courage and firmness of character. Is there any reason to suppose that the Party has less courage and firmness of character than for instance Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotzky? Is there any reason to suppose that the Party will more easily abandon its conviction with regard to the Opposition, with regard to the incompatibility of their Menshevist views with the ideology and the programme of our Party than the leaders of the Opposition who are accustomed to change their views as one changes a pair of gloves? (Laughter.) Is it not clear that Kamenev demands that the Party should abandon its views with regard to the Opposition and to the Menshevist mistakes made by the latter? Is not Comrade Kamenev going too far? Will he not recognise that it is dangerous to go so far? The question is: either the Party or the Opposition. Either the Opposition yields up its Menshevist views or it refuses to do so—and then, not even the memory of it will be left in the Party. (Cries of: "Quite so!" Applause.)

e) **The Opposition has broken away from the Traditions of Bolshevism.** Kamenev maintains that the Bolshevist traditions make it impossible to demand that members of the Party should abandon their views. Comrade Rykov has brought sufficient evidence to show that this is untrue. Facts go to prove that Comrade Kamenev is telling an actual untruth. We now ask the following question: is there any incident in the Bolshevist traditions which can be compared with what the Opposition has dared and is daring to do? The Opposition organised a fraction and transformed it into a party within our Bolshevist Party. Has anyone ever heard that the Bolshevist traditions have at any time permitted anybody to practice such double-dealing? How is it possible to talk of Bolshevist traditions and to admit at the same time a division of the Party and the founding of a new, anti-Bolshevist party? Let us continue: The Opposition organised illegal printing works and formed a bloc with bourgeois intellectuals who, on their part, formed a bloc with an openly White-Guardist group. The question is: how can anyone speak of Bolshevist traditions and at the same time admit that scandal which borders on direct betrayal of the Party?

The Opposition finally organised a demonstration against the Party, against the Soviets, it made an appeal to the street, to the non-proletarian elements. How is it possible for anyone belonging to the Party to talk about the Bolshevist traditions and at the same time to make an appeal to the street against his own Party, against his own Soviet Power? Where has it ever occurred that the Bolshevist traditions admitted such a scandal which borders on undisguised counter-revolution? Is it not clear that Comrade Kamenev is talking about the traditions of Bolshevism for the reason that he wants to mask his breach with these traditions in the interest of his anti-Bolshevist group? Nothing has come of the Opposition's appeal to the street, as it proved to be a quite insignificant group. This is, however, not due to any fault of theirs, but to their bad luck. What would have happened if the Opposition had somewhat gained in strength? It is clear that its appeal to the street would have developed into a regular putsch against the Soviet Power. Is it so difficult to realise that, in essentials, the said attempt on the part of the Opposition is not in any way different from the well-known attempt made

by the Left S. R.'s in 1918? (Cries of: "Hear, hear!") According to rule, we ought to have had all the members of the Opposition arrested for such attempts on November 7th. (Continued applause.) We only refrained from doing so because we felt sorry for the Opposition, because we were large-minded and wished to give it a chance to reflect on the matter. The Opposition however regarded our magnanimity as a weakness. Is it not clear that Kamenev's talk about the Bolshevist traditions is nothing more nor less than hollow and deceitful words, whose object is to mask the breach of the Opposition with the traditions of Bolshevism?

f) **On the alleged Unity and on real Unity.** Comrade Kamenev has sung a hymn in praise of unity. Has almost shed tears entreating the Party to come to his assistance and to establish unity "at any price". As you see, they are against the policy of two parties. They are in favour of unity "at any price". I may, however, take for granted that you know that at the very moment in which Comrade Kamenev was here praising the unity of the Party, those who share his views moved a resolution to the effect that the declaration of the Opposition in respect of unity was only a manoeuvre intended to preserve their own forces and to continue their policy of division. On the one hand hymns in praise of unity at the Party Conference of the Leninist Party, on the other hand illegal work aiming at dividing the Party, at organising a second party, at undermining party unity. This is what they call unity "at any price". Is it not high time to cease playing this criminal game?

Kamenev spoke on unity: Unity with whom? Unity with the Party or with Shtsherbakov? Is it not time to understand that it is impossible to maintain unity both with the Party and Shtsherbakov? Kamenev spoke on unity. Unity with whom? With Maslov and Souvarine or with the Comintern and the C. P. S. U.? Is it not the highest time to realise that it is impossible for anyone to talk of unity with the Comintern and the C. P. S. U. whilst remaining in harmony with Maslov and Souvarine? Is it not the highest time to grasp that it is impossible to combine the Leninist views with the Menshevist views of the Opposition, Lenin with Abramovitch? Comrades, that is really impossible! It is high time to stop this game.

These are the reasons why I believe that Comrade Kamenev's idle talk about unity "at any price" is a pharisaical game played with the intention to deceive the party. What we want is real unity, not juggling with unity. Is there a true Leninist unity in our Party? There is. If 99 per cent of our Party vote for the Party and against the Opposition, it is a true and genuine proletarian unity, such as has not existed hitherto in our Party. We have a party congress at which the Opposition has not a single delegate. (Applause.) What else is this but the unity of our Leninist Party? This is what we call the Leninist unity of the Bolshevist Party.

g) **Make an End with the Opposition.** The Party has done everything in its power to lead the Opposition on to the Leninist path. The Party displayed the utmost indulgence and magnanimity in order to give the Opposition an opportunity to think over matters and correct its mistakes. The Party proposed that the Opposition should own up and brand its mistakes in order to overcome them for good. The Party proposed that the Opposition should completely disarm both with regard to its ideology and to its organisation.

What end does the Party wish to reach in this way? Its object is to settle things with the Opposition and to proceed to positive work. Its object is finally to liquidate the Opposition and to make it possible to throw itself heart and soul on our great work of construction. At the 10th Party Congress, Lenin said: "We want no Opposition at the present moment, we want to make an end of it, we now have enough of Opposition!" The Party wishes that this slogan of Lenin be finally effected in the ranks of our Party. (Long and continued applause.) If the Opposition disarms, well and good. If it refuses to demobilise—then we shall disarm it. (Cries of: "Hear, hear! Applause.")

3. THE BALANCE.

It may be concluded from Kamenev's speech that the Opposition has no intention to disarm completely. The declaration made by the Opposition on December 3rd, 1927, has the same meaning. The Opposition evidently prefers to remain outside

the Party. There is nothing terrible, nothing special, nothing astonishing in the fact that they prefer to remain outside the Party. If we take a glance at the history of our Party, we see that at certain serious turning-points in the life of our Party, a certain number of the old leaders fell off the cart of the Bolshevik Party and thus made room for fresh elements. A turning-point is a serious thing. A turning point is a danger for all those who do not hold on to the cart of the Party with a sufficiently firm grip. Not everybody can keep his balance on a curve. The cart gives a jerk and someone or other falls out. (Applause.)

Let us now take the year 1903, the period of the 2nd Party Congress. That was the period in which the Party changed over from its compromise with the Liberals to a life-and-death struggle against the Liberal bourgeoisie; it was the period in which the Party changed over from preparing for the struggle against Tsarism to an open fight against it with the object of bringing about a complete collapse of Tsarism and feudalism. At that time the Party was headed by six leaders: Plechanov, Vera Sassulitch, Martov, Lenin, Axelrod, Potressov. The turning-point proved fatal to five out of these six leaders. They fell from the cart. Lenin alone kept his seat. (Applause.) Things happened in such a way that the old leaders of the Party, the founders of the Party (Plechanov, Axelrod, Sassulitch) and two young leaders (Martov, Potressov) were in opposition to a leader who was also young, to Comrade Lenin. If you knew what howling and wailing there was at that time from fear that the Party was collapsing, that the Party would not stand firm, that it would be impossible to do anything without the old leaders! The howling and wailing have died away and the facts have remained. The facts, however, were of such a nature that just thanks to the secession of the five leaders, the Party succeeded in finding the right way. Every Bolshevik is now quite clear as to the fact that our Party would not have succeeded in establishing itself as the party of the Bolsheviks which is capable of leading the proletarians towards revolution, without Lenin's determined struggle against those five leaders, without his dispossessing those five leaders. (Cries of: "Hear, hear!")

Let us now consider the subsequent period, the period of 1907 to 1909. That was the period when our Party changed over from its open struggle against Tsarism to the indirect fight, by making use of all legal possibilities — from the insurance offices to the platform of the Douma. That was the period of the retreat after the defeat in the revolution of 1905. This turning-point demanded that we should apply new methods

of fighting in order to enter afresh with our collected forces on an openly revolutionary fight against Tsarism. This turn proved fatal to a large number of old Bolsheviks. Alexinsky fell from the cart. He had been quite a good Bolshevik for a time. Bogdanov fell out. He had been one of the most serious leaders of our party. Roshkov fell out, an ex-member of the C. C. of our Party. And so on. At that time there was no less clamouring and whining about the decline of the Party than in 1903. The clamouring however has died away and facts have persisted. Facts indeed show that our Party would not have succeeded in finding the right path in the new conditions of the fight unless it purged the cause of the revolution of all persons who stood in its way. What was Lenin's aim at that time? His only object was to purge the Party as quickly as possible of all the wavering, whining elements, in order to prevent them from putting obstacles in its way. (Applause.)

In this way, comrades, our Party has grown.

Our Party is a living organism. As with every organism, a process of metabolism is taking place in it. The old and used-up material is eliminated (applause), the new and growing components live and develop. Some are falling off, above and below. But new forces are growing above and below and carry the whole further on. This is how our Party grew. This is how it will continue to grow in the future.

The same must be said with regard to the present period of our revolution. We are now living through a period of change; of a change from the reconstruction of industry and agriculture to the construction of national economy as a whole, to the transformation of national economy on a new technical basis; a period in which the construction of Socialism is no longer a prospect, but a living, practical thing which demands that serious internal and external difficulties be overcome. You know that this parting of the ways has proved fatal to the leaders of the Opposition, who were seized with fear in view of the fresh difficulties and wanted to persuade the Party to turn back in the direction of capitulation. There is nothing astonishing in the fact that some leaders who refuse to hold firm, are now falling from the cart. In this way the Party will get rid of persons who put obstacles in its way and prevent it from advancing. It is obviously their earnest wish to leave our party cart. Be it so! If anyone of our old leaders wishes to transform himself into waste material and wants to fall from the cart — it serves him right! (Tempestuous and continued applause. All the delegates rise from their seats and honour Comrade Stalin with an ovation.)

Report of Comrade Ordshonikidse on the Activity of the C. C. C. and Worker and Peasants' Inspection.

(Full report.)

Comrades! Now that the resolution on the political report of the C. C., containing an exhaustive valuation of the ideology of the Opposition, has been passed unanimously, it is unnecessary to deal much in detail with the Opposition. The Party, by this unanimous vote, and its acceptance of the tenet that membership in the Trotskivist Opposition, and the propaganda of its views, are incompatible with membership in the Party, has brought the question to a head, and now it depends on the Opposition itself whether it can and will remain in the Party, if it will disarm completely in accordance with the decisions of the Party Congress and thereby retain membership in the Party, or if it will persist in its erroneous views and thereby place itself outside of the Party.

The Party Congress, by this unanimous vote, has decided that unless the Opposition completely disarms both ideologically

and organisatorically, it puts itself automatically outside of the Party.

Up to now it has been our task to prove, in the course of disputes with the Opposition, that it is carrying on fractional work, that it possesses its own fraction, and that it is organising a second Party, but now there is no further need of proof or dispute, for even Comrade Kamenev, speaking here, has not ventured to deny the existence of a fraction of the Opposition, whilst the declarations of a number of one time oppositionals bear clearest witness to the fact that this is no longer merely a fraction, but a party with its own platform and its own programme. It is clear that two parties cannot exist within one.

What is our present position? The imperialist States are preparing an attack upon us, and we have equally urgent difficulties at home. We cannot overcome these difficulties unless we

are a united Party, a Party with that iron discipline which has always been our strength. Does the Opposition strengthen this discipline by its actions? Does it strengthen the unity of the Party, or does it seek to disrupt it? People who possessed their own printing office, who have striven to organise demonstrations against the Party and the Soviet power, do not strengthen Party discipline.

Who is it who raise their heads in response to the disruptive fight of the Opposition? What do the White Guard newspapers, the Menshevist Dan and the others, write about it? One thing only: its programme is nothing to us, its Left phrases are a matter of indifference, all that is important for us is that its agitation and fight shake the discipline, the dictatorship of the proletariat. The actions which the Opposition has permitted itself in the two years since the XIV. Party Congress place it beyond the pale of the Party.

From the time of the XIV. Party Congress onwards, the Opposition has carried on a continuous fractional struggle; during the sessions of the XIV. Party Congress it carried it on in Leningrad, and immediately after the close of the XIV. Party Congress it was again carried on with a view to preventing the Leningrad comrades, the Leningrad organisation, from submitting to the Party Congress. What else could the C. C. C. do but demand from the leaders of the Opposition that it should abstain from violating the decisions of the Party Congress. When the Opposition continued the open struggle in Leningrad after the XIV. Party Congress, and then took to "meetings in the forest" a few months later, what could the C. C. C. do? Praise Laschevitch and tell him that he was acting admirably? Of course not. The C. C. C. was obliged to warn Comrade Laschevitch that such things are impermissible in a Bolshevist Party. The C. C. C. issued this warning, and suggested to the Joint Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C. that Comrade Laschevitch should be removed from the ranks of the deputy members of the C. C.

A few months passed, and in October 1926 the Opposition endeavoured to force a discussion upon the whole Party. A discussion fever set in. The Opposition leaders rushed from one factory to another, from Moscow to Leningrad, from Leningrad to Moscow. Rejected on all sides by the rank and file of the Party members, they declared on 16th October that they abandoned the fractional struggle, and were ready to promise the Party not to take it up again.

Shortly before the 16th October, a number of comrades were expelled from the Party for breaking Party discipline, but after the declaration of 16th October the Control Commission took literally every possible step to bring these comrades back into the Party again, and imposed upon them one single condition; no more fractional fighting. We had to persuade some of these comrades for three days in order to induce them to remain in the Party. It may be that the Party Congress will ask us who commissioned us to devote so much time to persuading people who had no desire to remain in the Party? I must however report things as they actually were. Comrade Solz and I devoted a whole week to Vladimir Smirnov. (Interjection: A high honour!) This was to induce him to withdraw the unallowable declaration made by him at the session of the C. C. C., that we might be enabled to cancel the decision of the Moscow Control Commission and retain him in the Party.

In this manner we brought back into the Party 90 per cent of those expelled, calling down upon our heads the reproach that whilst every effort was being made to fight against the oppositionals and to exclude them from the Party, the Central Control Commission was reinstating them. In some districts, Transcaucasia for instance, there were a large number of expelled who were undoubtedly deserving expulsion, but they were almost all reinstated. (Interjection: "You acted wrongly!") I know that we can expect no praise for doing this, and I am not reporting it for praise or blame, but simply to show you that we have done literally everything possible to facilitate to the comrades of the Opposition to adhere to their declaration of 16th October.

The Opposition utterly disregarded our motives, and began to regard our attitude towards it as symptoms of impotence; it began to spread all kinds of legends on differences of opinion within the C. C., the existence of three or four groups, etc.

When we demanded an explanation from Zinoviev and Trotsky at the August Plenum, and before this in the presidium of the C. C. C., they not only refused to admit that this conduct was impermissible, but slandered the Party and its organs. And

still we only decided to submit the question of their expulsion from the C. C. to the Joint Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C., thus giving them the possibility of coming to their senses at least once, at the Joint Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C., and of abandoning their impermissible conduct. At the August Plenum we were occupied for almost three days with the Opposition, and made the utmost concessions in order to be able to retain it in the C. C., and in order to show for the hundredth time that we at least are sincerely anxious for Party unity. Although the actions of the Opposition have been utterly wrong and inadmissible, we have still made every effort to retain it in the C. C.

Those who participated in the Plenum will well remember the mood prevailing in this hall when I spoke here in the name of the Commission, whilst the whole Plenum was in favour of the expulsion of the Opposition. It cost much trouble to induce the Plenum to accept the proposal of the Commission.

Did the Opposition appreciate this step? The very next day rumours were in circulation: Oh, you C. C. and your C. C. C. are weak, their arms are short, they dare not touch us. On the day following the August Plenum, I said to Comrade Kamenev: "Comrade Kamenev, do not believe in such an interpretation of our action, it will be fatal." And at that time Comrade Kamenev replied: "No. What we have to do now is to keep at any price the promise which we have made to the C. C. and the C. C. C. The 16th October may be repeated once. But not a second time." And so it has proved. The third time has been impossible.

Further. The October Plenum. A fresh warning. But the Opposition has pushed this all aside. Instead of fulfilling the promises made to the Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C., it organised an illegal printing office. Around this printing office all sorts of riffraff gathered, all sorts of White Guard scum. But if one ventured to remark upon this, the Opposition was beside itself: What! You accuse us of conspiracy?

Here it is no question of conspiracy, but of the fact that the Opposition is beginning to be a tool in the hands of a third power. This is the fundamental point. When we demanded an explanation from Scharov and Preobraschensky on the printing office, they declared: "We declare to you that we, the undersigned, are politically responsible for this matter, and are its organisers, and not those non-Party elements which accidentally came into connection with it." And further: "We demand the immediate release of all those who have been arrested in this affair, as we alone bear the responsibility." (Y. Preobraschensky, L. Serebryakov, Y. Scharov.)

Here Comrade Kamenev was expressing his indignation at the arrest of Mratschkovsky. Do you think it was pleasant for any of us to put Mratschkovsky in prison? Do we not know very well that Mratschkovsky fought against Koltshalk? But when Mratschkovsky, who fought against Koltshalk, now fights against our C. C. and our Soviet government, what are we to do? There is nothing left for us to do, however much we may wish there were, but to put Mratschkovsky in prison (Applause). The revolution is not a joke. As soon as an attempt is made at undermining the Party leading the revolution, that revolution may be ruined, as Lenin told us. And we have no right to permit our Party and our revolution to be shaken. But the actions of the Opposition are leading straight in that direction.

Before the Presidium of the C. C. C. expelled Zinoviev and Trotsky from the Party, it imposed on them the condition: abandonment of all illegal meetings. This was the sole demand made: abandonment of illegal meetings without disbanding its fraction, nor to abandon the views which were incompatible with Party membership. It might come forward in the nuclei and in meetings, openly defend its platform, do what it will, only not call illegal meetings! Is this condition unacceptable? Is this equivalent to hanging and quartering? We are all members of one Party, and we say: You may develop your views, you may speak openly at our meetings, only you must give up your illegal meetings!

What did the Opposition reply? You point a revolver at our hearts, they declared give us time for consideration, discussion, etc. The question of the abandonment of illegal meetings could not be settled without first convening an illegal C. C., at which the matter could be discussed and agreed upon. An Opposition adopting such an attitude towards the Party makes it impossible for it to form a common body with that party. (Interjection: Quite right!)

The Opposition maintains that we have given it no opportunity of publishing its platform. But the C. C. and the C. C. C. decided that the discussion should begin one month before the convocation of the XV. Party Congress, in accordance with the Party statutes. Here there was nothing against the Party statutes, nothing unacceptable for the Party. But what did the Opposition do? It submitted a platform which represented the complete programme of a new Party, containing 72 pages of slander of our Party and the C. C., and demanded that this should be published at once. Two weeks before this platform was submitted to the Political Bureau, it was sent to Turkestan, but of course not for revision, but for distribution. When the C. C. C. replied that the discussion would begin on 1st November, and that the Opposition could then submit its counter-theses in accordance with the decisions of the Party, the Opposition opened its illegal printing office and began to print its platform illegally.

Before passing on to the work of the **Workers' and Peasants' Inspection**, I should like to make a few preliminary remarks. When it is maintained that our apparatus is worth nothing, there is doubtless much truth in the statement, but when the blame is thrown on the C. C. of the Party, this is not right. Not that we have any wish to offer an apology. I have been engaged in this work for a year, have pointed out many of the faults of our apparatus, and believe that its faults will have to be pointed out and corrected for a long time ahead. This is inevitable. This is necessary.

But if we are to form an idea of why our apparatus is what it is, we must look back, we must remember the conditions under which the apparatus came into being, we must remember what it has been and what it is now. We cannot for instance compare our apparatus with the State apparatus of France, Germany, or any other State. Shortly before October Lenin wrote as follows:

"Not a parliamentary republic — to return to this from the workers' council would be a step backwards — but a republic of the deputies of the workers, agricultural labourers, and peasants of the whole country, from the top to the bottom.

Abolition of the police, the army, and officialdom, that is, the substitution of the standing army by the general armament of the people.

The salary of all officials — all of whom can be elected or removed at any time — not to exceed the average wage of an efficient workman."

He wrote further, when developing this idea in his pamphlet: "Will the Bolsheviks maintain State power?", as follows:

"The Councils are the new State apparatus.

This creates in the first place the armed power of the workers and peasants, a power which does not stand apart from the people like the old standing army, but is closely bound up with it; from the military standpoint this power is incomparably stronger than the former power, and from the revolutionary standpoint nothing else can replace it.

In the second place, this apparatus creates a close, indivisible, easily controlled and renewed connection with the masses, with the majority of the people, such as did not exist in the very slightest degree in the former State apparatus.

In the third place, as this apparatus is elected, and those elected to it can be removed at any time according to the will of the people, both election and removal being free of bureaucratic formalities, it is much more democratic than the former apparatus of power.

In the fourth place, this apparatus establishes firm connections with every trade and profession, enabling far-reaching reforms to be attained without bureaucratic formalities.

In the fifth place, it creates a form of organisation for the vanguard — that is, for the conscious, energetic, and most advanced section — of the **suppressed** classes, of the workers and peasants, and therefore represents an apparatus with whose aid the vanguard of the suppressed classes may raise, enlighten, and lead that **enormous** mass of these classes which has hitherto stood entirely outside of political life, and even outside history.

In the sixth place, it furnishes an opportunity of combining the advantages of parliamentarism with those of immediate and direct democracy, that is, of combining the legislative with the **executive** function in the person of the elected representative of the people. In comparison with bourgeois parliamentarism, this is a step forwards in the development of democracy, and is of world historical importance."

This is the standard according to which we must measure our present Soviet apparatus. It need not be said that in the space of ten years we have not been able to create an apparatus as it should be, on the lines laid down by Lenin.

What was our position immediately after our victory? We did not possess any cultural or technical forces of our own. Who among us understood at that time how to manage an industrial undertaking? Who among us was capable of leading the country? 99 per cent. of our comrades had not learnt State administration. Therefore we were obliged soon after our victory to apply for technical and cultural aid to our class enemies, to the old officials, the old bureaucrats. These bureaucrats, in coming over to us, brought their routine with them. They were opposed to the Soviet power and sabotaged it openly. They endeavoured to build up the Soviet apparatus on the model of the old Tsarist apparatus. Frequently they assumed our outer forms, but strove to restore the old content to the new form.

If we take our apparatus today, do we find it in accordance with the apparatus described by Lenin? Or, to put the question differently: Has it been possible to keep our apparatus free from bureaucratic excrescences? Or has there not been a partial rebirth of bureaucratism, as inevitable as the partial rebirth of capitalism in our country after the introduction of the New Economic Policy?

The economic roots of bureaucratism lie in our poverty, in our technical backwardness, in the differentiation of the peasantry.

And now, what is our apparatus like today, what is the direction being taken by our State apparatus, towards greater bureaucratism or against it? Are the masses fighting with increasing energy against bureaucratism, or are they faltering? Has our apparatus become a foreign body, or does it belong to us? Have we succeeded in these ten years in making the Soviet apparatus work in the service of the proletariat and the socialist fatherland?

To this we reply that despite all the defects of our apparatus, despite its bureaucratic degeneration, and despite the extreme rise in prices: The Soviet apparatus is in our hands, it serves our socialist fatherland, it is our apparatus.

The Opposition has made a specially vigorous attack on the Red Army. If we are to believe the declarations of Zinoviev and Trotsky, and especially the declaration of the "15" — the Saponov-Smirnov group — our Red Army has become transformed into a sort of pretorian guard, ready for some incipient Bonaparte. Is this true? It is absolutely untrue.

The number of workers in the cadres of the Red Army is 18.1 per cent, of peasants 71.3 per cent, of other elements 10.6 per cent. The percentage of communists and members of the Young Communist League was 22.8 in 1925, 29.9 per cent in 1926. The number of Party members among the commanders grows from year to year. In 1920 the percentage was 10.5, in 1921 20 per cent, in 1922 22.5 per cent, in 1923 29.6 per cent, in 1924 31.8 per cent, in 1925 43.3 per cent, in 1926 47 per cent, and in 1927 54 per cent.

Is this an army alien to us or is it ours? Perhaps it has no contact with the working class? Perhaps it is out of touch with the peasantry? Perhaps our Red Army only comes in contact with the working class when there are strikes, and the troops are required to disperse the strikers, as is the case in the capitalist countries? In our country there is not a single person who would venture to assert that our Red Army had ever come to the factories in order to suppress the workers. Our Red Army has come to the factories but the workers have come to the barracks in order to demonstrate their unity and their brotherly alliance.

Turning to our other State organs, again we find that despite all drawbacks the State apparatus is in our hands. Such facts as the control figures of the State Planning Commission, the basis upon which our national economy is conducted systematically from year to year, demonstrate that the helm is in our hands, and that Lenin's question of: "Who leads whom?" is being solved in our favour.

There are 3,722,000 employees in our State apparatus, including those employed in educational work. Up to the present two million persons have been employed in administration, costing the country about two million roubles.

We are erecting extensive plants of various kinds, and the technical perfection and rapid completion of this will solve the problem of the industrialisation of our country.

Here again many errors must be admitted: Building work has been begun and carried on without certified designs, drawings, and pre-estimates, work has not been completed in the time agreed upon, the different departments of one undertaking are not carried out simultaneously, the work done is high priced and inferior, building materials and equipment are delivered unsystematically and with much delay. The outlay for general management is high (20 per cent of the value of the plant erected, and up to 100 per cent of wages).

We were of the opinion that the general costs of management were excessive, that the skill and experience of other countries was not being sufficiently utilised, and therefore we attacked this question with some severity. This severity is no longer necessary. And when I have had occasion to speak with comrades of the Supreme Economic Council, these have invariably been of the opinion that really useful work has already been accomplished, and that thanks to this work many defects have been removed.

One of the first tasks of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection is to continue the work of simplifying and cheapening our State, industrial, co-operative, and trade apparatus. A commission of the Council of Labour and Defence, under the chairmanship of Comrade Zyrupa, has made great advances towards the rationalisation of the goods traffic network. The practical execution of the measures advocated must however be accorded the strictest superintendence.

The Workers' and Peasants' Inspection must inexorably follow the strict carrying out of the decisions of the government and the Party. Lenin pointed out repeatedly that there is no lack of good laws among us, that indeed we have an abundance of them, only they are not always adhered to strictly and in time.

The Party has placed the question of the rationalisation of national economy. Work in this direction is already being done in our country, and on a very extensive scale. It is not yet possible to compile a summary of results, but I recently had the opportunity of reading the manuscript of an extremely interesting book by Yermansky. He has collected a great deal of material showing which results have been achieved with us in the sphere of rationalisation of production. There is much of which we can be proud, but there is much to be deplored as well. One instance is given, of a pencil factory erected by the Moscow Polygraphic Institute, which ordered the best of machines from Germany, but was unable to install them properly. The result was that the machines failed to accomplish the output of which they were really capable.

A number of other instances show, however, that great achievements have actually been attained. The simple and elementary proper organisation of labour yields the greatest results. The same book gives the following example: In an undertaking abroad it was found that one worker accomplished 50 per cent

more work than all the others, under like conditions. Inquiry showed this to be due to the fact that this worker, before beginning work, had all his tools ready in the order in which he required them during worktime.

This simple trick sufficed to ensure a 50 per cent increase of output. In our coal mines we often see an excellent hewer leaving his work to look for pit props, which could very well be supplied to him by an unskilled worker.

In spite of our technical backwardness, there is much opportunity for rationalisation in our undertakings. Both the workers and our technical scientific experts must take part in this work, foreign experts must be attracted and foreign experience must be appropriated. Without the extensive aid of technical science no great progress can be attained towards rationalisation. The Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, which is of the opinion that rationalisation must be carried out with the aid of the forces in the undertakings, has set itself the task of controlling the achievements attained, the suitability of the instructions given to the workers and technical science assistants, and the efficaciousness of the equipment.

Our main efforts must be directed towards a ruthless and systematic fight against bureaucratic distortions in every department of our Soviet apparatus. Here it is not only a question of removing those defects of which I have spoken here, but of preventing inadmissible treatment of persons in the State institutions, in works and factories, in the co-operatives, in the militia, in the law courts, etc. It must never occur in our co-operatives that people are received and served according to their dresses. If their reception is to be adapted to their clothing, then the better service ought to be given to the less well dressed. In our institutions the inquirer must receive the information he requires, and a comprehensible reply. If frequently happens that the inquirer can neither reach the right person nor receive a clear answer.

The struggle against bureaucracy must be carried on by the masses of workers and peasants themselves. Lenin has taught us that a successful struggle against bureaucracy is only possible with the participation of the broad masses, and he was never weary of repeating that the non-Party working men and women, the peasants and peasant women, must be induced to join the struggle.

Lenin considered the press to be a powerful weapon in the fight against bureaucratism.

In our Soviets we have a powerful organisation for the struggle against bureaucratism. The actual realisation of Soviet democracy means a deadly blow against bureaucratism. In the Soviets we have about 1½ million members, in the co-operatives about 20 million, in the trade unions 9 million. To these must be added the Young Communist League, the Party, the production consultations, the economic commissions, the control commissions. The whole working class is our army, and with its help we must carry on a systematic fight against bureaucratism.

When Lenin created the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, and set it the task of combating bureaucracy and the other faults of our apparatus, he was of the opinion that the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection would not be able to fulfil this task unless the Party gave its best collaborators for the work in the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. He stated definitely that we must give our best to the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, or it was not worth while to undertake its reorganisation. These instructions of Lenin must be followed. (Enthusiastic, prolonged applause.)

From the Discussion on Comrade Ordshonikidse's Report

Speech of Comrade YAROSLAVSKY.

(Full Report.)

25 speakers took part in the discussion on Comrade Ordshonikidse's report. The following speech by Comrade Yaroslavsky, member of the Presidium of the C. C. C., is the most characteristic of these speeches, and is here appended in a concise form.

Comrades, I have been asked to say a few words on the work accomplished by our colleagues in the Party.

A reference to the work of the local Control Commissions shows that during the two years under report (not quite two years) 93,000 Party members and candidates have been called to account by the Party for some reason or another. Of these 83,000 members complied with the demands of the Party, whilst 28,563 members have been expelled. The absolute number is extremely high, but when we divide it by two to find the annual number, we find that in 1926 1.8 per cent. of the members and candidates were called to account for this or that offence in 1926, 1.6 per cent. in 1927. We see that the number has declined slightly. It must also be remembered that during the last few years we have included those members called to account by the district Control Commissions (which formerly did not exist), so that the number has increased.

Taking the figures for one year, the number of expelled is between 14 and 15 thousand. A fairly large number, but by no means higher than we had in former times. Formerly too we were obliged to purge our Party, which, as a leading Party sometimes admits people who are only anxious to find a soft job.

The number of expelled diminishes from year to year. We have invariably maintained the class standpoint within the Party. We inquire into the offences of Party members from every aspect, and never omit to take into account the political development and conditions of life of the offenders.

Petty squabbles have diminished. Every single Party organisation can confirm the fact that the squabbling which once corroded the Party organisations has greatly lessened. This does not mean that it has entirely ceased, for there are still cases of that sort of squabbling in which certain groups, striving for the leadership, puff up trifles into the appearance of fundamental differences of opinion, or where one group accuses another, as happened in Komi (Syzyane district), and the opposition group drags up all kinds of ideological substantiations for the purpose of having the other group removed, etc.

This kind of thing is still going on, but not so much as in former years. And there have been fewer conflicts on national bases. There has been less drunkenness, fewer violations of Party discipline, fewer embezzlements and debts. I cannot say that everything is perfect with us in these last respects. If there is an improvement to record, this is due to the fact that the Party organisations and our Control Commissions have taken drastic measures against every type of embezzlement, and especially against all persons who disregard public interests, and whose sole endeavour is to exploit for their own benefit such opportunities as come in their way.

I unfurl at this Congress the first oppositional flag. (He unfurls the flag. Sensation.) This is the banner of the Spassk co-operative "Bondary". This co-operative was conducted under the leadership of a former factory owner, and its secretary was his daughter. This was in the Far East, in the town of Spassk. The "Bondary" resolved to hoist a flag on the anniversary of the revolution, and to inscribe it with the words: "Long live the unity of the Bolshevik ranks and their vanguard, the Leninist Opposition!" (Laughter.)

We are responsible for a number of steps taken against the Opposition. We do not wish to deny this responsibility; on the contrary, we are proud of it. Before the Party Congress we voted for the expulsion of Trotzky and Zinoviev from the Party. Before the Party Congress we supported the measures for the removal of Byeloborodov from his post as chief Com-

missar for Home Affairs and of Smirnov from the position of People's Commissar for the Post and Telegraph Service. But it must be remembered that we had already shown the utmost patience. We knew very well that these people were pursuing an anti-Party line, yet after the XIV. Party Congress we took no measures for removing the oppositionals from leading political positions. They themselves clung to these positions: "Look, we are entrusted with the most responsible functions, our comrades are abroad, Rakovsky in Paris, this one here, another there" etc.

And when the game was completely lost, what then? Then it came to illegal meetings, at which every word spoken was an incitement against the Party. We in the Commission have data — anyone may see this material — on dozens of illegal meetings organised by the Opposition, and conducted by its leaders, Trotzky, Zinoviev, Rakovsky, Radek, and others. Here they expressed their true opinions.

Trotzky was asked what he thought of the manifesto (this took place at an illegal meeting at the "Malaya Ordynika"). Trotzky replied: "This document is an adventure, a stillborn child of a bureaucracy which feels the ground shaking under its feet".

At the next meeting he was asked: "Why have you put yourself in communication with Schtscherbakov, a man not belonging to the Party?" He replied: "Schtscherbakov is not a member of the Party simply because he was not admitted, but he is a real communist". This real communist, the son of a manufacturer, maintains connections with perfectly outside elements, but he appears to be related to some of the oppositionals, related in the literal sense of the word. And this relationship is between Schtscherbakov and the chief leaders of the Opposition.

He is a real communist, only, as you see, he has no membership card in his pocket. When Trotzky was asked how it would be at the XV. Party Congress, he declared: "What is the XV. Party Congress? The coming XV. Party Congress is a conference of the Stalin fraction for the whole Soviet Union." (Noise and sensation.) "And of course" continued Trotzky, "the Opposition will continue its activities after the Party Congress. And again, at another illegal meeting, in the Miuskaya Ulitsa, Trotzky declared: "We cannot be divided from the working class except by flesh and blood. We are convinced that the real discussion will not begin until after the Congress."

What faith can we have in the declarations which they have made to us, after all this?

Zinoviev will not protest against Urbahns continuing to dub him president of the Comintern, after he has become the president of some unknown "International". Whether he will arrive at the 3½ International, or at the II. International itself, where various colleagues of the Opposition have already landed (Rosenberg for instance) will be seen in the near future, if the Opposition does not find its way back to the Party. It does not even observe that elementary loyalty to the Party which it once demanded from the "Workers' Opposition".

Permit me to devote a few words to the actions of Byeloborodov and Mratschkovsky. Byeloborodov was People's Commissar for Home Affairs. He assisted in the elaboration of those election instructions with which the Opposition subsequently reproached us. I ask you, can any one name one single document in which this People's Commissar for Home Affairs declared that he was not in agreement with the recent acts of the Government? He remained a member of the Government. Any honourable man in this position would have said: "Comrades, I cannot continue to be People's Commissar, for I am not in agreement with the line of the Party."

But he remained. And so far as he was able, he made use of the apparatus itself for sending people in all directions to act in his name. He himself travelled with Mratschkovsky to the Ural. Here he made declarations to persons not belonging to the Party, to the effect that: "The Stalin fraction, calling

itself the C. C., has formed a bloc with the Right S. R.'s, and is pursuing a policy in the interests of the bourgeoisie. They will rob the working class and pillage the peasantry." What is this called, in the language of any class? It is called treachery.

When he was thrown out of the hall, he addressed himself in his excitement to the sentries posted before the building, and said: "You are serving another class." A Red Army Soldier asked him: "What other class?", to which Byeloborodov replied: "You are serving Ustryalov". I do not know if every Red Army soldier knows who Ustryalov is, but he knows that he serves the Workers' and Peasants' government, that he serves the cause of the proletarian revolution. (Applause.) And when the People's Commissar for Home Affairs declares to him that he is serving another class, then this is (A voice: "Counter-revolution!") ... right, it is nothing less than counter-revolution. No Menshevik would venture to do this, but a Trotzkyite makes use of the trust of the Party, he ventures to do it, and does it!

After this it is our duty to tell the whole country that Byeloborodov does not represent the views of the Soviet Government, that he can not be a member of the Soviet Government, that he cannot even remain for one moment a member of the Party." (Applause.)

I sent for him and questioned him in a friendly manner. He maintained of course that the matter had not been quite as described, that he had said something of the sort, but not exactly that. But on the whole he did not deny the part he had played. I therefore cannot see any reason why there should be any alteration in the decision of the Ural Control Commission on Byeloborodov.

The same applies to Mratschkovsky. Mratschkovsky declared to us, when we were inquiring into the affair of the illegal printing office, that he was responsible for its organisation, and that he was going to continue it, and to combat us with every possible method. Thereupon he went to the Ural, lived there illegally, and declared that he would not leave until he had forced the Ural Party organisation on to its knees. (Laughter. A voice: "He wanted a great deal." "He will be forced to his knees himself!")

The question being so: Who — whom? the Ural Party organisation naturally took the necessary steps to prevent Mratschkovsky from accomplishing his object. He pursued the most demagogic of lines. What were his directions? Mratschkovsky drew up the following draft, which appears to have been passed on by Kusown'kov. Here we find the following "directions": We should not pay too much attention to the Party membership book. If we are expelled, we should not deliver up the Party membership book; the signatures for the platform should be collected even under separate points, that is, separate points should be shown and this or that signature obtained for the different points. We should always mention that Mratschkovsky played a great part in the civil war, and that for this reason he cannot be expelled from the Party, etc.

From the soil prepared by the Opposition there is now springing up the most varied flowers, even white guard growths. First we see Radek, Laschevitsch, Bakayev, Naumov, Salutsky, Fyedorov, Zinoviev, and Yevdokimov, embracing one another on one list. These write articles alleged to be for the "Lenin-gradskaya Pravda", but since they know very well that we cannot print such despicable productions, they are now spreading them themselves in secret. In these articles they describe the Party as "railers, scandal-mongers, hooligans attacking the Bolshevik Leninists, as the most miserable of rowdies, political bankrupts".

Let us take for instance the entirely rural gouvernement of Vologda. Here a considerable Trotzkyist group has been established, and is endeavouring to work in the village. It distributes circulars: "To all the groups of the Ustyanyov district", to the oppositional group of Vyelsk, etc. The slogans are quite interesting: "All together to the work, down with the dictatorship of the commune, long live the right and united party." And where are we to find this right and united party? We gather that what we require is a united and properly constructed party, the party of the Trotzkyist Left. This is written by a Trotzkyist to the oppositional group at Vyelsk, apparently in reply to a question on the success of the industrialisation loan. You will have seen in today's newspapers that the industrialisation loan has been fully subscribed and even 21 millions beyond. (Applause.)

We know that the working class is supporting the socialist Soviet structure as only the working class can support it. We know that the peasantry too has participated in this industrialisation loan. I believe that this will not be the last industrialisation loan, and that we shall show the capitalists of the whole world that the Leninist Party in our country finds the required support from the working class and the peasantry. But these people are alarmed in case the peasantry should take part in the industrialisation loan; they are as disquieted as we were in 1927 as to the possible participation of the peasantry in the "freedom loan". And this Trotzkyite writes to his leaders: "The industrialisation loan is rousing but little interest among the peasantry, the peasants themselves do not take it up, and it is only being subscribed by their immediate masters, the employees. Your fears are unfounded." Now you see what they fear: that the peasantry might support the industrialisation loan. This train of thought is only possible to the enemy, only possible to those who have gone over finally into the camp of counter-revolution. (A voice: "Hear, hear!")

This oppositional asks his leaders: "What shall I do when non-Party peasants come to our group, in order to join our struggle against the policy of the country?" Things have come as far as this. He does not know what to do. He has been thrown into such a state of confusion that he does not know whether to reject with contumely or to embrace those who approach his group to "join" in the fight against the Party. Here we see to whom the Opposition appeals: to the third force. Here is the third force. Here real counter-revolution enters.

We often spoke of this during Lenin's lifetime, and Lenin said that those who act against their Party, against the proletarian Bolshevik party, become the spokesmen, the banner, of all the old counter-revolutionary elements. We have often warned the Opposition that it would come to this, and the climax has at length been reached. If it has not the strength to turn abruptly and determinedly from this path, then you will understand that the Party cannot deal with such a group otherwise than with a group of counter-revolutionaries. (Voices: "Hear, hear!" Applause.)

I cannot dwell long on the document referred to by Bukharin at the Moscow Gouvernement Conference, the draft of a "programme of the Communist Party of the working class of the Soviet Union". Of course neither Zinoviev nor Trotzky, nor anyone who was ever leader in our Party, wrote this programme, but it is they who have induced these people to draw up this programme: of that there cannot be the slightest doubt. Here we find everything that is suited to be brought up against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and yet this does not prevent the programme from containing a thesis which renders it entirely anti-Semitic. This is extremely interesting, for the Opposition is always endeavouring to prove that we, the majority of the Party, permit anti-Semitism. In reality it is the Opposition which unfetters every counter-revolutionary element, including anti-Semitism. In this programme we find the following:

"Instead of breaking down the barriers of class and nationality, they are pursuing a completely tsarist policy: Divide and rule, and incite the workers against their national intelligentsia by means of treating these as if they were rogues, accusing them of counter-revolution and similar deadly crimes (verbatim), merely because they see too much. This band of parasites treads the path of the most cunning and unscrupulous European bourgeois and intelligentsia, the path of the worst of those elements who have pushed their way to the front ranks of the parasites with loud outcries on revolution and the welfare of the working class, who not only exploit foreign nationalities and enrich themselves by their labour, but exploit the workers of Europe as well; they have contrived to betray and rob the whole working class, and in this they have far surpassed the adventurers and hangers on from the bourgeoisies of other nationalities; with their despicable actions they have aroused the hate of the whole nation against the whole Jewish race, no matter to what class the Jew may belong."

This is followed by an examination of the points of the platform of the Opposition.

The Trotzkyites are indignant at the repressive measures adopted against them. I must tell you that before the 15th November we counted the members of the Opposition engaged in

fractional work since the XIV. Party Congress, and found they numbered 2031. This makes 0.17 per cent (one sixth per cent.) of the total membership of the Party. During the time up to the Party Congress 970 persons were expelled. This in the whole of the Party organisations. About 4000 in all voted for the Opposition, whilst we had counted only one half of this number. This means that we had to calculate on oppositionals in the Party who are perhaps doing no fractional work. If you observe the social position of the oppositionals, we had counted you will see that these are 35 per cent. employees, 13 to 14 per cent. students. More than one half are non-workers. Whilst at the present time the percentage of working people in our Party is 62 per cent, the Opposition has drawn about 40 per cent workers into its organisation, and this only recently, since it issued the slogan to induce workers to join.

In the Central Control Commission the Opposition was treated even more gently. For instance, where the Party called 75 members to account, only 19 have been expelled. 146 expelled members in various places appealed against their expulsion, and this was only confirmed in 47 cases.

If you make a survey of all these activities, and add to this the existence of that other party, the "Red Cross", the number of whose members has been published in the "Pravda", you will be able to form a correct estimate of the Opposition. Let it join in one party with the liberals, with Schtcherbakov and his kind, but let it leave the working class in peace, for the working class, I am fully convinced, when it learns of all these counter-revolutionary actions, will rap the Opposition even more severely on the knuckles than it has already done. ("Hear, hear!" Applause.)

Report of Comrade Litvinov.

Moscow, 14th December 1927.

Outside of the agenda, Comrade Litvinov gave today a Report to the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. on the activity of the delegation of the Soviet Union in the preparatory commission of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, and declared inter alia:

The correspondence in connection with the invitation to take part in the work of the disarmament conference pointed out definitely that the Soviet Union mistrusted the activity of the League of Nations in connection with disarmament. **What we saw and heard in Geneva was not likely to disperse this mistrust.**

The results of the toilsome labour, the draft for the international disarmament conference, contains no single figure relating to disarmament. It was not possible to obtain unanimity amongst the Powers upon any single important point of this draft. Up to the present the preparatory commission has made no proposal whatever for disarmament, but has simply discussed the level of armaments in the individual countries. The concluding paragraph of the draft contains a clause according to which in time of war the convention is to become invalid and every State is to have the right to arm to an unlimited degree. This they call the "sober and practical" way whilst our proposals were "utopian".

Recently not merely has no progress been made in the disarmament question, but actual measures have been taken to prevent a discussion of the subject. As is known, the question of disarmament has been made dependent upon the question of safety and the specially created Security Commission is to determine the degree of security of each individual State. When however, the Soviet delegation raised the real question of disarmament in the preparatory commission, their action was declared to be heresy.

The situation of the representatives of the capitalist States in the preparatory commission was really embarrassing. They were unable to put anything forward as an alternative to our proposals for complete disarmament. The excuses they made were simply absurd.

Thanks to the obstinacy of the Soviet delegation which succeeded in obtaining that a further discussion of the Soviet proposals will take place at the next session of the preparatory commission, the attempts to sabotage the draft have been

countered. Without a doubt the representatives of the capitalist States will pursue the same tactic at the next conference, so that our delegates will be faced with a serious struggle in order to obtain a real discussion of our proposals and an alteration of the methods used for the work of the commission.

The German delegation supported our resolution in general and also our demand for a speedy session of the preparatory commission, but it gave way in the question of the date. The results was that a dividing line was drawn between the representatives of the capitalist States and us.

The net result of our activity in Geneva is the following: First of all, the problem of disarmament has been raised publicly before the whole world. Boncour and Benesch may declare that the proposals of the Soviet Union contain nothing new, the fact that proposals for real and complete disarmament were introduced for the first time, however, cannot be denied. The programme of the Soviet delegation won not only the sympathies of the real friends of peace, but also of the reformist leaders who approved of the programme, at least in words. During its stay in Geneva and even now after its return, the delegation has received numerous letters and declarations of individuals and of groups expressing solidarity with the Soviet programme.

In order to counter the impression made by the Soviet delegation, the capitalist Powers are using forgeries. Some doubtful source recently brought into circulation a forged article of comrade Stalin containing lying accounts of our armament, in particular of our air fleet. That proves what a deep impression the attitude of the Soviet delegation made when it is necessary to use such methods to efface this impression.

The proposal of a socialist that the Soviet Union should begin with the disarmament and then the capitalist States could decide whether they would disarm or not, is hypocrisy. That would not be disarmament, but merely the disarmament of the Soviet Union.

Our attitude is unambiguous. **We declare our preparedness to disarm with the others completely.** The best means of testing our sincerity would be for the other Powers to join our programme. The refusal of the capitalist States to do this will convince the broad masses all over the world once again that **complete disarmament and the abolition of war is only possible by means of the Soviet system.**