

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol. 7. No. 2

PRESS

6th January 1927

CORRESPONDENCE

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 3 Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, S. Liesbfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. *Eighteenth to Twentieth Session.*

Full Report.

Eighteenth Session.

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

Moscow, Dec. 8, 1926.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

The 18th Session is open, discussion will continue on the Russian question. Comrade Semard has the floor.

Comrade SEMARD (France):

In connection with the discussion on the Russian question, the French Party has distributed to the delegates a letter by Suzanne Girault and the reply of the Pol-Bureau and information on the declaration of Souvarine in the "Revolution Proletarienne", the organ of Monatte and Rosmer.

Our Central Committee expressed its attitude on the Russian question three times. The first was immediately after the session of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. last July, when our Party approved the disciplinary measures which were taken against the members of the Opposition and issued a declaration of solidarity with the C. P. S. U. The second was at the beginning of September when we emphasised that the measures taken against the members of the Opposition were well-grounded and necessary, and that the question of the Chairman of the Communist International and Zinoviev's position on the Executive should be examined. The third was in October, when the Opposition surrendered. Our Party at that time declared that the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. had acted correctly in carrying out the struggle to the complete liquidation of the Opposition, especially since we are now passing through a period where the international bourgeoisie is intensifying its offensive against the Soviet Republic. We emphasise in this connection that despite the internal and external difficulties Russia is triumphantly continuing to work for the building up of Socialism. This reso-

lution at the same time emphasised that the Opposition met with the resistance of the overwhelming majority of the nuclei and that the attitude of the nuclei proved the correctness of the line laid down by the XIV. Congress of the C. P. S. U. The C. C. drafted its resolution emphasising the correctness of the political line carried out against the Opposition. Our C. C. constantly maintained a fundamental scrutiny: I will state the reasons for this. The Pol-Bureau itself unanimously supported the majority and began to hold information meetings in the Paris area, opening the discussion in the whole Party. This went on throughout October. The reason why the Communist Party of France did not immediately open a discussion throughout the Party simultaneously with the opening of the discussion in the Russian Party, was that the Pol-Bureau, after the last executive, in view of the dejected mood which prevailed in our Party, decided to consolidate the entire Party as well as its leadership. Before our National Congress in Lille, which took place last July, we decided first, to smash the Rights, then to disintegrate the Centrist tendencies, and finally to beat certain ultra-Left elements. After carrying out these political operations, after consolidating the Party, we intended to take up the Russian question in the whole Party.

After our Congress in Lille, which marked important progress in the consolidation of the French Party, we decided to open the discussion, but carefully and with the intention that it should in no way interfere with the Party's work. At this time it was our impression that the Opposition had established certain international connections, viz., with Germany; but we believed that it had found no elements in France which would do fractional work on their behalf. We believed that only certain ultra-Left elements, and a few Rights would defend the Russian Oppo-

sition, and rather weakly at that; but that no systematical factional work would be carried on among the membership.

Comrades, we must say that in this respect we were mistaken. Above all, fractional work was carried on at the Congress of Lille by Comrade Jacob, who at the time was the representative of the French Party to the Executive of the C. I. Jacob even had conferences with Right elements, namely, with Deputy Gauthier, who was one of the signers of the celebrated "Letter of the 250" to the Executive. Jacob negotiated with these Rights in order to unify the Opposition at the Congress of Lille. Gauthier's conduct astonished us, because he made statements from the tribune which we, the members of the Pol-Bureau, knew nothing about. He made statements regarding the nature of the discussion which was going on among the various members of the Party leadership since the last Executive and he had such exact information, that there must have been connections between him and his friends of the Russian Opposition. Since then, we have discovered that Jacob received instructions from Zinoviev and from Trotzky regarding the fractional work to be carried on in France.

Shortly before Jacob left, there took place here a meeting with Trotzky, and Trotzky demanded from Jacob, among other things, that he should agitate for the re-instatement of Souvarine. We have discovered these facts since we have been here.

The Opposition in our Party has the same position as the Russian Opposition: the Right elements have fused with the ultra-Left elements.

Thus one finds in this Opposition bloc our Comrade Suzanne Girault. She objected to the first two resolutions which referred to discipline, and which were proposed to our Executive; she declared that no proof had been adduced of Zinoviev's factional work.

When the Opposition declared its surrender, she still voted against our resolution, saying she could not express an opinion so long as she was not informed.

The tactics of the Opposition in France aimed to gain as much time as possible in order to prevent the French Party as a whole from taking a position and especially to prevent the C. C. from expressing itself finally on the contents of the question. They believed — and this was clear from the statements of Comrade Jacob — that events which would take place in Russia would give another aspect to the situation, viz., that a bad economic situation which was predicted by the comrades of the opposition and by Comrade Jacob would soon show that the Russian opposition was right. They counted upon internal difficulties in order to be able to justify the correctness of the Russian Opposition's line.

As far as Suzanne Girault is concerned, she declared, when we demanded that she state her position precisely, otherwise she would not receive a mandate as representative of the Party to the Executive, that she agreed with the Opposition 75%.

In her letter to the Pol-Bureau she spoke of the right of the free expression of opinion by minorities, and — in a much more moderate way and with much more diplomacy, defended democracy in the Russian Party; she slipped into the destructive anti-Communist policy, which is represented by Souvarine in Monatte and Roomer's publication "La Revolution Proletarienne".

I do not wish here to make any direct connection between the attitude of Suzanne Girault and this counter-revolutionary policy, but I do maintain that the objective manner in which Suzanne Girault has put the problem of democracy in the Russian Party and the coarse and dishonest manner in which Souvarine poses this problem in the "Revolution Proletarienne", represent a very close agreement of efforts inside and outside the Party, both against the Russian Party and against the leadership of the French Party.

What does Suzanne Girault say? After she recognises that the opposition has surrendered, she states this fact and declares:

"I agree with the attitude taken by the opposition." Then she immediately made reservations and said: "The disciplinary measures adopted are not well balanced and the methods used by the majority are bad, they prevent the minority from expressing its opinion."

She refused to approve the measures taken by the C. C.

She denied the right of the Russian Party to withdraw Zinoviev's mandate as Chairman of the International. She protested against the ruling which forbade the opposition in general and Zinoviev in particular from expressing their views at the next World Congress.

We believe that the Executive should severely reprimand Suzanne Girault and Jacob; both of them are on a steep dangerous decline, down which they can slide very far, indeed even to the level to which Souvarine, Ruth Fischer, Urbahns and their consorts have slipped.

I should like to say a few words about the counter-revolutionary activity of the petty-bourgeois Souvarine.

Souvarine has openly defended the same platform as the Opposition bloc, and he advocates it with the same cynicism and dishonesty, which is common to all counter-revolutionists. He has written a disgraceful article in the "Revolution Proletarienne", several parts of which deserve to be quoted.

Souvarine sizes up the members of the Executive of the Communist Party and the members of the Pol-Bureau as follows:

"The blind and deaf people of the Pol-Bureau, these parvenue, drunk with power, believe they can overcome their difficulties; as a matter of fact they are only increasing them; in their incorrigible hatred they show themselves incapable of overcoming these difficulties through internal discussions. Some who are paid for it, others who are followers or fanatics, others who have become cretinised, may praise them and adore them for this purpose. In telling them the truth we have done the greatest service to them and to the revolution. We shall continue to do this,"

How does Souvarine speak of the discussions in the nuclei and of the resistance which the Party nuclei put up against the factional work of the Opposition? How does Souvarine judge this matter?

He ridicules the refusal of the workers to hear the leaders of the opposition, he describes this refusal by simply accusing the workers that they apply the same methods as the Italian Fascists.

He writes:

"With these methods they have imitated Italian Fascism: gangs of incited hooligans were brought in trucks to the meetings where Opposition speakers were announced; they were ordered to interrupt every deviating opinion with cat-calls and whistles, to annoy the leaders of the Opposition and if the interruptions and threats did not succeed, to throw the Opposition leaders out of the hall. The only thing that was missing was castor oil; no doubt it is too expensive in Russia."

Regarding the situation in the Russian Party, Souvarine writes:

"A certain acceleration of amorality and immorality — the Party cadres set the example for this — and demoralisation, which springs from other causes. When former Bolsheviks violate the statutes, the programme, the resolutions of the Party, when they violate the statutes and decisions of the International and the Soviet Government, when they violate law and justice, when they falsify the text in the "Pravda", then there is no reason why members of the Communist youth organisations should not violate young girls on the streets. It is unnecessary to say that the tremendous number of good-for-nothings about whose existence in Communist ranks the "Pravda" is now writing, are excellently moving "along the line". These people vote with gusto for resolutions which condemn Brandler, Bordiga, or Rosmer and censure Trotsky. Through such good-for-nothings they force the creators of the October Revolution to keep silent in Lenin's Party, on the very occasion of the ninth anniversary of the Revolution".

For the time being I should only like to remark that the Fifth World Congress hesitated to expel this counter-revolutionary petty-bourgeois. I believe this Executive will not hesitate to expel him finally.

What is the tactic of the Opposition? In France: above all, to avoid taking a clear attitude as long as possible. What work was done and is being done in order to crystallise the

Opposition in France? Naturally, the attempt was made to reinstate Souvarine and Rosmer and other friends of the counter-revolutionary publication, "Proletarienne". Trotsky at first proposed to Jacob the reinstatement of Souvarine; Zinoviev proposed it to Humbert-Droz; and Preobrazhensky made this proposal to me. They said he should at least be used in "l'Humanité" because he is an excellent writer. He gave proof indeed, that he is "an excellent writer"! (Laughter.)

In Russia, the tactic obviously consists of keeping silent and voting for the majority; in France it is to gain time, not to say anything about the economic conditions, but the tactic is precisely the same. But if the Opposition in Russia was able to be direct, in France it was much more diplomatic and its tone much more moderate. Before a meeting of the Paris Organisation Jacob described the internal difficulty during the last grain campaign and said the following:

"Import has decreased. The textile industry unfortunately must continue to buy its cotton and its wool from America and Great Britain; and since they could not export as much as was planned, there has been a slowing up of industrialisation. It was not possible to import everything necessary. The textile factories and other factories were forced to close during Easter and throughout the whole of July; and I am afraid that before the end of the year they will be forced to close shop altogether. The corresponding drop in income cannot be seen from the budget. The taxes had to be raised, the cost of living has risen from 20 to 25%. Consequently, we have had a drop in the real wages of the workers. What has been the result? Naturally, a certain amount of dissatisfaction among the workers. All the collective agreements with the trade unions provided a raise in wages. These raises were annulled. Hence, no wage rise — and consequently disappointment among the workers."

And who, according to Jacob is responsible for this economic situation in Russia? Jacob declares:

"All this comes from the fact that the majority has under-estimated the kulak danger or at least has created this impression by directing its fire against those who pointed out the kulak danger."

This refers to Zinoviev, Trotsky and Co. An exaggerated pessimism in regard to the conditions of the proletariat emphasised by stressing the difficulties of an economic nature and their direct efforts upon the proletariat, with this conclusion: if we had listened to the voice of the Opposition, all this would not have happened; only the Opposition has a correct line. This is how Jacob describes the situation in Russia.

What attitude did Jacob adopt after the surrender of the Russian Opposition? Naturally, Jacob handed in a resolution of surrender, a resolution similar to the one handed in by the Russian Opposition.

But Suzanne Girault handed in no resolution of surrender. She was shrewd enough to bind herself not 100%, but only 75%; she said:

"Wait until I have informed myself, then I will express my opinion. Reading the "Pravda" has convinced me that, for the time being, the Opposition is right, because the C. C. has adopted the line of the Opposition."

I believe that her tactic is to gain more time. Jacob cannot do this any more, because he had taken a categorical position, but Suzanne Girault still has the possibility of playing with the C. C. and the Party; she says:

"Give me all the texts (also the proposals of the Opposition which were not recorded in the protocol of the C. C. of the Soviet Union)."

Suzanne Girault needs all the documents in their completeness in order to be able to take a final attitude.

Thus were the factional attempts made within the Party while Souvarine was carrying on his work of demoralisation from without. He is 100% in agreement with the bourgeoisie. I have already given some examples as to how Souvarine carries on his work of demoralisation; I shall take up a few details. Souvarine, at one time wrote for the "Bulletin Communiste". This stopped immediately after the last Executive.

The "Bulletin Communiste" was read by only a few active workers; it was read very little by the comrades organised in the trade unions; but Monatte-Rosmer's "Revolution Proletarienne" is read by active trade unionists. Not only that: it

is useful to the bourgeoisie in its fight against Communists and the Communist International, and it is dangerous because it inspires vacillation and doubt among the trade unionists who sympathise with us.

The International must not let Souvarine get away with these vile actions; measures must be taken to show the French workers the role and the counter-revolutionary attitude of Souvarine.

We also believe that we must not tolerate in our ranks alleged Communists who circulate the articles of the "Revolution Proletarienne"; we must not permit Party members to write for the "Revolution Proletarienne" under pseudonyms; energetic measures must be taken to expel them from our ranks.

Souvarine identifies the Opposition with the Russian working class by placing the Opposition at the head of the Russian working class. According to Souvarine, it is not the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. which is the vanguard, but the Opposition. The Executive must leave this counter-revolutionary to his petty-bourgeois scribbling, and express its complete confidence in the C. C. of the Russian Communist Party.

The French Delegation expresses its agreement with the statements made here by Comrade Stalin.

The Delegation finally demands that every active comrade, who, holding a leading post in the International or in one of its Sections, devotes himself to fractional work, should immediately be removed from his post.

We demand that Suzanne Girault be deprived of her mandate as candidate on the E. C. C. I.

We demand that the Communist International publicly condemn the "Revolution Proletarienne" of Monatte-Rosmer in a special resolution to be published in all the organs of the French Party, and that it state that the "Revolution Proletarienne", which poses as a Communist trade union organ, is only a counter-revolutionary organ which gets its arguments from the white-guard Russian press in France.

We demand the final expulsion of Souvarine, and that he should be removed from all functions in Soviet institutions in Russia or in France.

These are the practical proposals of the French Delegation. (Applause.)

Comrade WONTRATSCHKE (Czecho-Slovakia):

In the name of the Czech Delegation, I should like to say the following: when reports about the discussion in the Russian Communist Party appeared in capitalist countries, it could be observed that not only the bourgeois, but also the Socialist press rejoiced and expressed the hope that the discussion in the Russian Party would lead to its destruction and thus that the Soviet Union would be shaken and smashed. They openly sided with the Opposition.

From the very beginning, our Party in Czecho-Slovakia turned its entire attention to two points which were of great importance. 1) The menace to the unity of the Bolshevik Party of the Soviet Union which is the kernel of the C. I. This threat was equivalent to a threat to the cohesion of the instrument of the proletarian dictatorship, which, again, was equivalent to a threat to the unity of the C. I.; 2) The victory of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. Every Communist felt that this question was closely connected with all others. For us in Czecho-Slovakia the question of the realisation of Socialism in one country is of special importance, because the German Social-Democracy of Czecho-Slovakia, which is under the influence of Austria-Marxism, always prophesied that the "experiment" of the Bolsheviks in Soviet Russia would soon break down. In our struggle against the German Social-Democracy we observe that through this German Social Democratic propaganda, a large number of German workers allowed themselves to be taken in tow by the Social-Democracy, and this has made it difficult to win them over to our Communist ideas.

The moment the German workers were informed about the actions of the Russian Opposition we had to carry on an even more difficult struggle, because the German Social-Democracy now says: "You see, we were right. The experiment of the Bolsheviks will not continue very much longer; the collapse of the Soviet Union is imminent. Immediately after the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U., the Czech Party adopted an attitude to these questions and unanimously backed up the decisions of the Russian Party Congress. The Polit-Bureau as well as the Plenum of the C. C. in January of this year, unanimously adopted the proper decisions.

We were very much disturbed when we heard that after the XIV. Party Congress, the Opposition continued its disorganising activity, and attempted to create confusion in other countries. However, when it became clear that the Opposition bloc was composed of all Right liquidatory, and "Left" elements, and that its only purpose was to overthrow the C. C., every comrade knew immediately that the Opposition bloc would not live long, that as a result of its own contradictions, it would collapse from within. The revolutionary workers of Czecho-Slovakia said to themselves that the Opposition which maintains that the present Soviet State has no proletarian character, that the Party has degenerated, etc., cannot have serious intentions towards the Party.

In his report yesterday, Comrade Stalin said that the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. is the loud-speaker of all vacillating and confused petty-bourgeois elements. We can say the same for Czecho-Slovakia. Just as in Soviet Russia, in our country, too, all elements which are loud speakers of the petty-bourgeois and confused elements have gotten together. For example the Right group of Görlich and the Neurath group, which at one time fought each other bitterly, hoped, each of them, after the XIV. Party Congress, that their wishes would be fulfilled. It at once became clear to us in Czecho-Slovakia, that the majority of the Russian Party was correct and not the Opposition. It was clear to us that the disintegration of the Russian Party would mean the disintegration of the C. I., that the result would be despair and unspeakable misery for the international proletariat.

The reactionary press in its articles expressed the opinion that this "activity" of the Russian Opposition bloc would result in the leaders devouring each other; they added further that this was the law of every revolution and in this connection they cited the end of the French revolution, which collapsed because the leaders fought each other.

We saw furthermore, that as a result of the fact that the two previously named groups in the Czech-Party united on a common platform against the unity and the decisions of the Party, factional activity in the Czech-Party assumed serious concrete forms in the Reichenberges district. Inspired by Comrade Neurath, several comrades in the Reichenberg district were misled into making their influence felt through factional activity analogous to that of the Russian Opposition. Comrades, I can say to you that as soon as the Reichenberg workers discovered this factional activity, they unanimously backed up the decisions of the Party and were not in the least inclined to play with the unity of the Party. The Reichenberg workers, the Czech workers in general, remembered what Bebel once said:

"When our enemies begin to praise us and give us testimonials, we must realise that we must have committed a blunder, and must begin to think how to make it good."

When the campaign of the bourgeois and Social Democratic press was launched and they began to praise the Opposition, our workers said to themselves that this cannot be the right way, the Opposition is treading a path where the Czech workers could not follow. The practical factional activity in the Reichenberg district was completely liquidated in a short time, so that there can be no talk of an Opposition any more.

I can say here, in the name of the Czech Party, that our workers looked with pride on the constructive work in the Soviet Union, that we will do everything possible to support the difficult work which the Communist Party must carry on in the Soviet Union, so that the building up of Socialism can be realised in the near future. (Applause.)

Comrade TOM BELL (Great Britain):

Comrades, Comrade Stalin's report brings before this Plenum two very important questions. The first question is that of the unity of the Party — the fundamental basis of Bolshevism and the Communist International. The second question is that of building socialism in a single country. It is very important that on both these questions every Party here takes a very clear and decisive stand.

The question of the unity of our brother Party, the C. P. S. U. is not a mere organisational question. It is essentially a political question and has to be judged on that basis. Party unity is a fundamental feature of the Communist International, it was the intent of the founders of the Communist International that

we should have a single International Party with a single leadership and direction.

Here I think it is well to recall the contrast between the methods of the Second International and those of the Comintern. In the Second International we have big personalities who exercise a personal leadership. As a matter of fact every leader in himself is a basis for fractional activities. There is no common direction in the Second International. There is no centralised direction in a Party sense. In the Second International it was always a fetish that international decisions were to be applied to the respective countries in accordance with the national traditions and national conditions. This left it open to the leaders in the particular countries to decide whether or not important international decisions should be applied at all. It was against this lack of centralised Party leadership that the founders of the Communist International aimed when they proposed the grouping together of all those elements who were prepared to build up a new International that would not repeat the mistakes of the Second.

In the Communist International, the big men, the big personalities, are subordinated to the Party. The Party is the real leader. How powerful and supreme the Party is over personalities has been repeatedly demonstrated not only against the various oppositional movements that have sprung up in the U. S. S. R. from time to time, but also in the other Sections of the Communist International, where the experiences of the C. P. S. U. regarding oppositional blocs have been repeated on a smaller scale. In all cases the Party has always triumphed.

A collective direction is a necessary corollary of the Party as a leader. This is an essential and characteristic feature of the Communist International indisputably necessary for the very maintenance of the revolutionary leadership of the international proletariat. In the collectivity the personalities are fused in the common direction, and I want to say that our Party has been singularly fortunate in this particular connection. Indeed, since the formation of the Communist Party in Great Britain we have always striven, and I can say striven successfully to secure a common, collective direction in the operation of the political policy of our Party. Though our experience with oppositions is very limited (probably our time will come when we, too shall have to deal with serious political oppositions) nevertheless, our experience, limited as it is, justifies our complete identity with the measures taken by the Party of the U. S. S. R. to deal with its opposition.

The fundamental question of the whole discussion around the opposition is the question of whether or not we can build socialism in a single country. Comrade Stalin has put this question very concretely. He has said it is not a question of building socialism in Bulgaria, (we might say in Chili or Peru), it is a question of whether or not it is possible to build socialism in the Soviet Union, within the confines of the U. S. S. R.

To this question every Party must give a decisive answer with regard to its own particular national boundaries. It is a question that every Party must answer as concretely as our Russian Party has done. The answer will determine the general political line that will be taken by our brother Parties.

In Great Britain, the question of whether or not we can build Socialism in our country is as old as our social reformist movement. This question was raised long ago by the reformists, by those elements that went to make up the Independent Labour Party, the Social Democrats, the trade union leaders, who all oppose Marxism as being a "catastrophic" theory. They argue, that even given the most favourable majority in the parliamentary democracy, the fact that Great Britain is largely dependent on the colonies and foreign territories for its food supplies, means that the revolution would be starved out, even if it were politically possible.

It is put quite correctly, I think, that if socialism cannot be built up in the U. S. S. R., then obviously our brother Party is not right in insisting on continuing the dictatorship. In this question we too are involved, for if it is impossible to build up socialism in Great Britain, then to continue the work which we are carrying on to win the masses over to Communism, is an actual practice of deception upon the masses. If it is impossible to build up Socialism in Great Britain then there is no need for a Communist Party in Great Britain.

If it is impossible to build up Socialism in Great Britain, then all that we, i. e., those elements who are anxious to work for a transformation of society in Great Britain can do is to follow the Labour Party.

But when we are considering the question of a proletarian revolution in England, we must remember that the existence of the U. S. S. R. is something we cannot really rule out. Exclude the colonies (which, of course, we cannot do in any proper perspective of the proletarian revolution in England) — but excluding the colonies, for argument's sake, we have to take as a positive contribution to the proletarian revolution in England the existence of the U. S. S. R. as an economic base.

Another important question is this — can we manage to organise and run the industries of Great Britain? To this question we emphatically say, yes. In the U. S. S. R. there were many difficulties that had to be overcome after the October days on account of the backwardness in the industrialisation of the country. Many of those difficulties will not, and do not prevail in Great Britain where we have one of the oldest technically organised industries in the world of capitalism. We have a skilled industrial working class, which is highly trained, highly developed. We have also a well trained trade union movement, a trade union leadership with experience as functionaries, who not only deal with questions of wages, negotiations with employers, but whose very business of negotiating with employers involves an understanding and study of prices and raw materials, in a word, all those factors which are essential for the proper organisation of economy. It is very important for the building of socialism that we have in the working class in Great Britain, a whole army of technicians who do not by any means belong to the intellectual class, but who are essentially proletarian in their origin and general make-up. So there are some stages which in Great Britain we will be able to jump over, stages which were absolutely necessary for the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. to overcome before they could go on to the high road of building up socialism.

Another point is that in Great Britain it is openly acknowledged that agriculture has not been developed to its utmost capacity but has been subordinated to industrial development. Scientists, long ago, have declared that it is possible by a more intensive agriculture in Great Britain to produce food that would sustain double the existing population. When we take that into consideration, when we take into consideration that we cannot obliterate the U. S. S. R. — the fact that we have one-sixth of the globe as our ally — we can see what a tremendous potentiality we have here for our economic base.

Then we have to consider our relation to the colonies. Obviously, the conquering of the political power by the working class of England and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship means the separation of the colonies from Great Britain. The separation of the colonies from Great Britain means the liberation of large peasant territories who are capable of forming alliances with the proletariat of Great Britain, for example, Ireland, which is a huge agricultural territory capable of enormous development.

We can scarcely imagine a proletarian revolution in Great Britain without a complete separation of India from Great Britain and the setting up of an independent India. Here again is a huge territory, having easy access to the U. S. S. R. and thus to Great Britain, that will form a powerful economic base for the sustaining of revolutionary forces in Great Britain. We have here then, in addition to intensive home cultivation and the positive assistance of the U. S. S. R., bases in Ireland and India, and possibly some of our other colonies. These are the main allies of the proletarian revolution in England which we must take into consideration and which we must always have in mind when we speak about building up Socialism in Great Britain. The industrial working class, I repeat, can have, with the agricultural workers, an alliance with the Soviet Union and thus be assured of the maintenance of their revolution and dictatorship.

Already Comrade Lenin has brought our attention to the importance of the co-operative movement in building up the revolution in the U. S. S. R. In Great Britain we have a highly organised co-operative movement. A co-operative movement that not only produces raw material, essential food supplies, but has huge factories for the working up of those raw materials into finished products. In the distribution of the finished products it has enormous distributing centres and, though it is true, that

our co-operative movement is purely capitalist in its leading ideology and direction, nevertheless, it has an essentially proletarian basis and, under proletarian control, will be a useful and very powerful support for our proletarian revolution.

Given the proletarian power, as I have already stated, it means that the colonies are released for the support of socialism. The British bourgeoisie will retreat to one or another of these colonies, as a new basis to carry on their counter-revolutionary activities. But one thing is absolutely sure and positive, and that is that India, the gem of the British Empire, will be lost for British imperialism, and this will be a most powerful support for our proletarian revolution.

From the standpoint of Great Britain we can say that the weakest link in the chain of the British Empire is the fermentation that is now going on in the colonies, and the demand of the colonies for complete separation and independence. Here I would like to say that we do not at all share the views of our Comrade Buck from Canada, where he speaks of our discussing whether or not Canada was going with America, and raises the question of which section of the Canadian capitalist class the British workers should ally themselves with. The question of whether or not Canada will go with America will be determined largely by the principles with which we imbue the separation movement in Canada, and by the positive activities of our Communist movement, which must recognise the alliance of workers and farmers, the only real pledge of Canadian independence. If we are passive; if we adopt the fatalistic attitude, then Canada may go anywhere, but if we are active and place the independence of Canada as a Workers' and Farmers' Republic, in the forefront of our programme, then we can secure Canada as an ally of the proletarian revolution in England against both the British and American capitalists.

Once capitalism has been overthrown and the proletariat has gained political power in England, then we can say that we are going to, and we will build socialism. But to lead the working class to socialism, whether in the U. S. S. R. or in Great Britain, or in any other country, the one thing that is essential is a centralised Party and a single leadership. Without this it is impossible to secure socialism for the U. S. S. R. or for any other country. The firm faith of the working class is essential to support a centralised Party and a united leadership. The determination on our Party to preserve at all costs the dictatorship of the working class, to suppress all groupings, all opposition elements that open the way for a new class attack on the proletariat, is absolutely indispensable for the building up of socialism in any country.

Disloyalty to the Party in the U. S. S. R., in Great Britain or in any of the sections of the Communist International, is intolerable; factionalism either in any single Party or within the Communist International is a crime against the revolution and a crime against the world proletariat. Therefore, in the name of the Communist Party of Great Britain we emphatically condemn the opposition which has tried to throw back the revolutionary movement in the U. S. S. R., and we approve of the disciplinary measures that have been taken to suppress that opposition.

To the second question — can socialism be built in Great Britain? We say yes! emphatically Yes! By means of the proletarian dictatorship in Great Britain, in alliance with the U. S. S. R. on the Continent and the huge peasant reserves in the colonies, we say emphatically yes, it is possible to build socialism, and we will build socialism in Great Britain!

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

Before I give the floor to the next speaker, I have here a declaration of the Russian Delegation to bring before the Plenum:

Statement of the Bureau of the Comintern Delegation of the C. P. S. U.

In reply to the request of Comrade Zinoviev, made at the Session of the Delegation Bureau on November 22nd, regarding the permissibility of his speaking before the Enlarged Executive of the E. C. C. I., in order to "clarify" the point of view of the opposition of the C. P. S. U., the Delegation Bureau decided the following:

The Bureau of the Delegation of the C. P. S. U. maintains that Comrade Zinoviev's appearance at the Enlarged Plenum would be in essence an appeal to the E. C. C. I. against the decisions of the C. P. S. U., and consequently, would of necessity constitute an impetus to further factional struggles. Therefore, the Delegation Bureau considers Comrade Zinoviev's appearance at the Plenum inadvisable. Despite this, however, the Bureau considers it impossible to forbid Comrade Zinoviev to appear before the Plenum, since every member of the C. P. has the right to appeal to the E. C. C. I. against the decisions of his Party.

This decision has been confirmed by the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. In taking this decision, which involves the right of every Party member to appeal to the highest International body, the Delegation Bureau proceeded from the premise that the appearance of Comrade Zinoviev at the Plenum would of necessity mean an appeal to the E. C. C. I. against the decisions of the C. P. S. U. It was in this way that the question of Comrade Trotsky was considered at the V. Congress where the Russian Question was taken up. In reply to a question of the Congress Presidium whether he did not consider it necessary to appear at the Congress, he wrote a letter to the Presidium in which, among other things, he said:

"In regard to the question which you have addressed to me in the name of the Presidium, as to whether I should like to participate in the debate on the Russian Question, I request you to transmit the following to the Presidium:

On the questions which were the subject of discussion in our Party, definite decisions were adopted by the XIII. Congress of the R. C. P. Thereby the discussion is closed. As far as I know, none of the members of the R. C. P. have appealed to the V. Congress in regard to the decisions of the XIII. Party Congress. Consequently, no one has disputed their validity, or the fact that they are binding for all Party members. Under the circumstances, a resumption of the discussion at the World Congress of the questions which have already been settled by the XIII. Party Congress would mean actually the creation of unnecessary difficulties for the harmonious work of our Party."

Thus, the question of the non-appearance of Comrade Zinoviev for the Opposition can only be decided by himself.

Comrade Dengel has the floor.

Comrade DENGEL (Germany):

Comrades, the questions which have arisen in the discussion of our Russian brother Party are of the utmost international importance. It may be said that in this discussion all the fundamental questions of the Bolshevik Party and of Leninism in general have been brought up anew for decision. Discussion in the past were resulted from the serious situation in the Soviet Union, in the West European Parties they were a result of the growth of the Young Communist Parties, which showed infantile diseases, Right as well as ultra-Left. In this discussion we may say that the first great attempt has been made at revisionism, it is an attempt to make a breach in the Lenin policy of the Communist International. The struggles which lie behind us were battles won against revisionist elements and which ended with the complete defeat of these revisionist elements.

Already the form in which the discussion was carried on differs essentially from the form in which it was previously carried on in the Bolshevik Parties. The alliance of comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev, etc., with Comrade Trotsky and with the so-called Workers' Opposition, (Shliapnikov, etc.) shows that this is not only a question of differences regarding definite theoretical questions, but that these comrades, after forming a fractional bloc, attempted to begin an offensive along the whole line in order to destroy the unity of the C. P. S. U. and to seize power in the Bolshevik Party. It is of great significance that during the course of this struggle, Comrade Trotsky became the unchallenged leader of the Opposition. Trotsky, who before October 1917 carried on a ceaseless struggle against the fundamental teachings of Leninism, who after October 1917, on nearly all questions on which there were differences in our Russian brother Party, was on the side of the Opposition: Trotsky, who on such important questions as the question of relationship to the peasantry, has never really given up his Menshevist theory, he

has become the leader of those comrades, who only two years ago, carried on the sharpest struggles against him.

They ally themselves with Radek, who, in 1923 was the leader of the German Rights; they ally themselves with Shliapnikov, with direct liquidatory elements — at any rate only a few months ago they were direct liquidatory elements. It is necessary to state that Comrade Zinoviev, who enjoyed a high degree of authority in the Comintern, has squandered and frittered away this authority. No leader of the Comintern has ever more quickly dissipated his capital of confidence and authority which he had in the Comintern, than has Comrade Zinoviev. We had confidence in Comrade Zinoviev. We saw in him the comrade who led the struggle against Trotsky, we saw in him the comrade who helped the German Party, who at the V. World Congress drew the fundamental lessons of October 1923; we saw in him the comrade who fought against the Rights in France, against Souvarine, we saw in him the comrade who after the Frankfurt Party Congress, pointed out to the leadership of the German Party at that time eventual serious ultra-Left errors which they might commit on the basis of their past; we saw in him the comrade who wanted to help the German Party to get into a healthy state — and in this respect he made an essential contribution in the "Open Letter" of the Comintern.

This confidence which Comrade Zinoviev had won on the basis of the past aid which he, together with the leadership of the Russian Party, had rendered to the German Party, he lost in that moment when, with absolute lack of principle, he allied himself with those who have not learned from experience, who have remained what they always were, with Trotsky and Shliapnikov, and together with them attacked the Leninist policy of the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern.

Now as to the question of the effect of the Russian discussion on our German Opposition: The German Opposition is essentially a result of the growing pains of the German Party. The ultra-Left Opposition which we have in Germany today grew out — as has often been pointed out — of the weaknesses which the Left showed in the Party during their development. The Left who assumed leadership at the Frankfurt Party Congress carried along, in the past large ultra-Left elements. The leadership of Ruth Fischer and Maslow did not know how to get rid of these ultra-Lefts, but developed these further; in fact it drew to it new specific ultra-Left elements. I recall only the systematic work for building up an opposition against the Comintern and against the Russian Party. This element was not present among the old Lefts. It was only when the bankruptcy was already clear that there began under the leadership of Maslow and Ruth Fischer a partial change which led directly to serious opportunistic deviations. Part of the workers did not understand this change and went over to the Opposition.

It can be said that after the publication of the Open Letter, and after the introduction of the policy proposed in the Open Letter by the leadership of the German Party, the liquidation of the opposition could have been effected very easily. It can be said that today, apart from a few splitters, who have gone over into the camp of the counter-revolution, the German Party would be sound and united, if the opposition were not supported by the Russian opposition. The German opposition had no Bolshevik principles. It consisted partly of adventurers like Katz or of elements like Korsch and Schwartz. In questions of the practical policy of the German Party they were absolutely negative, like Ruth Fischer and Maslow and the Weber opposition. They were looking desperately for a political platform and found it in the ideology of the Russian opposition.

It must be said that the German Opposition has learned some things very well from the Russian Opposition. It has carried the ideas, the ideology, maintained by the Russian Opposition, to the most extreme point. I am now thinking above all of the theories formulated by Korsch and Schwartz — Korsch who boasts in a Communist Labour Party publication that he brought up the question of Red imperialism in Germany; Korsch who speaks of the necessity of disintegrating and destroying the Comintern and the Communist Party of Germany; Korsch who openly called for an armed uprising — he is only the logical continuation of the line of the Russian Opposition. If in the Russian Opposition they are at least playing with the idea of forming a second Party alongside of the Bolshevik Party, in order to use it in the struggle against the dictatorship of the proletariat, then it must be said that Korsch has had the courage to speak out openly

what the Russian Opposition has dreamed, thought and said.

Are the direct allies of the Russian Opposition in Germany essentially different from Korsch? Absolutely not. Ruth Fischer, for example, in a recent meeting of functionaries at Charlottenburg stated that in the last Soviet elections the reaction triumphed; in another place she said that the dictatorship of the proletariat in Soviet Russia is slowly being destroyed.

The Weber Opposition also does not differ in decisive questions of principle from that which Korsch represented in the German Party. The Weber resolution also says openly that as a result of the growing influence of the town and village bourgeoisie, the dictatorship of the proletariat is slowly being destroyed and the Communist Party of Russia is taking no steps to prevent it, but on the contrary is facilitating this destruction — and it could not be otherwise, since the Bolshevik Party is the ruling Party in Soviet Russia. This charge then means nothing less than that the leading Party in Soviet Russia, i. e. the Communist Party, is betraying the revolution. If one is of the opinion, that the proletarian dictatorship in Soviet Russia is slowly being destroyed, that the revolution is being betrayed, then one must demand, as Korsch is demanding, that such a Party should be overthrown, that power should be wrested from its hands by all possible means. That would be to act in a revolutionary manner.

If the Opposition should obtain support in the C. I., then the C. I. would be faced by the most severe crisis which it has ever had. Support for this Opposition in the C. I., a certain amount of power of the Opposition in the C. I., would mean to give place to the most extreme liquidatory elements in the C. I., to have the seeds of a split in the C. I. It is extremely fortunate for the C. I. that the Russian proletariat, that the workers in the Russian Party possessed sufficient internal power to reject this liquidatory, seemingly revolutionary theory of the Opposition.

We see already today how the influence of the Opposition in Germany began to drop with extraordinary rapidity after the Russian Opposition was forced to capitulate as a result of its smashing defeat. However, this was only possible because also the oppositional workers in our Party understood, after this capitulation, that Comrade Zinoviev, in whom they had believed up to that time, had played a bad game; they understood that the road being followed by the Russian Opposition led to destruction. They understood on the basis of the effects of Opposition on the German bourgeoisie and Social Democracy, where this road would really lead to.

How, for example, did this Opposition affect the white guard emigrés abroad? The white guard emigrés abroad took up this discussion with eagerness. The important leaders of the liberal Russian emigrés issued slogan: now the chief thing to do is no longer to build up an illegal opposition in Soviet Russia against the Bolshevik Party, but to support the Russian Opposition within the Bolshevik Party. The bourgeois press, especially the liberal bourgeois press, was full of joy over what was going on in the Russian Party.

Even more was the Opposition flattered by all elements in the Social Democratic Party. We not only heard songs of praise for the Opposition from Paul Levi in the "Leipziger Volkszeitung", but the same kind of songs from the "Vorwärts". This is easy to understand. That which the Opposition theoretically represented resembled very strongly what Otto Bauer and Kautsky have written about the impossibility of building up Socialism in one country. These people also write that in Soviet Russia the proletarian revolution is declining, that Soviet Russia is growing up into a bourgeois peasant state. This is the same theory as that propounded by Trotzky and Zinoviev. When today, for example, the Wedding Opposition speaks of solidarity which must be maintained with Soviet Russia, it is the same point of view as that upheld by Otto Bauer, who also says that this bourgeois peasant revolution in Russia must be protected against eventual intervention.

No, Comrade Riese, this is not a question of solidarity which one must maintain with some kind of an economic struggle in some kind of a country. It is of the utmost importance to understand that Soviet Russia is the firmest support of the proletarian revolution, that the Bolshevik Party of Russia is a part of the Communist International. This is not a question of solidarity in the ordinary sense of the word, but a question of the consciousness of the unconditional unity for organising and carrying out the proletarian revolution on a world scale.

Kautsky maintains the point of view that in the developments of Soviet Russia it is not a question of the path towards Socialism, but of a degenerated proletarian Party which exercises terror not to build up Socialism, but to maintain power. This renegade even maintains that the development of the proletariat is retarded by this very degenerated Bolshevik Party. He comes to the conclusion that it is necessary to demand that this Party be overthrown by all means, even by a bloody uprising, through civil war. This is the same point of view as that maintained by the renegade Korsch. It is natural, therefore, that the Social Democratic Party, with all its shadings, from Paul Levi to the "Vorwärts" and the "Hamburger Echo" and other Right papers, should unanimously burst into peans of triumph over what is going on in the Opposition in Russia as well as in Germany.

What is the content and the reason for this Opposition? Comrade Stalin showed us yesterday that in the proletarian movement there are three forces: first the petty bourgeois section within the proletariat; secondly, the broad and continually growing section of the really revolutionary part of the proletariat; and thirdly the labour aristocracy. The present "Left" Opposition is based on the petty-bourgeois wing of the proletariat, which is also represented in the revolutionary parties.

What is the expression of the petty-bourgeois in the revolutionary proletarian movement? It is above all a lack of faith in the forces of the proletarian movement, the retreat before the difficulties — and as a result defeatism and pessimism. This basis of the present Opposition in the C. P. S. U. is quite clear: lack of faith in the forces of the Russian proletariat — the Russian worker and the poor peasant; lack of faith in that they will be able to overcome the obstacles and contradictions which develop in the course of the building up of Socialism. Lack of faith in the ability of the proletariat to press back the kulak elements, the N. E. P. bourgeoisie, in economic construction.

Finally, lack of faith in the ability of the proletariat of Western Europe, in the course of the revolutionary movement which is proceeding under the leadership of the Comintern, to muster sufficient forces to stop imperialism which is preparing intervention against Soviet Russia; or else, if intervention comes, to carry through revolution in their own country. Thus, despite all their "Left" phrases, they lack faith in revolutionary development on an international scale, and not only have no faith in the revolutionary development of the world proletariat but they even lack faith in what Lenin taught us about the revolutionary development in the oppressed colonial and semi-colonial countries. We have seen that in the Chinese question, part of the Opposition comrades have urged that our Chinese brother Party should leave the Kuomintang. Why? They have veiled the real reasons with revolutionary phrases but in reality the reason lies in their lack of faith in the revolutionary movement in China.

Why is the lack of faith growing now? Why has it become strong now? This is clear. In the building up of Socialism we see the growth of certain difficulties and contradictions and these difficulties are reflected in a certain part of the proletariat. The temporary growth of the opposition in the German Party has the following causes: first, the German proletariat was beaten in various great revolutionary struggles, and, secondly, it suffered not a decisive but an important defeat in October 1923. This defeat took place at the beginning of the stabilisation of German capitalism. This stabilisation naturally has its effect also within the Communist Party of Germany, among the petty-bourgeois elements in the Party. It is in these objective conditions that the causes for the temporary growth of the opposition are to be found.

When today Korsch, and also Scholem, Ruth Fischer and Maslow, urge a struggle against the "degenerated Comintern", a struggle against the ruling Party in Soviet Russia, and when Korsch quite openly urges an uprising, a revolution against the present regime in Soviet Russia these people have already overstepped the bounds of petty-bourgeois opportunistic confusion; they have gone over into the camp of the counter-revolution and of imperialism. Reviving German imperialism finds its reflection in the petty-bourgeois opposition in the Communist Party.

It is no accident that at the same time when among the masses of the proletariat there has grown up a strong sym-

pathy for Soviet Russia, when delegations of Social Democratic workers returning from Soviet Russia make enthusiastic reports before hundreds of thousands of Social Democratic and non-Party workers and are listened to with enthusiasm, that there should arise within the ranks of the Communist Party such moods and theories of animosity against Soviet Russia. This happens at a moment when the German bourgeoisie is turning towards the West; one can say that it has made peace with the West and is seeking, with the aid of the imperialist West, with the support of this or that imperialistic group of powers, to carry out its own imperialistic construction.

Today part of the German opposition is already in the camp of the German bourgeoisie and the entire Opposition, beginning with Kötter and Weber down to Korsch is objectively supporting the efforts of German imperialism and of Western imperialism. The renegade Korsch, for example, says not only that the Comintern is about to enter on the path of August 4th; he actually says that it already has its August 4th behind it. We know that on August 4, 1914 the international social democracy committed a tremendous piece of treachery against the proletariat of the whole world. How did the individual Social Democratic parties excuse this treachery? The French Social Democracy excused this treachery by pointing to the reactionary Junkers in Prussia, and the German Social Democracy excused its treachery by pointing to the Asiatic barbarity of the hordes of Cossacks who wished to destroy the German homes.

Today Korsch seeks to cover up his own August 4th, his going over to imperialism, to the bourgeoisie, by upbraiding the Comintern with August 4th. I believe that nothing can save this renegade and all those who gather around him from going down in proletarian history as traitors to the proletariat, as traitors to the proletarian revolution.

Comrades, the thorough defeat which the Opposition suffered in the discussion in our Russian brother Party, is a decisive victory of Leninism.

In the first place this defeat signifies — let us hope — the final rejection of Trotskyism.

In the second place I believe that the serious struggle which has been carried on in our Russian brother Party has helped a number of Communist Parties of the Comintern to completely reach Leninism. Since all basic questions of Leninism came up in the discussion, the Communist Parties of Western Europe have been forced to formulate and consider all these questions anew.

Thirdly, the discussion is a victory for Leninism, because for a long time the petty bourgeois elements in the Comintern are disposed of, because in the course of this discussion the proletarian revolutionary forces, the cadres of functionaries in the various Parties developed to such an extent that in the future they will themselves be strong enough to settle these petty-bourgeois elements.

Fourthly, the defeat of the Opposition is a victory for Leninism because the Communist Parties have learned far better than heretofore not only to defeat the ultra-Left petty bourgeois elements, but also to overcome the Opportunist dangers, which arise anew during the period of stabilisation.

We also have a guarantee that the Opposition will not advance again, that the Opposition is finally defeated. This guarantee consists in the objective circumstances that, contrary to the expectation of the Russian Opposition, the economic difficulties in the Soviet Union were overcome — even though not entirely, at least much better than was expected. Socialist construction in the Soviet Union is going forward despite all economic difficulties and despite the contradictions that develop. The prophecies uttered by Comrade Trotsky only six months ago have not come true, and I believe that these dark prophecies of Comrade Trotsky were also a reason for the defeat suffered by the Opposition among the proletariat.

We see not only the growth of the Soviet Union despite all difficulties, but simultaneously, the revolution in China is advancing and at the same time we see the gigantic upsurge of the revolutionary development of the British proletariat following its recent terrific struggle. At the same time we see

how the proletarian revolutionary forces are growing in Western Europe.

In Germany we have the elections in Saxony, which show an advance of the Communist Party. We have now held the Workers' Congress at which 2000 delegates were present including 137 Social Democrats. This Congress was greeted with great enthusiasm by large sections of the proletariat; its course was followed with great seriousness. All this shows a rapid growth of revolutionary forces in the German proletariat, despite the stabilisation of the bourgeoisie and despite the fact that the bourgeoisie is beginning to consolidate itself economically and to make economic progress.

But at the same time the contradictions within capitalism are growing, at the same time the forces of the West European proletariat are growing stronger. All these objective conditions taken together are the real guarantees that the Opposition will have no more power to raise its head, and that, in the course of the further development and continuation of a real Leninist policy on the part of the Comintern and the Comintern Parties, the Opposition will receive its deathblow. (Applause.)

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

The next speaker was to have been Comrade Riese but he has withdrawn his request for the floor.

(Disturbance in the hall.)

Comrade RIESE (On a point of order):

I requested the floor on this question in order to make a declaration on behalf of the Wedding Opposition. However, after I heard that Comrade Zinoviev was going to speak I told Comrade Remmele: If the floor will be given to Comrade Zinoviev I will withdraw my request for the floor and will speak after Comrade Zinoviev. However, if Comrade Zinoviev will not speak then of course I do not withdraw my request for the floor.

Comrade REMMELE:

This declaration was superfluous. It is understood of course that Comrade Riese will get the floor if he is on the list later, in case Comrade Zinoviev does not speak.

Comrade GESCHKE (On the point of order):

I should only like to say that in yesterday's session of the German Delegation, despite requests and decisions of the German comrades which lasted for two hours, that Comrade Riese should take the floor on this question and speak, he maintained that he would not speak, but would only make a declaration on behalf of the Wedding Opposition. Now that it is known that Comrade Zinoviev will speak Comrade Riese declares that he will speak. This is what is called international connection! (Voice: Dialectic!)

Comrade BODEMANN (Switzerland):

Comrades, first of all I should like to point out a few defects which in my opinion have characterised the international carrying out of the campaign against the Russian Opposition. In the first place it was a mistake that, after the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, no discussion was conducted in the other Comintern parties. After the profound differences came up at the XIV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U., and after we saw in what manner the new Opposition had "prepared" for the Party Congress and how it acted at the Party Congress, I am of the opinion that if this discussion had been carried on in the Parties in the capitalist countries it would have been easier, for example, for the German Party to overcome the ultra-Left sicknesses. The ultra-Left exploited in the struggle against the Party, the great confidence which the mass of members, not only in Germany but in the entire international, had toward Comrade Zinoviev and other comrades of the Opposition.

The second error was that the orientation of the Communist Parties regarding the intensity of the contradictions within the

Party of the Soviet Union was insufficient. The bourgeois press was already able to publish details about the meeting of the so-called "forest brothers" on the first day in connection with the decision of the Plenum. On the next day our press claimed this information was a product of the imagination of bourgeois journalists. It was only on the fourth and fifth day that the Party central and the Party organ obtained the proper information and had to confess that the bourgeois press was better orientated than our Parties.

The third error was that even after the July Plenum the orientation of the Parties was insufficient. The workers could not understand how Zinoviev, who only a short time ago carried on the sharpest struggle against Trotskyism, should now become Trotsky's ally. At the same time they could not understand how Zinoviev, who considered himself the guardian of the principles of Leninism, could ally himself with Shliapnikov and Medvediev, who wished to liquidate the Comintern. We told them to read the speeches of Bukharin, Stalin and Rykov; there they would find the facts in black and white. But they said, show us in black and white that Zinoviev has made an alliance with Trotsky, that he has entered into a bloc with Medvediev and Shliapnikov. It would have been a great advantage if we had, for example, Comrade Zinoviev's speech on the international situation at the July Plenum; then we could have conducted the discussion on a much better platform.

So much for the introduction.

In regard to the matter itself, I can state that we completely approve of the attitude of the Russian Party. The Opposition showed an absolute lack of principle and lack of basis not only in questions of Socialist construction, but in another matter, too, — on the question of the building up of our Party the Opposition has a false point of view. At the V. Plenum of the Comintern, Comrade Zinoviev made a brilliant speech on Bolshevisation; his theses on Bolshevisation were adopted. Through these theses there goes like a red thread the notion that the unity of the Comintern is a prerequisite for the carrying out of Bolshevisation. And these very same comrades who pretended to be guardians of Bolshevism, who stepped forth as the champions of Bolshevisation come and violate the principles of Leninism by starting factional work in the strongest section of the Communist International, in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They have thus menaced the unity of the Party.

From the speech of Comrade Zinoviev at the July Plenum on the International situation nobody can tell whether Comrade Zinoviev recognises temporary, partial stabilisation or whether he foresees an immediate revolutionary situation.

But in the British question the Comrades of the Opposition made proposals where we can see quite clearly that the workers will have to draw conclusions which the Opposition dares to deny. It is certain that if the Russian comrades had disrupted the Anglo-Russian Committee on their own initiative, the basis for the struggle for trade union unity would have been considerably shaken. Every reformist trade unionist could then say: why do you talk of trade union unity? You were allied with the

British trade unions and that not only in the Anglo-Russian Committee, but the Russian trade unions were connected with the widest masses of the British proletariat. You yourselves have smashed the movement for unity. In Switzerland, workers who have maintained the same attitude as the Communist Labour Party in Germany — namely, they agitated for leaving the trade unions, though of late they have ceased to do so — drew the logical conclusion. They said that the Russian trade unions should have left the Anglo-Russian Committee; in fact, one must leave not only the Anglo-Russian Committee, but all trade unions which are under reformist leadership.

The Opposition created a panic, it lost the ground under its feet and therefore no longer believed in the power of the proletariat. Every simple worker who comes to Soviet Russia today sees quite plainly that Socialist construction is going forward. Even Social Democratic leaders and reformist trade union leaders who have visited Soviet Russia and after their return carried on the sharpest struggle against the Communist Party, are not in a position to dispute the Socialist construction which is going on in Soviet Russia. Certainly there are many defects and difficulties, but the Opposition wishes to see only the defects and the difficulties, and exaggerates them in order to be able to conduct the fight against the Party, and thus occupies the same position as the Social Democracy in its struggle against Soviet Russia.

We must above all draw a lesson from this discussion. In the conference on the International situation we said expressly that the Soviet Union is the strongest factor against capitalist stabilisation. We declared further that the Soviet Union is that factor which gives us the best possibility of breaking down the wall which separates us from the masses of Social Democratic and non-Party workers. The Social Democracy knows this very well.

Of course, we Communists defend the measures taken in the Soviet Union by the Communist Party. We defend them because we have unshakable confidence in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. But I believe that we should learn from this discussion that the defence of the measures taken by the Soviet Union in connection with Socialist construction should be made not only on the basis of unshakable confidence in the Russian Party. In all our Parties we should carry on a thorough discussion of the problems connected with Socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Our comrades will thus be in a position consciously and thoughtfully to handle these phenomena of Socialist construction in Soviet Russia, so that they may be in a better position to counter-act Social Democratic propaganda.

I am convinced that if the Parties in the capitalist countries will take this occasion in order to conduct fundamental educational work regarding Socialist construction in Soviet Russia, we shall reach the point where also in the capitalist countries the workers will all the more quickly tear loose from the Social Democracy and the reformist trade union bureaucracy, and will be bound all the more closely to the Soviet Union and the revolutionary movement. (Applause.)

(Close of Session.)

Nineteenth Session.

Moscow, Dec. 8, 1926.

Comrade WYSOTZKI (Poland):

Comrades, in the name of the Communist Party of Poland, I express our full solidarity with the C. P. S. U. in all of the questions that have arisen as a result of the struggle against the Opposition bloc. I can express this solidarity not only in the name of the Central Committee, which in its Plenum only in the last few days unanimously adhered to the decisions of the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U., but also in the name of all our organisations, Polish, Ukrainian, White Russian and Jewish, which all decisively repudiated the attitude of the Opposition bloc as soon as they had knowledge of it. The advances of the Opposition received exactly the same reception among the numerous comrades languishing in the prisons who followed up the happenings in the leading Party of the Comintern with uneasiness. The only exception is furnished by a small group of ultra-Leftists who are in contact with Ruth Fischer and consorts, and who are trying in vain to win supporters in Poland.

The questions involved in the campaign bound up with the activity of the oppositional bloc in the C. P. S. U. have a tremendous significance for our agitation among the broad proletarian masses of Poland. In fact we must get a clear reply to the question of whether the workers of the Soviet Union, who captured power in October, who overthrew the bourgeoisie and landowners in the civil war, who fought back the intervention — whether they are building up Socialism or something else. Whither has the alliance between proletariat and peasantry led us? In whose hands is the power, in the hands of the working class or in the hands of the kulaks and N. E. P. bourgeoisie? Is the industry, re-built under such heroic efforts in the Soviet Union, doomed to be scrapped or are further perspectives of development open before it? Are we in the Soviet Union marching upward or are we approaching the abyss? All of these questions are of most vital interest to every worker in Poland.

It is no accident that the Polish bourgeoisie and the reformist press uninterruptedly ride this theme, it is no accident that on this occasion they are making tremendous propaganda daily with the aid of the Opposition and calling upon the latter as witnesses to prove that capitalist exploitation prevails in the Soviet Union, that its industry is doomed to decline, and that the Soviet Power is approaching disintegration and degeneration. In Poland, however, where there is no legal Communist press whatever, the bourgeois and Social Democratic newspapers which daily spill their whole garbage cans over the Soviet Union, enjoy a monopoly with regard to the informing of the masses of the people. It is no accident that the Polish Government has thus far prevented a workers' delegation from visiting the Soviet Union, and that it has not permitted a single report from a West European Workers' Delegation to be published in Poland. For it knows that there is no more powerful weapon of revolutionary propaganda than the spreading of the truth about the Soviet Union.

It is this truth which we Communists disseminate to the working class in our leaflets and newspapers, without any sort of beautification, and this truth is penetrating by thousands of channels into the innermost masses of the workers, and is becoming a powerful antidote to the bourgeois vilification. This truth about the Soviet Union is contrasted by the Polish workers with what they see in their own country, and from it they draw their will to revolution.

With regard to the re-building of industry, the workers in the Soviet Union have reached the pre-war status, they are directing their own industry, and they are developing it without bourgeois aid. In Poland the very existence of industry itself is in question, since the Polish peasant, starving on his miserable bit of land, has no money with which to buy industrial products.

In the Soviet Union the question of the tempo of the industrialisation of the country is upon the agenda — but in Poland we have the question of its deindustrialisation, of its agrarianisation. In the Soviet Union unemployment is absorbed through the development of industry — in Poland it is becoming a chronic phenomenon. In the Soviet Union a certain

though slow progress is possible without credits from foreign capital, solely through the joint efforts of the workers and peasants. In Poland the bourgeoisie is ready to hand over the whole country, with its natural riches and working class, to the foreign capitalists, which to be sure, are in no hurry to make this purchase. In the Soviet Union the working class rules in the person of its revolutionary Party — in Poland we have the rule of the jumping-jack of the bourgeoisie and landowners, the Fascist Pilsudski, who fills the prisons with revolutionary workers and peasants. In the Soviet Union all nationalities enjoy complete equality — in Poland on the other hand, the Ukrainians, White Russians, Jews, Germans and Lithuanians are subjected to the severest persecutions.

The truth about the Soviet Union, where the workers and peasants have liberated themselves from the yoke of the bourgeoisie and the property owners, and where under the greatest exertion of their strength they are working at the building of Socialism — this truth about the Soviet Union that we are spreading among the workers and peasants of Poland, is the greatest drag upon the anti-Soviet military plans of Pilsudski. At the same time however, this truth about the Soviet Union is the mightiest lever of revolution in Poland itself.

Our whole Party observed with enthusiasm how the ordinary workers, the C. P. S. U. members in the "Aviopribor" factory, in the Putilov works and in other factories furnished the sharpest and most determined resistance to the enemies and disrupters of Party unity, who were striving to sow panic and distrust. The passionate defence of Leninism and of the unity of the Party by the working masses themselves, this support of their Central Committee by the working masses, is the best guarantee for the proletariat of the whole world that the cause of the proletarian revolution is in loyal hands.

Comrade CAVILLI (Italy):

The Italian delegation declares that it considers correct the political line of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. This line laid down in the resolutions of the XIV Party Conference of the C. P. S. U., and in subsequent resolutions of the leading organs of the Russian Party, is a direct continuation and application of the directives drawn by Lenin for the Russian proletariat and the Soviet State. We emphasise particularly that the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. today proceeds on the line drawn by Lenin in his last speech before the Communist International at the IV World Congress, when, in the development of the economy and policy of the Soviet State, the principal problems involved in the present discussion were already revealed. We are convinced that a deviation from this line would signify a conflict with the basic principles and practical contents of Leninist teaching, and that they would be injurious to the revolution.

Of the various problems which make up the matters under the discussion between the Central Committee and the Opposition bloc, the problem of the possibility of building Socialism in the Soviet Union has particular importance. The thesis of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on this question must be underlined most decidedly by the Communist International. Ever since 1917, the Russian Communist Party and the Russian revolution were the most powerful driving element, and the strongest organising factor of the revolutionary forces of all countries. This function of the Russian Party and Russian revolution at present finds its expression in the conviction of the proletarian vanguard, and of the masses, that after seizing power the proletariat can build Socialism, in the conviction that Socialism is being built in the Soviet Union.

The attitude of the opposition bloc on this question is a principal concession to the open enemies of the Russian revolution and of the revolutionary movement of the whole world. This attitude of the opposition bloc is an extremely dangerous expression of lack of faith in the revolution, an expression of scepticism and defeatism. It is therefore necessary that the line of the Opposition be freely and decisively combated, not only in the Russian Party, but in the whole International.

In Italy, the Fascist press tried and continues to try to utilise the arguments of the opposition bloc in order to fight the tremendous effect of the Russian revolution upon the toiling

masses of our country, in order to fight the revolutionary unity now in progress of crystallisation around the Russian Revolution in our country as in others. It is extremely noteworthy that in a country like Italy, where the State apparatus and the Fascist Party oppress every movement of the worker and peasant masses with unheard of terrorism, the Fascist papers were for a long time filled with articles in which they tried to prove, on the basis of statements by the most prominent leaders of the opposition bloc, that the Soviet State was with utmost certainty becoming a purely capitalist State, and that in the world struggle between Fascism and Bolshevism, the former would win the upper hand. This campaign of the Fascists is proof that we cannot desert the lessons and practice of Leninism without objectively rendering service to our enemy.

Our Party works in a country in which the majority of the population consists of peasants; it is today confronted with problems analogous to those faced by the Russian Party before the seizure of power, and on the morrow, after the victory of the revolution in Italy, we shall likewise be confronted with the same economic and social problems with which the Russian proletariat, and its vanguard, the C. P. S. U., occupies itself. Therefore we understand full well how dangerous it would be for the C. P. S. U. to leave the line of Lenin: the amalgamation of the proletariat and poor peasantry, and the alliance of the proletariat with the middle peasantry.

We recognise clearly that side by side with the successes of the Soviet State, with the results of socialist construction, which inspire us with enthusiasm, there are difficulties to be overcome by the Russian proletariat on its road. We understand that the greatest sacrifice will be demanded from the Russian proletariat in the exercise of its function of leadership under these difficulties. We know that these difficulties can be overcome only under the sure leadership of the Party, in that it shows to the proletariat, above and beyond all special interests of groups and institutions, its permanent and general class interest. This is the way of Marxism and Leninism. But in the theory and practise of the opposition bloc, on the other hand, there prevails the tendency to awaken Social Democratic and syndicalist traditions, which have hindered the ideological and political development of the West European proletariat, which have hindered the latter in its organisation as a ruling class. The oppositional ideology, which contains the ideology of the ultra-Left and Right deviations, retards the real Bolshevisation process of the Communist Parties of Western Europe.

The ideological and political victory of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. over the opposition bloc is therefore a victory which was won in the interest of the Communist movement, in the interest of the labour movement of all countries. The ideological struggle against the mistakes of the opposition bloc coincides with the struggle that must be conducted in all Parties of the Communist International against Right and ultra-Left deviations.

The delegation of the C. P. of Italy ratifies without any reservation whatever the struggle carried on by the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. against the efforts of the opposition bloc to blast the unity of the Leninist Party, to inject the disruptive germ of factional struggle into the Bolshevik Party. The unity and the iron discipline of the C. P. S. U. are a necessity for the assurance of proletarian hegemony in the transition period. The toiling masses in general, and our Party masses in particular, view in the Soviet Republic, and in the Communist Party which has its leadership in hand, a battle unit for the realisation of Socialism. The leading comrades of the opposition bloc, who are trying to blast this unity, must be held to strict accountability by the Enlarged Executive, as has been done by the higher units of the Russian Party.

The C. P. S. U., as the vanguard of the revolutionary movement of the whole world, and as the immediate guardian of Lenin's teachings, must continue to exercise the leading function at the head of the Communist International, which is historically its own. We see in this the real guarantee that the decisive victory which the Russian Party, which Leninism has won over the deviations of the opposition bloc, will have decisive value for all Communist Parties and for the whole, uniform, compact world party of Bolshevism: the Communist International. In the leading function which the Russian Party exercises at the head of the International, we see the most earnest guarantee for the victory of the world revolution.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

Comrades, the Presidium has decided to give the next speaker extended time, in this case one hour. The next speaker will be Comrade Zinoviev:

Comrade ZINOVIEV:

Comrades, the decision of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. made known here today left it to me to decide whether or not I shall appear here at the Enlarged Executive. After mature deliberation I decided that I would appear.

Is there really a danger that my appearance here might give an impetus to further factional struggle? I believe that this danger is not altogether out of the question. But in my appearance I shall avoid absolutely everything that might lead to such results. I do not want any factional struggle, I will not wage one.

(Interjection by Comrade Thälmann: "But you have waged one!")

Comrade Thälmann, according to the stenogram of the session of December 4th, declared in the name of the Presidium that

"Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky, as members of the Executive, have the right and opportunity, at any time and at any hour, to appear here and if they wish also to take the floor".

Another member of the Presidium, Comrade Ercoli, replying to the apprehension of Comrade Riese that my appearance here might be interpreted as a continuation of factional struggle, according to the stenogram declared the following:

"I believe that the arguments of Comrade Riese are not valid. It is well known that the Russian oppositional comrades, after their 'Declaration of October 16th' defended their viewpoint at the XV Party Conference, and nobody dreamed of declaring that their defence was a breach of the pledges made on October 16th. On the contrary no one ever imagined that these comrades would fail to take the floor in this highest body of the Russian Party, the Party Conference. The problem stands before us in exactly the same way. Also after the declaration of October 16th, they (that is, the oppositional comrades) have also the right to come here and defend their standpoint".

That is quite clear and unequivocal.

In the "Pravda" also this was reported. If I were to remain silent after all this the Communist International would have to interpret this as though I myself had no desire to appear before the Communist International.

The V World Congress of the Communist International in a similar case (although it took place after a Party Congress and not a Conference of the C. P. S. U.) directly condemned a similar silence. In the resolution of the V World Congress it is stated:

"The representatives of the Russian Opposition have upon formal grounds evaded an appearance before the Congress, although the Comintern had invited them to present their viewpoints to the Congress, and although the Russian delegation had voted in favour."

On the basis of all these facts I must therefore express myself before the Enlarged Executive. As you will see, comrades, I will confine myself entirely to the presentation of my principal views. I declare emphatically: I am making no appeal to the Comintern against the decisions of my Party. I submit to these decisions. But I owe to the Comintern, in whose directing organs I have participated actively since the first day of its existence, the duty of making certain explanations. My Party has not forbidden me this.

Since the Presidium has limited my time to one hour I must change somewhat the original plan of my speech:

I. SOCIALISM IN A SINGLE COUNTRY.

First of all the question arises of whether Marx and Engels ever expressed themselves upon this theme. I reply, certainly, they have expressed themselves. The chief question is the question of the theory of socialism in a single country. In expectation of the workers' revolution in France, Marx raised the question of what would be the international situation of the French workers' revolution on the day after its victory.

MARX.

Marx said that the task of the working class (that is, the socialist revolution)

"could not be decided in France, but it would be proclaimed in France. It can be solved nowhere within the limits of national boundaries".

1. Marx held the view that a single country could (and must) begin; 2. that this country need not necessarily be the most industrialised country (France of that time was not); and 3. that the socialist revolution could also be "proclaimed" in a single country but that it could not be "solved" in one single country. In other words: the socialist revolution can also in one country win the first victories and begin to build Socialism, but it cannot be finally victorious in one country.

"It can be solved nowhere within the limits of national boundaries."

This is precisely the formulation of the question which, as we shall see later, Lenin gave in a more thoroughly elaborated form, in the course of a new historical stage.

In a letter to Engels (October 8, 1885) Marx wrote:

A revolution is imminent on the continent and it will also immediately take on a socialist character. Will it not necessarily be suppressed in this little corner, since over a much greater territory the development of bourgeois society is still on the ascent?"

Thus Marx considered even the whole European continent, viz. without England, as a "little corner" and feared that a social revolution might be suppressed by the capitalisms of those territories in which capitalism was still developing on an ascending curve.

From this Marx by no means drew the "conclusion" that the proletariat on the continent, or even in one single country, could not seize power. From this Marx of course did not draw the "conclusion" that the proletariat, after seizing power in one country, must not proceed with the building of Socialism in this country. But Marx at the same time knew that the social revolution, even on the whole continent was, under certain conditions menaced with suppression, if "over a much greater territory the development of bourgeois society is still on the ascent". (What is involved here is obviously not only armed intervention — Marx puts the question more broadly.)

The Social Democratic leaders size up the present situation of world capitalism as a development on the ascendant curve. This is closely bound up with the optimistic (i. e. for the bourgeoisie) appraisal of capitalist stabilisation. For this very reason they are so ready to pronounce a death sentence on the U. S. S. R. In their opinion the U. S. S. R. is confronted with the choice of ruin or degeneration.

We Bolsheviks stand upon the basis of the Leninist appraisal of present-day capitalism as a dying capitalism, of the present period as the eve of the social world revolution. This is in connection with our view of stabilisation as a partial, wavering, not long-lasting stabilisation. This leads us to an unshakable faith in the world revolution and in the final victory of the U. S. S. R.

In his criticism of the Gotha programme (1875) Marx expressed himself in the same sense.

ENGELS.

Engels expressed himself on this question in complete agreement with Marx. In the "Fundamentals of Communism" (first project of the Communist Manifesto) he replied to the question:

"Can this revolution proceed in any single country?"

"No. Large scale industry, by creating the world market, has brought all the peoples of the earth, and especially the civilised peoples into such connection with one another that every people is dependent upon what happens to every other."

From Engels' whole presentation it is clear that what he considers is not whether one country can launch the social revolution. In this connection Engels is undoubtedly in agreement with Marx.

Engels enumerates twelve of the most important measures which the victorious proletariat must carry out in the very beginning.

"Finally, when all capital, all production and all trade has been gathered together in the hands of the nation, private property has disappeared of itself, money has become superfluous and production is so far multiplied, and people are so far changed, that even the last forms of relationship of the old society can fall."

I believe that from these words of Engels it is clear how incorrect it is to say that we in the U. S. S. R. — under the N. E. P. — are supposed to have already fulfilled nine-tenths of this programme of Engels. The N. E. P. is not yet Socialism. Lenin said that the Russia of the N. E. P. has yet to be transformed into a socialist Russia. Unfortunately in this year of 1926 this task is far from being nine-tenths carried out. After these words by Engels himself, there follows the question: "Can this revolution proceed solely in any single country?" And the answer — "No", etc. This must not be forgotten.

From all this it can be seen that Engels, when speaking of a simultaneous socialist revolution in England, America, France and Germany, by no means had in mind that the conquest of power by the proletariat absolutely had to take place at one and the same moment in these four countries. Engels was by no means of the opinion that a single one of these countries could not "begin". So flatly only the honourable "leaders" of the II International put the question, who, with the word "internationalism", tried to justify their treason, their failure to act, their going to the side of "their" bourgeois fatherland.

Engels, on the other hand, wanted to say that the victory of the socialist order over capitalism could take place only if Socialism had entrenched itself in the four at that time leading countries, which, viewed in historical perspective, will proceed in one and the same period.

In 1885 ENGELS wrote:

"Only an all-European revolution can be victorious" (re-translated from Russian edition, p. 23).

Consequently Engels in 1885 viewed the question exactly as he had in 1847.

This was the standpoint advocated by Marx and Engels in the "Communist Manifesto".

Are the views of Marx and Engels concerning the international character of the proletarian revolution out of date?

The law of unevenness of development.

In my opinion it is entirely wrong to maintain that the above-cited views of Marx and Engels on the international character of the socialist revolution are out of date just because Marx and Engels did not live in the period of imperialism.

Lenin once wrote:

"Neither Marx nor Engels experienced the imperialist epoch of world capitalism, which only began in the years 1893—1900. But one peculiarity of Great Britain since the middle of the 19th century consisted in that at least two of the significant essential features of imperialism were to be found there: 1. Vast colonies, and 2) monopoly profits (in consequence of its monopolist position of the world market). In both respects England at that time constituted an exception among capitalist countries, and Engels and Marx, who analysed this exception, indicated clearly and definitely the connection of this phenomenon with the (temporary) victory of opportunism in the British Labour movement." (From the German: *Sammelband* pp. 332—333.)

The "law of uneven development", from which so many incorrect conclusions are now being drawn, Lenin did not characterise solely as a law of imperialism, but as a law of capitalism as a whole.

"The unevenness of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism" — Lenin wrote. (Russian: *Collected Works*, Vol. XIII, p. 133).

Of course this law was well known to Marx and Engels. (Interjection: "Who disputes this?"). To claim that this law of the unevenness of capitalist development was unknown to the founders of scientific communism is absolutely incorrect.

The law of uneven development, yes, even more sharply: of **contradictory, antagonistic development** springs inevitably out of the anarchy of production, out of the competitive system. Marx gives a whole series of direct formulations concerning the uneven development of capitalism (see for instance "Capital", Vol. III, Part I, pp. 241, 242, 248. Russian edition).

In the "Theory of Surplus Value", in the chapter "Accumulation of Capital and Crises", Marx, in analysing the question of over-production, takes as an example "British and Italian production", the "British offer and the Italian demand". And Marx says:

"But since capitalist production can enjoy its fling only in certain spheres and under given conditions, no capitalist production whatever would be possible were it forced to develop in all spheres **simultaneously and equally.**"

(Karl Marx, "Theories on Surplus Value", Vol. II, Part II, p. 315, edition of 1910).

In the imperialist epoch all objective premises for the socialisation of production are created in **certain advanced countries**, which approximate one another in this respect; these advanced countries play a decisive role in world economy so that, after the consolidation of proletarian power in them, they will certainly and unreservedly be in a position to lead the remaining countries to Socialism, that is, to establish the final victory of Socialism in the whole world.

Lenin correctly unmasked the Kautskian "Theory of Ultra-Imperialism" as an anti-revolutionary one, as deception of the workers.

And at the same time Lenin took Hilferding (the pupil of Kautsky) "at his word", when he wrote in "Finance Capital", that under monopolist capitalism the victory of the world revolution had become economically far easier, since after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie it is sufficient to expropriate a small number of the most powerful banks and thereby begin the transition to Socialism.

Precisely in the fundamental work of Lenin, "Imperialism, the last stage of Capitalism" we read:

"**However strong may the levelling have proceeded of recent years of the world, the approximation of economic and living conditions in various countries under the pressure of the big bourgeoisie, of trade and finance capital, a considerable difference nevertheless remains, and among the six countries mentioned we find on the one hand young, extraordinarily rapidly advancing capitalist countries (America, Germany, Japan); on the other hand, countries with an old capitalist development which in recent times are progressing much more slowly than the former, England and France and finally also a country, Russia, which in an economic respect has remained furthest behind, and in which modern capitalist imperialism is, so to say, enveloped in an especially close net-work of pre-capitalist relationships.**" (German: Marx Library. Vol. I, p. 83.)

At the same time Lenin wrote:

"Nay 3-5 big banks, in any capitalist highly developed nation that you may choose, have established a 'personal union' between industrial and bank capital, and have at their disposal concentrated milliards upon milliards, which comprise the greatest part of the capital and money receipts of the whole country. The financial oligarchy, which spreads a tight net of dependent relationships without exception over all economic and political institutions of modern bourgeois society, is the most crass form in which this monopoly appears." (German: Marx Library. Vol. I, pp. 86 and 87, 106, 109-110, 110-111).

Correct conclusions from the "Law of Capitalism" (about the unevenness of development) can be drawn only in the event that one does not for a moment forget this second side of the process, namely, that imperialism means **monopolist capitalism**, that the imperialist epoch means **not only concentration, but also centralisation**, that the epoch of finance capital is the epoch of financial oligarchy, the epoch of the concentration of capital and currency receipts in the hands of a tiny group.

The conditions of monopolist capitalism, the conditions of imperialism, facilitate the proletariat of a country in its chance to break through to Socialism, the chance also in one country (and at that not necessarily in the country most industrially

developed) to fight their way through to power and to begin with socialist revolution.

Imperialism has brought it about that at present a **larger number of countries** have become economically ripe for Socialism than was the case in the epoch of Marx and Engels, for this very reason imperialism in the main represents the eve of the socialist world revolution.

The proletariat of a single country not only can but must seize power, for we have the "scientific conviction" (Lenin) that the victory can be assured on an international scale, that the objective premises for Socialism are in the main mature, that on a world scale heavy industry and technical development are already sufficient for us to take over the direction of peasant economy, and that the time is now too far advanced for the proletariat to take power prematurely.

Now comes the question: Are Marx and Engels actually "out of date" on these questions?

Marxism is of course no dogma, but a guide to action. But in the above cited doctrines of Marx and Engels are involved not merely casual words, but **fundamental marxist conceptions**. Here we have the revolutionary kernel of marxism (viz. also of Leninism).

It is well known that Bernstein and other revisionists and "camp followers", e. g. Charles Adler, began their "work" by trying to "prove" that the Communist Manifesto was out of date. The orthodox Marxists, especially Lenin, combated this in the most determined manner. We must now do the same.

LENIN.

It is self-understood that every real step which actually fosters the maintenance of the achievements of the proletarian revolution is worth more than dozens of theses and programmes about the desirability of world revolution "in general". In this respect the international proletariat must learn first of all from Lenin, from the first leader of the victorious proletarian revolution. Lenin advocates unreservedly the fundamental views of Marx and Engels.

After the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks, Lenin repeatedly came back to the question of Socialism in one country. I shall mention only his most important expressions here*.)

"... A complete final victory on an international scale in Russia alone is impossible, it will be possible only then when the proletariat is victorious in all, or at least in the most advanced countries, or in some of the most advanced countries" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVI, p. 61).

"I have expressed this already repeatedly: in comparison with the advanced countries it was easier for the Russians to begin the great proletarian revolution, but it will be more difficult for them to continue it, to conduct it to a final victory in the sense of the complete socialist society." (Our caps). (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVI, pp. 184-185).

"Has at any time any one of the Bolsheviks disputed that the revolution can be finally victorious (our caps) only then when it shall include all or at least some of the most important advanced countries?" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVI, p. 195).

"The social revolution in such a country can lead to a success only under two conditions: first, under the condition that it will receive timely support from the social revolution in one or several advanced countries... The second condition is an agreement between the proletariat which realises its dictatorship and holds State power in its hands with the majority of the peasant population." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, Part I, pp. 137-138).

Thus Lenin considers mandatory for victory not one but two conditions, not only a juncture with the peasantry, but also the international revolution.

The well known essay "On Co-operation" closes with the following words:

"I am ready to declare that for us the centre of gravity would shift to cultural work if there were not international

*.) For the comrades who want to study the question in more detail I will cite a number of sections in the Russian edition of Lenin's Collected works: Vol. XV, p. 82, 87-99, 232-233, 126-127, 129, 187, 138, 165-66, 414-15, 268, 175, Vol. XVI, pp. 8, 61, 69-70, 55, 102, 120-22, 195, 354, 390, 404, Vol. XVII, pp. 153, 406-409, 415, 18, Vol. XVIII, pp. 137-48, 148, 180, 189, 313, 321, 333, 368, 380, 433, 436, etc.

relations, if we did not have the duty of waging the struggle for our position on an international scale". (Lenin, Vol. XVIII, Part 2).

"... You all know what an international power is represented by capital, how the great capitalist factories, enterprises, trading houses throughout the whole world are bound up with one another. From this it of course becomes quite clear that, speaking fundamentally, capitalism cannot be finally vanquished in any single country." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XX, Part, 2, p. 453).

"We have always declared with certainty that this victory cannot be a firm victory unless it is supported in its essence by the proletarian revolution; that a correct appraisal of our revolution is possible only from an international viewpoint" (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, Part 2, p. 189). See further also: Vol. XVII, part I, p. 321).

"We have not even finished the foundation for a Socialist economy, this can again be taken from us by the hostile forces of dying capitalism. This must be clearly recognised and openly admitted, for nothing is more dangerous than illusions (and attacks of dizziness on high places). And in this recognition of the bitter truth there is nothing "terrible", nothing that gives any just cause for even the slightest despair, because we have always defended that elementary Marxist truth, we have constantly repeated: that for the victory of Socialism the joint efforts of the workers of several advanced countries are necessary". — This is what Lenin wrote in March 1922. (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XX, Part 2, p. 487.)

I can give dozens of further citations of this kind from Lenin. What is Socialism?

"Socialism is the abolition of classes. In order to abolish classes one must 1. overthrow the landowners and capitalists. This part of the task we have carried out, but this was only a part and not even the most difficult part. In order to abolish the classes we must first destroy the difference between the workers and peasants, and make all into workers." (Lenin, Collected Works. Vol. XVI, pp. 351—53, further Vol. XIV, part II, p. 377.)

Concerning the time required for the realisation of the socialist order in Russia, Lenin said the following:

"The road of organisation is a long road, and the task of socialist construction demands a long drawn stubborn work and real knowledge which we do not possess to a sufficient degree.

Also the next generation, which will be further developed, will probably hardly be able to achieve the complete transition to Socialism." (Lenin, Collected Works. Vol. XV, p. 240.)

"Communism is a higher stage in the development of Socialism, in which men work conscious of the necessity of labour for the commonwealth. We know that we are not now in a position to introduce this social order, let us hope that this order will be established by our children, or perhaps even among our grandchildren." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVI, p. 398.)

In other places (for instance, in his speech at the Youth Congress) Lenin, having in mind the various stages in the development and consolidation of Socialism, also mentioned shorter periods. Extremely important is his following declaration:

"As long as our Soviet Republic remains a lone boundary mark of the whole capitalist world so long would it be absolutely ridiculous phantasy and utopianism to think of our complete economic independence and the disappearance of these or the other dangers." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVII, pp. 408—409.)

Comrade Stalin cited this passage in his speech at the XV. Party Conference with the **elimination of the words I have emphasised above**. But in these words is the whole kernel of the affair, and these words of Lenin show clearly that what is involved is not only armed intervention, but also the economic encirclement, viz, that we must be afraid lest our "complete economic independence" be taken from us with the aid of the masters of the world market.

The well-established system of conceptions of Marx, Engels and Lenin characterised by the above-mentioned numerous ci-

tations from these classicists, is usually counterposed by a tiny fraction from a small article by Lenin, written on August 25, 1915. Let us consider this fragment. In this article, which bears the heading: "Concerning the slogan of the United States of Europe", Lenin writes:

"The unevenness of economic and political development is an undeniable law of capitalism. From this follows that a victory of Socialism is possible at first in a few countries or even in one single country. The victorious proletariat of this country, after having expropriated the capitalists and having organised its socialist production, would arise against the rest of the capitalist world and if necessary proceed even with armed force against the exploiter classes and their States. The political form of society in which the proletariat is victorious will be the democratic republic, which more and more centralises the forces of the proletariat of the respective nation or nations in the struggle against the States that have not yet advanced to Socialism. Without the dictatorship of the oppressed class, the proletariat, a destruction of the classes is impossible. A free union of nations in Socialism is impossible without a more or less long-drawn stubborn struggle between the socialist republics and the remaining States." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XIII, p. 133, German: "Against the Stream", p. 126.)

Out of this fragment they tear the words "that a victory of socialism is possible at first in a few countries or even in one single country", and from it draw the conclusion that the teachings of Lenin are the teachings of a victory in one country.

Let us investigate the section cited. It is quite beyond doubt that the words "victory of socialism" are to be understood here in the sense of the capture of political power by the proletariat. In this fragment Lenin does not even speak of the Soviet Republic, but of the democratic republic.

But with Lenin it is stated: "After . . . having organised its socialist production", etc.! The question arises here: Is it therefore not clear that he speaks here not only of the seizure of power by the proletariat, but also expressly includes socialist production? — No, this is exactly what is not clear.

Something else is clear! "After having expropriated the capitalists and having organised its socialist production" here means: after having taken over power from the capitalists and having brought it about that the factories and workshops are working under the direction of the proletariat, i. e. when the ground is laid for the organisation of socialist production. As soon as one captures political power, the capitalists must be expropriated and a start made with the organisation of socialist society, at the same time, one must prepare for war (or to make war) against the capitalist States, and to try to win the oppressed classes of other countries to our side — this is the actual idea of Lenin.

Is it really possible to ascribe to Lenin the "idea" that he had proposed first to expropriate the capitalists, thereupon during a few decades to organise socialist production, and only then proceed with arms against the exploiting classes and their States and win the oppressed classes of other countries to our side? This would be pure nonsense, it would be equivalent to the pacifist trance-like, phillistine-like belief that the capitalists and their States would agree to wait a decade until the proletariat, which had seized power in one country, had organised and developed socialist production and only then advanced for war with the bourgeoisie. Or else all that is left is to ascribe another "idea" to Lenin, that he had held it possible "to organise socialist production" according to the recipe of a wiseacre in the course of a few weeks or months. There is no other alternative for our opponents. It is a false "explanation" of Lenin.

In order to better comprehend how in 1915 Comrade Lenin formulated the question of a revolution in Russia, it is necessary to turn to the most important programmatic documents written by Lenin shortly before and shortly after the article "Concerning the Slogan of the United States of Europe".

Thus, for example, Lenin wrote, in our C. C.'s famous manifesto on the beginning of the imperialist war 1914:

"In Russia, in view of the great backwardness of the country, which has not yet completed its bourgeois revolu-

tion, the tasks of the Bolsheviks must remain as heretofore, the three basic conditions of the consequent democratic transformation: the democratic republic (including full equal suffrage and self-determination of all nations), the confiscation of large landed estates, the 8-hour day. In all advanced countries, on the other hand, the war places upon the agenda the slogan of the socialist revolution."

This was written in October 1914. In August 1915 the article "Concerning the slogan of the United States of Europe" was written. And in October 1915 Lenin wrote the famous thesis of our central organ at that time:

"6. it is the task of proletarian Russia to carry to the end the bourgeois democratic revolution in order to release the socialist revolution in Europe". (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XIII, p. 208, German, "Against the Stream", p. 292.)

In March 1917, after the victory of the February revolution in Russia, Lenin wrote

"that these theses were literally confirmed in a splendid manner by the revolution".

When Lenin left Switzerland after the February revolution he addressed a letter to the Swiss workers, which was patently intended for the whole international. In this letter he wrote:

"The Russian proletariat is not in a position to conduct victoriously the socialist revolution, alone, with its own forces. But it may give such a momentum to the present Russian revolution that it would furnish the best conditions for such a revolution which, in a certain sense, it would have initiated. It may facilitate the conditions under which its principal and most loyal ally, the European and American socialist proletariat, would enter upon the decisive struggle". (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XIV, Part II, p. 408, German: Fritz Platten, "Die Reise Lenins", pp. 11—12, or Guilbeaux, "Lenin", p. 171—172.)

This by no means signifies that Lenin even for a single moment thought of limiting the Russian revolution to the boundaries of a bourgeois democratic revolution. (Interjection: "Which you are doing!")

Already in my book "Leninism" (p. 54) I reminded the comrades that Lenin had said:

"From the democratic revolution we shall immediately and to the limit of our forces, the forces of the conscious and organised proletariat, begin to go over to the socialist revolution..." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. VI, p. 449).

The question arises why Lenin himself did not on a single occasion, neither in 1916 nor 1917, nor in 1917—23, interpret his article ("Concerning the Slogan of United States of Europe") in the manner in which it is now interpreted? The question arises why Comrade Stalin himself, up to 1924 (see his book: "Lenin and Leninism"), did not notice this article and why he until then interpreted the views of Lenin on the international character of the revolution exactly as we all did?

The question arises why, in the draft programme of the Comintern, which was written by Bukharin in 1922, there is not a single word about the "theory of Socialism in a single country" (nor about the supposition that Marx and Engels were ignorant of the law of uneven development)? There can be no doubt that the programme of the Comintern could now be written by the supporters of Comrade Stalin's standpoint in no other way than from the angle of the theory of Socialism in one country. This very theory would form the central point of the whole programme. And in 1923 — while Lenin lived — we find that the programme contains about it not a word, not a syllable, not a sound! The question arises: Is that an accident? And finally the question arises as to why only in 1926 is there for the first time proposed in the Comintern the new conception concerning the victory of Socialism in one country? Why did no one propose it to the Comintern while Lenin lived? Why did this theory of Socialism in a single country arise only after the death of Lenin?

We have here interpreted the true views of Lenin. Have they contained any pessimism?

No! In them there was and is no pessimism whatever, much less lack of faith in Socialism. Pessimism and lack of faith would set in only if anyone of us were to assume that the present capitalist "stabilisation" would last a number of decades,

that our epoch is already no longer the epoch of world revolution, that the victory of the proletarian revolution had become problematical. But this would be precisely a complete revision of the views of Lenin, especially his teachings on imperialism. We have certainly by no means made ourselves guilty of this.

Lack of a perspective, passivity would result if we doubted that one could and must build Socialism in our country despite the capitalist encirclement, without folding our hands, with all energy and enthusiasm. But of this there can be no thought whatever. We are building socialism and we will build it up — with the aid of the proletarian revolutions in the other countries. (Interjection: "But if the revolution is delayed?")

On this we have expressed ourselves in detail in our book "Leninism". Under this very viewpoint we are fighting in our Party for the acceleration of the tempo of the industrialisation of our country.

Among various foreign Communists we have observed the following mood: "Among us (in Germany or in Czecho-Slovakia) the proletarian revolution is not yet coming — so the Russians should at least build up Socialism in their country, even without our help." These are really moods of passivity and pessimism. With these same trends of thought many Social Democrats will also agree. In certain Russian Communists this is in reality an expression of pessimism with regard to the proletarian world revolution, and it calls forth an unconscious desire to palm off the NEP. as socialism. Precisely in this there exists the danger of the revision of Lenin's views concerning the international character of the proletarian revolution.

Our proposals are very simple. We propose: 1) That the views of Marx and Engels on this question shall not be declared out of date; 2) that we shall retain that conception of Lenin's views on this question that was common to us all up till 1924. That is all we propose.

So that the comrades can more readily comprehend how the views of Comrades Stalin have changed we submit a parallel presentation of his old and new standpoints concerning the question of victory of Socialism in one country:

"But the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the seizure of power by the proletariat in one country does not yet mean the guarantee of the complete victory of Socialism. Its most important task — the organising of socialist production — still remains unsolved. Can these tasks be solved, can the final victory of socialism be won without the joint efforts of the proletariat of several highly developed countries? No, this is impossible. In order to overthrow the bourgeoisie the efforts of one country are sufficient. This is shown us by the history of our revolution. For the final victory of socialism, for the organising of socialist production, however, the efforts of one country and at that of an agrarian country like Russia will not suffice — for this we require the efforts of the proletarians of several highly-developed countries."

(J. Stalin, "Lenin and Leninism", 1924, pp. 40—41).

"But to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and to establish the power of the proletariat in one country, does not yet mean the assurance of the complete victory of Socialism. After the victorious proletariat of one country has consolidated its power and has won over the peasantry for itself, it can and must build up the socialist society. Does this mean that the proletariat thereby has already achieved the complete victory of socialism, i. e., does it mean that the proletariat alone with the forces of one single country, can finally consolidate socialism and absolutely guarantee the country against intervention and, consequently, against the restoration? No, it does not mean this. For this the victory in several countries is necessary.

(J. Stalin, "Question of Leninism", Marx Bibl. Vol. V, p. 96).

The emphasised section shows the evolution of Comrade Stalin's view.

The present formulation of the question concerning the "victory of Socialism in a single country" only arose at the end of 1924. Even at the XIV Party Congress the Majority spokesmen did not raise this question in all its sharpness. The XIV Party Congress adopted no decision on this.

Sometimes it is declared: even if the theory of Socialism in a single country contradicts the teachings of Marx and

Lenin, it is at present nevertheless politically useful because it gives the Russian proletariat a perspective.

Such a formulation of the question is extremely dangerous. This is the worst kind of opportunism. From the standpoint of scientific socialism anything theoretically wrong cannot be politically advisable. A perspective is undoubtedly necessary for Socialist construction. But why should this perspective be national and not international? Here lies the kernel of the question.

If our proletariat recognises that the question of the world revolution is for us a question of life and death, then this is something entirely different than if it is trained to the belief that it is building up Socialism independently of the course of the world revolution.

Our perspective is therefore the perspective of a world revolution. The Soviet power will not be destroyed, and it will lead the work of socialism because, first, the alliance between working class and peasantry can be assured in the Soviet Union and second, because the revolutions in the other countries will come inevitably, and even though they are delayed they will nevertheless come in sufficient time.

I am, as you see, not a pessimist. In my book "Leninism" in 1925 I have expressed myself more extensively on this.

"We were optimists at the XII. Party Congress of the R. C. P. (1923). In 1925 there is even far more cause for optimism." (See my book "Leninism", Russian, p. 339).

Of course I do not "deny" the great successes which the Soviet Power has achieved. "especially on the economic field", on the contrary; I am proud of them, just as are all Bolsheviks. We were not the least of those who worked for those successes. And we hope, despite differences, to continue to work energetically in the raising of Socialist economy and Socialist culture in the U. S. S. R.

The mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry on a world scale. As one of the "most decisive" arguments against our position on the question of Socialism in a single country, this argument is trotted out, that also on a world scale the mutual relations between the proletariat and peasantry are approximately the same as in Russia, i. e. that the peasantry comprises an overwhelming majority.

This argument disregards at least the following four circumstances:

1. On a world scale heavy industry and technical development are already sufficient for the proletariat to take over the leadership of the peasantry. Lenin said:

"Nevertheless we are justified in saying that on a world scale such an industry is at hand. On the earth there are countries with such an advanced heavy industry that they can immediately supply hundreds of millions of backward peasants. Upon this we base our estimates." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XVIII, pp. 433—436.)

2. In order to be victorious it is not absolutely necessary to have a majority everywhere. It is sufficient to have it at the decisive place at the decisive moment. We recall the well-known work of Lenin on the results of the elections to the Constituent Assembly (1918) in which Lenin explained with excellent clarity how the Bolsheviks won the victory because, at the decisive moment and in the decisive places — in Petrograd, Moscow, in the chief army centres and in the fleet, and among the poor peasantry — they had the majority even though the Social Revolutionaries still had a considerable majority in Russia, as the elections showed.

3. If one speaks about the majority of the peasants throughout the whole world, one has in mind also the peasant population of the colonies and semi-colonies, in general of the dependent countries. Among these must be included the hundreds of millions of peasants in China, India, Egypt, etc. It is self-understood that if one takes into consideration the position of these hundreds of millions of peasants suffering under the yoke of imperialism, the role which confronts them in an epoch of the proletarian revolution cannot simply be likened to the situation and role of the European or American agricultural population. Lenin had this very thing in mind when he spoke of the fusion of the great national revolutionary movements with the proletarian revolution. On the other hand, the

liberation of the colonies as a result of the proletarian revolutions in the ruling countries will create a completely new situation. The liberation of the principal colonial countries has for its premise simply the victory of the Socialist revolution in two or three of the strongest imperialist States.

4. In the U. S. S. R., after the conquest of power by the proletariat, the relationship between the proletariat and peasantry is something entirely special. In all the rest of the world we now still see three classes: the proletariat, the peasantry, and the bourgeoisie, which rules and which rides on the backs of the workers as well as of the peasants and which, by means of deception, has won over to itself a section of the workers and peasants. We (the U. S. S. R.) are now surrounded on all sides by bourgeois states, i. e., by states in which the bourgeoisie determines the policy, and in which they control the army and navy, the factories and workshops.

This is by no means the same as what will exist tomorrow, i. e., when the whole world (or at least the decisive countries) will have overthrown the bourgeoisie and when only two classes will remain — the proletariat and the peasantry. If tomorrow, let us say, the German proletarian revolution were to join us, and the day after tomorrow the British, this would immediately change the whole situation. We would then have put an end to bourgeois rule in the two countries that are decisive for Europe. The real relationship between the proletariat and peasantry in these countries would immediately change, although the statistical relationship would remain as before. And a decisive change would also immediately take place on a world scale in the relations between proletariat and peasantry. Although in the whole world the peasant would continue to constitute a statistical majority, and although in all the rest of the world the bourgeoisie would continue to ride upon the backs of the workers as well as of the peasants — the situation would nevertheless be fundamentally changed.

That is why Lenin said that the victory of the Socialist revolution is practically assured from the moment in which it has been victorious at least in some of the most important countries.

II. OUR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY.

"The stronger that the official Social Democracy is in a country the worse off is the proletariat in that country. This can now be considered as a fully proven axiom. Other things being equal it is unquestionably so."

I wrote this in the article "The Social Democracy as the Tool of Reaction" immediately after the I Congress of the Comintern. (Kommunistische Internationale, 1919, p. 181—182.)

As the "Third Party" of the bourgeoisie, as the "Left Wing of the bourgeoisie", as a "wing of Fascism" we characterised the upper strata of the official Social Democracy at the V Congress of the Comintern. In its essentials we maintain this appraisal also today. This explains the fact that the Social Democratic leaders and the Social Democratic press organs, including the Russian Mensheviks, who naturally try to exploit our differences of opinion for their own purposes, continue to attack us with a maximum of rage and hatred, in exactly the same manner as do the most important press organs of the world bourgeoisie and of the White emigration.

It is claimed that Levi and other Social Democrats sympathise with me. I should like to point out the following facts.

At the recent Party Congress of the Austrian Social Democracy in Linz, Käte Leichter appeared in the name of a local organisation of the Vienna Social Democratic Party and proposed an amendment in the draft programme worked out by Otto Bauer. The amendment demanded: struggle for the amalgamation of workers' parties on an international scale. In speaking for her proposal this Social Democrat said:

"We also believe that the development recently shown in Russia will contribute very much to this. No matter how we may look upon the methods of Stalinism one thing is sure that at present that tendency has won out in Russia which, if it proceeds consistently, will lead to a constantly stronger rapprochement with the Social Democracy."

In this spirit practically the whole Social Democracy judges our differences of opinion. And the whole of the bourgeois world-newspapers, and the bourgeois politicians of all over Europe and America, go still further.

III. RELATIONSHIP TO THE ULTRA-LEFT AND THE RIGHT.

The general attitude of the C. I. towards the ultra-Left and Right mistakes must, in my opinion, be determined by the following instructions by Lenin.

In the "Infantile Sickness", Lenin writes: "In struggling against what enemies in the labour movement has bolshevism grown up and become strong?" Lenin replies:

"First chiefly in the struggle against opportunism which in 1914 finally sprouted into Social chauvinism and definitely went over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Naturally enough this was the chief foe of Bolshevism within the labour movement. This foe still remains the principal enemy on an international scale". (German edition, CI, 1920, p. 13.)

In the report to the II Congress of the CI Lenin said:

"Opportunism is our chief enemy . . . Here is our principal foe and this foe we must conquer. We must leave the Congress with the firm determination to fight it to the very end in all parties. That is the chief task. In comparison with this task it is an easy job to make good the mistakes of the 'Left' trend in Communism . . ." (German: Minutes of the II Congress of the CI, 1921, pp. 36 and 37.)

If one takes up the practice of the most important Sections of the Comintern in recent months then it is clear that towards the "Left" there has been applied a policy not of cure but of expulsion, whilst towards the Right (Poland, Great Britain) an altogether too soft policy was applied.

The period of relative capitalist stabilisation will inevitably be a period of the growth of opportunism in certain Communist Parties, a period of the strengthening of Right groups and "leaders". If we forget this and throw ourselves with all severity against the ultra-Left, then this will bring serious harm to the Comintern.

Among the Right as well as among the ultra-Left there are elements that are really breaking with the Comintern. It is unnecessary to say that anyone who does not agitate for the U. S. S. R., is no Communist. Anyone who whispers any sort of distrust of the U. S. S. R. to the Social Democratic workers who travel with the delegations to the U. S. S. R. commits a crime against the proletarian revolution. Such people are enemies of Communism. Against them we must fight as against our worst foes.

Anyone who has taken this path is no longer either a "Right" or an "ultra-Left" — he has simply gone over to the other side of the barricade.

The Right tendencies undoubtedly play a very serious role, e. g. in the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia (in the central organ of the Party an article is "suddenly" published which solidarises itself with Otto Bauer on the questions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, violence, etc.). Articles containing Social Democratic deviations — on the question of the presidential election — are no rarity. And although in the first case the C. C. corrected the author — all this is no accident. In Norway (a tendency for the liquidation of the Party); in Holland (on the occasion of the Java uprising the Dutch Communist Party proposed jointly with the Social Democrats . . . the sending of a mixed commission to investigate the affair); in Poland (the tactics at the time of Pilsudski revolt); in Great Britain (in the course of recent events it developed that in one group of the Party there prevails a stubborn Right deviation, and especially in England this Right danger can become extremely harmful). In Germany also the "Right" danger is an undeniable fact.

I hope that no one will tell me here that I have any sort of spiritual or political sympathy with any of the real Right tendencies and groups, or with their leaders, mentioned here. All these groups are grim foes of the opposition in the C. P. S. U.

With regard to Souvarine only this is correct that Comrade Humbert Droz discussed with me the question of the further attitude towards Souvarine, just before his departure for the V Congress of the C. P. of France. I expressed the view that if Souvarine discontinues his factional organ, as demanded from him by the VI Enlarged Plenum, it might perhaps be well for the Party to give him the opportunity to go for a year to China or America, and if he acts in a disciplined manner, to take up

the question of his readmission, since he was expelled for one year. With the specific viewpoint of Souvarine I have absolutely nothing in common and I stand, and have stood, in no contact with him. (Interjection: "Then why do you want to re-admit him to the Party?")

IV. ON THE QUESTION OF THE DANGER OF DEGENERATION.

Of course what is involved here consists only of dangers, of tendencies, and not of accomplished facts.

The question of the danger of degeneration can be put the way Herr Korsch puts it, or as Martov put it in 1920—21, i. e., with the intention of discrediting and vilifying the Soviet Union. But one can also and must put it — the way Lenin did.

"What is the New Economic Policy of the Bolsheviks — revolution or tactics?"

Lenin put this question on the occasion of an attack by Professor Ustrialov in the spring of 1922.

Other Bolsheviks also wrote about this, and especially also Comrade Bukharin in the book "Attack" (pp. 237—239) in which he spoke of the dangers of a transformation into an appendage of the NEP. oligarchy, etc.

These dangers are therefore not hatched out. They must not be exaggerated — but they must not be forgotten either.

In what do these dangers consist?

1) In the international capitalist encirclement, in the temporary and relative stabilisation of capitalism. It would be ridiculous to deny that such a situation inevitably calls forth "stabilisation moods", over-estimation of the forces of international capitalism.

2) In the negative aspects of the NEP. The NEP. is necessary. In no other way than through the NEP. can we, in the Soviet Union, reach Socialism. But it would be ridiculous to deny that this partial revival of capitalism, which we have permitted, does not contain its dangers. Lenin constantly reminded us of that.

3) In the petty bourgeois environment. The working class holds power in a country in which the tremendous majority of the population consists of peasants. As to the dangers contained in a petty bourgeois environment, Lenin reminded us unceasingly.

4) In the monopoly position of our Party. The dictatorship of the proletariat is not possible without the dictatorship of the Communist Party. Our present opponent, Comrade Bukharin, said about this now disputed question, at the III Congress of the C. I.

"As Marxists and orthodox Communists, we are all convinced that the dictatorship of one class is possible only as the dictatorship of the vanguard of this class, that means that the dictatorship of the working class can be realised only through the dictatorship of the Communist Party. We have long ago rejected the senseless theory of the counter-position of dictatorship of class to dictatorship of Party".

The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot tolerate the existence of other Parties. The monopoly position of our Party is absolutely necessary. But it is impossible not to see that the monopoly position of our Party also has its negative aspects. That is what we pointed out in a number of resolutions at our Party Congresses, e. g., at the XI. Party Congress, while Lenin lived and under his complete agreement. Especially the XI. Party Congress pointed out that the monopoly position of our Party results in that considerable groups of political functionaries, who under other circumstances would be with the Menshevik and Social Revolutionaries, will now inevitably approach our Party and surround it, or simply enter the Party and thereby inject non-Bolshevik moods and views into the Party.

5) In the State apparatus. It is unnecessary for us to talk about how impossible it is to change it in a short time in a really proletarian spirit. We must remain conscious of the fact that not only does the Party exert its effect on the State apparatus, but also the State apparatus upon the Party. All the greater is therefore the negative significance of bureaucratism in the State apparatus.

6. In the camp-followers. The "specialists" (experts), the higher categories of employees and the intelligentsia are necessary for our cause. It is not to be doubted, however, that through this group of workers an unproletarian influence penetrates our State and economic apparatus, and sometimes also our Party apparatus.

All these dangers must be recognised — not in order to surrender to them, or to exaggerate them, but in order to fight them with proper measures, as Lenin taught us.

In the period in which private capital is growing in the towns, and the kulak in the village, the Party must watch these dangers particularly painstakingly, in order to launch the struggle against them with all possible means. Given a correct policy the Party will be completely successful in this, since the forces which counter-act the tendencies and dangers mentioned are very great. The proletarian revolution has awakened tremendous forces. In our revolution, in our Party, there are tremendous forces.

V. THE QUESTION OF TWO PARTIES.

Now as to the question of two parties: I am accused of a certain tolerance of the idea of two parties in our country. That is false. That cannot be proven by anything. I was the first to fight against the revision of the formula regarding the dictatorship of the Party. It is surely quite clear that anyone who is for the dictatorship of the C. P. S. U. (b) cannot have a tolerant attitude towards the idea of a second Party.

At the XII. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. (1923) a resolution was adopted on my report in which one of the fundamental tenets of Leninism was repeated, namely, the sentence that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realised in any other way than through the dictatorship of the Communist Party. A year later Comrade Stalin on the XII. Party Congress opposed this formula and maintained that Lenin was supposed to have spoken of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" and not of the dictatorship of the Communist Party.

The passage in question in the resolution of the XII. Party Congress reads:

"The dictatorship of the working class cannot be assured in any other way than through the form of the dictatorship of its advanced vanguard, that is the Communist Party."

Comrade Stalin replied to this:

"I remember that in one of the resolutions of our Congress, it seems even in the resolution of the XII. Party Congress, such an expression was included, of course, through an oversight..."

"For is not Lenin correct when he spoke not about the dictatorship of the Party but of the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Stalin "Results of the XIII. Party Congress of the R. C. P., 1924, p. 22.)

This is of course not a Leninist formulation of the question. Lenin said: We have the dictatorship of the proletariat and precisely for this reason the dictatorship of the Communist Party. The whole kernel of our Central Committee was unanimously of the view that in this question Comrade Stalin made a great principal error.

On the basis of this incorrect declaration of Comrade Stalin I wrote an article ("On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the Dictatorship of the Party") which appeared as an editorial in the "Pravda" No. 190, 1924). Prior to this there took place a conference of 25 members of the C. C. — Leninists (among them all members of the Pol-Bureau with the exception of Comrade Trotsky) — which with an overwhelming majority repudiated the principal mistakes of Comrade Stalin and ratified my article. Comrade Trotsky likewise never expressed himself in his works in the sense that the dictatorship of the proletariat is actually conceivable only in the form of the dictatorship of its vanguard, that is of the Party. Of course, I stand completely on this standpoint, now also, that the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat is possible only under the dictatorship of the Communist Party. Even for this reason alone, I shall always fight with all the means at my disposal against the slightest tendency towards two Parties, against the slightest attempts to weaken the dictatorship of the Bolshevik Party.

VI. THE QUESTIONS OF UNITY AND FACTIONAL POLITICS.

I withdraw not a single word of what I have written in the course of many years about the harmfulness and dangers of factional politics, especially for a Communist Party in power. If the general evolution of the struggle within the C. P. S. U. has led to the result that the advocacy of our principal views took on the character of factional struggle, then in our declaration of October 16, 1926, we have openly admitted our mistake and have called upon all our supporters to refrain from factional politics. We will remind you, however, of the decision of the XIII. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.:

"Only a constant, pulsating ideological life can preserve the Party in the manner in which it crystallised itself before and during the Revolution, this includes a constant critical study of our past, correction of our mistakes and the collective discussion of the weightiest questions.

For the safeguarding of this, it is desirable that the leading Party organs, heeding the voice of the broad Party masses, do not look upon every criticism as an expression of factional spirit and thereby crowd conscientious and disciplined Party members onto the path of exclusion and factionalism."

The pledges that we took upon ourselves in the Declaration of October 16, we shall carry out in every respect. This we declare also in the forum of the Comintern.

The unity of the C. P. S. U. (b) and of the whole Comintern must be assured at any price.

VII. CONCERNING THE BLOC.

Lenin considered blocs permissible. In 1920 at the X. Party Congress of our Party, Lenin said:

"A bloc — well, is a bloc! We need not be afraid of it, but must welcome it and effectuate it more solidly and broadly in the central organs of the Party Itself" (Lenin, Collected Works Vol. XVII, pp. 90—91).

Perhaps Lenin formed a bloc with Comrade Trotsky against other members of the C. C. — on the eve of the October uprising of 1917, in the question of the structure of the Red Army, economic organisation, the national question, the foreign trade monopoly.

The Executive of the Comintern also endorsed and organised blocs of two (and more) groups within the Communist Parties of various countries, e. g. in Germany, France, Czecho-Slovakia, Italy and America.

The representatives of the present Majority also tried to form a bloc with Trotsky for a time subsequent to the XIV. Party Congress.

The differences of the past have an important significance. But a bloc must be judged on the basis of the theoretical ideas and political tasks on which it is based, and analysed without distortion from its own documents. From this viewpoint, we calmly leave to the future the verdict on these ideas and slogans which we defend — in the way and with the means that our Party allows.

VIII. CONCERNING TROTSKYISM.

That which differentiates historical Trotskyism from Leninism up to 1917, and which is not defended by Comrade Trotsky himself, was in no way the property of the bloc, and will of course always encounter my sharpest resistance. Especially am I most sharply opposed to the theory of the permanent revolution, and I have fought this false theory on many occasions. Comrade Trotsky himself has declared:

"We proceed from the fact, as irrefutably proven by practice, that in all in any manner principal questions, in which anyone of us differed from Lenin, Lenin was absolutely right..."

...In the question of the relations between proletariat and peasantry we stand completely on the theoretical and tactical teachings which Lenin formulated on the basis of the experiences in the Revolutions of 1905 and 1917, as well as upon the basis of the experiences of Socialist construction (smytchka)...."

If we wanted to occupy ourselves with retrospective discussion of all differences at this time, there would probably be very serious differences of opinion on various essential questions of the past. But it is fundamentally false to think that any imaginable question dealing with the appraisal of the driving forces of the Revolution can be referred back to the old fight about the theory of the permanent revolution, etc. The driving forces of revolution (and counter-revolution) in each new state are subject to concrete Marxist appraisal on the basis of the sum total of past experiences.

As heretofore, of course I stand also at present on the basis of Leninism.

I have by far not taken up all of the charges brought against me — for obvious reasons. I have only picked out some of the most important questions of principle.

I have said nothing about our differences of opinion concerning; 1) the tempo of industrialisation in the U. S. S. R.; 2) the necessity of greater restrictions and greater burdens on private capital; 3) the same with respect to the kulaks; 4) the necessity of maintaining and gradually raising the real wages of the workers; 5) the necessity of realising the fundamentals of inner Party democracy; 6) the necessity for a more serious struggle against bureaucratism; 7) the necessity of a more decisive resistance against the extension of suffrage and property rights of the upper strata in the villages, as well as the land lease terms and our proposed liberation of 40% of the poor peasants from tax burden; 8) the price policy (I have never proposed and do not propose a policy of raising prices); 9) the N. E. P. and State capitalism; 10) the social composition of our Party.

What I have said is sufficient to show that I have been guilty in no manner of "Social Democratic" deviations.

Since I have differed with the majority of the C. P. of the C. P. S. U., since I have remained in the Minority, I can no longer participate in the leadership of the Comintern. This was clear to me already after the XIV. Party Congress. In my speech at the XIV. Party Congress I already said this. Already at the first Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., subsequent to the XIV. Party Congress, I submitted a written request to be freed from my position as chairman of the C. I.

In leaving direct work in the Comintern in consequence of the prevailing situation, I shout with you:

Long live the Comintern!

Long live the unity of the Comintern and the Communist Parties!

Long live the Soviet Union!

Long live Leninism!

Long live the world revolution!

Comrade PEPPER:

Party Comrades, I believe it was no accident that the first words spoken by Comrade Zinoviev on this tribune were the words of **new factional struggle**. The resolution of the Russian delegation bureau declared that it considered Comrade Zinoviev's appearance here undesirable because it would create the danger of a new factional struggle. Comrade Zinoviev himself admitted this: "**the danger of further factional struggle is not altogether out of the question**". Nevertheless, Comrade Zinoviev decided to appear here. The appearance of one of the most prominent leaders of the Opposition bloc on this international tribune, in my opinion, cannot be characterised otherwise than as an **International protraction of the Russian factional struggle** on the part of the Opposition. Comrade Zinoviev declared that he took the floor for an "**Explanation**" of the Opposition viewpoint. He delivered no **discussion speech**, but instead, nothing less than a co-report. This is the political content of the speech of Comrade Zinoviev!

The kernel question — said Comrade Zinoviev — which occupies him and of course which occupies also the C. I., is the **question of the construction of socialism in one country**. This is in fact the kernel question, it is a vital question not only for the C. P. of the Soviet Union, but also for the entire Communist International. Comrade Zinoviev and the other leading comrades of the Opposition have proven by their attitude that they still do not understand that by denying the possibility of the construction of Socialism in the Soviet

Union, they have brought themselves into Opposition against the entire C. I.

The Communist International has no programme, said Comrade Zinoviev, and also in the draft programme there is not a single word concerning the **problem of building Socialism in a single country**. This statement sounded like an indictment of the C. I. A few days ago, we received a memorandum from the German ultra-Leftists who were expelled from the Party, in which was contained the same reproach against the Comintern. It sounds somewhat peculiar when Comrade Zinoviev, until only recently Chairman of the Comintern, now throws up to us that the C. I. has as yet no programme. Surely, Comrade Zinoviev is at least equally responsible for this.

What has the speech of Comrade Zinoviev contributed to the solving of the problem of the possibility of building Socialism in one country. He did not even make the slightest attempt to give any sort of actual analysis of this problem. **Instead of analysis he gave us citations**. He tried to parade Marx and Engels against the building of Socialism in one country. He brings us Marx and Engels' citations written in the '40s and without further ado wants to apply them to our present period. But here there is surely an essential difference. In the '40s there were lacking the most important basic conditions, the economic and social premises for the building of Socialism and even for the victory of the proletariat itself. This circumstance explains the correctness of the statements of Marx and Engels that the revolution on the European Continent, leaving out England, would remain an insignificant affair. For the '40s this was absolutely correct. On the European Continent at that time there was only a very weak industry, and a still weaker proletariat. No real proletarian mass Parties were then in existence. **But it is certainly utterly wrong to compare the period of the '40s with the period of present day imperialism, that is to simply liken Europe prior to the 1848 bourgeois revolution with Europe after the first world war and after the first socialist revolution in the Soviet Union**. Present day Europe is a continent on which all the material pre-conditions of Socialism (concentration and centralisation of capital, monopolies), are at hand, where there exist large mass Parties of the working class, which already possess a revolutionary tradition. It is no application of Marxism, but contempt for the Marxist method if one only comes with citations and does not take into consideration the fundamental differences in the whole situation prevailing in Europe in these two periods.

Comrade Zinoviev then touched upon the question of N. E. P. He did not reply to the question which the whole Communist International is justified in putting to him: **What is the New Economic Policy, is it really the "broadest retreat" — and only the "broadest retreat"**, as it was once characterised by Comrade Zinoviev — or are there contained in it also elements of a re-grouping of forces, a preparation for a new economic offensive in the direction of Socialism, as Comrade Lenin in his time characterised the N. E. P.? After all, it is a peculiar thing: Comrade Zinoviev tried in his speech today to give a much more confused and unclear reply than was given in the previous statements of the Russian Opposition. In the place of his former fiery accusations against the line of the C. P. of the Soviet Union, he now applies the method of **half-concealed insinuations**. This peculiar method is really the chief feature of Comrade Zinoviev's attitude today.

For example, Comrade Zinoviev tries to "prove" that the **socialist revolution is an international revolution**. He brings up heavy artillery, he cites Marx and Engels, he has a pile of citations from Lenin, all for the purpose of proving that the world revolution is actually an international revolution, that we are living in an age of world economy, that a world market has already been established by capitalism. All this looks very learned. But behind this erudition is hidden a political aim. Why all these citations? Does Comrade Zinoviev want to maintain that anybody in the C. P. S. U. or in the Comintern has said that the Socialist Revolution is not an international revolution? Has anyone of us ever maintained that we are living in the period of nationally-bounded revolution? Has anybody ever expressed any doubt that world economy has already been established? Or is he really trying to prove to the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., or to the Enlarged Executive, that capitalism has already established a world market, etc.? Why prove this? Who has disputed it? This whole so-called "proof of the case" — "supported" by so many citations —

does not serve for the clarification of the theoretical problems, it has a quite definite political purpose. And this purpose is to awaken distrust, to sow suspicion, to make it appear as though someone, that is to say the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., had taken the ground of the nationally-limited revolution, had denied the existence of world relationships.

Now a further question. Comrade Zinoviev mentioned here the question of the law of the unevenness of capitalist development, and maintained that this law was already formulated by Marx, that it is a general law of capitalist development and that it does not apply solely to the period of imperialism. All this is true. But who maintained the contrary? Comrade Zinoviev tried to put it as though Comrade Stalin had said that the law of the unevenness of capitalist development had been unknown to Marx. But what did Comrade Stalin actually say? He maintained that in Lenin's whole conception, in the method of his analysis, this law played a fundamental role. Did he want to say thereby that Marx had not seen this law? By no means. Did Stalin claim that this law applied only to the period of Imperialism? By no means. Lenin stated explicitly and more than once — I shall not give citations — that this law is a general law of capitalist development. Again, for what purpose this polemic of Comrade Zinoviev? It seeks to cover over a real difference. What is this difference? It is to be found in the statements of Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev at the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U., according to which the effectiveness of the law of uneven capitalist development is supposed to have become weaker during the period of imperialism. Comrade Stalin maintains the contrary, that this law of the unevenness of capitalist development has been intensified during the period of imperialism, and thereby he is in conformity with the views of Lenin.

Thus in the speech of Comrade Zinoviev insinuation follows upon insinuation. He makes the further claim that by raising the perspective of the possible building of Socialism in one country we restrict the proletarian struggle to a national perspective. What is the meaning of this charge if it is translated out of the language of semi-insinuation into the language of political clarity? Nothing less than that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has nationalistic tendencies, that it is nationally limited, that a danger of national narrowmindedness is prevalent in it.

The next insinuation! Comrade Zinoviev declared that Marx and Marxism must be defended, that Marxism shall not be revised. Splendid! But I ask who has assailed Marx and Marxism here, who is attempting to revise Marxism? What is the meaning of this charge? Again, the method of semi-insinuation, of under-cover attack.

A further insinuation: Comrade Zinoviev dished up here as a great discovery, that years are necessary until socialism can be built up and he expressed himself very disdainfully against any statement that a few weeks or months would suffice. What is this? Does Comrade Zinoviev intend to polemise against anyone who ever really existed? Whoever said such a stupid thing?

The next insinuation, for a change, is an international one. Comrade Zinoviev related here that certain German and Czech comrades are of the opinion that it is important that in Russia socialism is really being constructed because forsooth the Communists in other countries cannot accomplish anything now.

I believe that it was the duty of Comrade Zinoviev to base such charges upon citations. Is it permissible to make such a terrific accusation, that in two of our most important mass Parties, a liquidatory and defeatist mood prevails, without offering concrete evidence? This charge is an unfounded insinuation against the German and Czech Parties, and in my opinion the C. I. must vigorously repudiate this insinuation.

The next insinuation is again directed against the C. P. S. U. Comrade Zinoviev cites here some Social Democratic paper or other in which it was written that the victory of "Stalinism" is really nothing else than a major rapprochement with the social democracy. What is the import of this charge? Nothing less than the C. P. S. U. is coming close to the Social Democracy. Comrade Zinoviev did not say this in so many words. But did he draw a line between himself and this citation from

that Social Democratic rascal? He merely presented it and left us to draw our own conclusions. But by this he wanted to say that in the C. P. S. U. real Bolshevism is advocated only by the poor, suppressed Opposition.

In his speech, Comrade Zinoviev also raised the danger of degeneration in the C. P. S. U. He spoke about tendencies, not about accomplished facts. Nobody has denied that there are dangers that signs of degeneration may occur. Of course, in a ruling Party like the C. P. S. U. in a country in which the Communist Party has a monopoly, such dangers can arise. The degeneration of the C. P. S. U., however, means nothing less than:

1. That it is no longer a truly proletarian Party,
2. That it is no longer fighting for Socialism, and
3. That it is no longer fit to play the leading role in the Communist International. That is entirely clear. How can the C. P. S. U. remain the leading Party of the Comintern if it contains the greatest "deviation" of all of us? The greatest mistakes that were ever made by any Section of the C. I. are after all infantile sicknesses compared with the "bourgeois degeneration", the "bourgeoisification" of the C. P. S. U.

Comrade Zinoviev charges that the Communist International no longer combats Right deviations, but that it persecutes only the ultra-Left. He maintains that he has remained as of old, that he has always combated these deviations and that he continues to do so also at present. I am afraid that Comrade Zinoviev is wrong when he says that he has remained as of old. He has unfortunately changed in many respects. Also in this connection a number of false ideas make their appearance in his statements. First he states that Lenin taught us that the Comintern must primarily fight opportunism, that opportunism is our chief foe. Very true. The foe, the greatest foe, is opportunism, but today it is to be found chiefly and for the most part not in the ranks of the C. I., but in the ranks of the II. International. Secondly, the question must be put in this way that within the Communist International the Right and ultra-Left deviation must be combated equally. Each situation, in each country, must be concretely studied as to where, concretely, the greatest danger lies, and this must be fought. Thirdly, can Comrade Zinoviev maintain that he has really fought these dangers? Yes, Comrade Zinoviev can maintain that for many years, and even very actively, he fought against these dangers. But for his most recent period one must observe the contrary. Did not Comrade Zinoviev long refuse to combat Medvediev and Shliapnikov, i. e. the Right danger in the Russian Party? Did he not long refuse to part company with the German ultra-Left? It cannot therefore be said that in the most recent period Comrade Zinoviev fought this danger in the Leninist sense of the word. The charge directed by Comrade Zinoviev against the leadership of the Comintern, that it is not fighting the Right dangers in my opinion throws a peculiar light upon the former leadership of the Comintern. But this charge has no foundation whatever. Comrade Zinoviev says that we do not condemn the Right mistakes of the Polish Party. But the thesis of Comrade Bukharin gives a sharp, an extremely sharp, condemnation of these mistakes. The thesis likewise condemns the article on the dictatorship of the proletariat, contained in the Czech press, and calls upon the C. C. of the C. P. Cz. to take measures to prevent a repetition of such mistakes. The thesis of Comrade Bukharin speaks about a series of mistakes and shortcomings in the British Party. But can one say that these mistakes of the British Party constitute a "stubborn" Right deviation? In my opinion they can not. Is it not true that the British Party for the most part has already itself recognised these mistakes and that it has openly admitted them here? Peculiarly enough, Comrade Zinoviev suddenly becomes very mild at the place where one can find really "stubborn" Rightists. In his speech here, he could not deny that he had conducted negotiations for the re-admission of Sourvarine into the Communist Party. These are contradictions that no one can afford.

With this I come to the end, and will close with the following:

When Comrade Zinoviev says that we will build up Socialism — he even said we will build Socialism with enthusiasm, then I am afraid that this conclusion at the end of his discussion speech must remain only an empty phrase. How can

anyone build Socialism with "enthusiasm" if one first theoretically proves that the construction of Socialism in the given Soviet Union is impossible, and if one, secondly, maintains that the C. P. S. U., which should direct this constructive work, is beginning to degenerate. If one, thirdly, makes the charge that the Comintern, which must lead the European and American workers without whose solidarity actions the building of Socialism is impossible, is so opportunist that it is hopeless to look to it to lead these proletarian masses on the road of the Revolution. The foundation of Comrade Zinoviev's explanations are not enthusiasm, but pessimism. With pessimism one can

neither build up Socialism in the Soviet Union, nor lead the European and American proletariat to victory over capitalism.

All of us, who for years fought under the leadership of Comrade Zinoviev, had to separate from him the very minute that he united with Trotzkyism. Anyone who unites with Trotzkyism cannot be the leader of the Communist International, he is no longer the representative of Leninism, but he has deserted the banner of Leninism.

(Applause.)

(Close of Session.)

Twentieth Session.

Moscow, December 9th, 1926.

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman):

The 20th Session is opened. We shall continue with the agenda. The next speaker in the discussion on Comrade Stalin's report is Comrade Smeral.

Comrade SMERAL (Czecho-Slovakia):

Comrades, I shall not reply to the many compiled citations of Comrade Zinoviev with other citations, nor will I subject the structure of his speech, which consisted mostly of citations, to a theoretical analysis. Other comrades will be more able to indicate the theoretical deficiencies of his evidence. In the short time at my disposal, I shall try in a very simple manner to present certain contributions as to how the activity of the Opposition affected the foreign comrades and foreign Parties.

First, as to my personal impressions. I am living and working in Moscow here about ten months; I have therefore been able to observe at first hand all the phases in the development of the factional activity of the Opposition. My chief impression is the following: The Opposition has already done very serious damage to the C. P. S. U., the proletarian dictatorship, and the whole C. I. The methods systematically applied by the Opposition during the whole of last year, and which, despite the October declaration and the decisions of the last Russian Party Conference it again applies here at the Enlarged Executive of the C. I., makes a business-like activity of the Party absolutely impossible. The methods that have been applied and that are still being applied here by the Opposition, if there were any chance of their further development, would inevitably directly menace the unity of the Party.

Even upon the stage to which it has now developed, it disturbs the normal work of the Party and of its leading organs in a very critical time, namely at the beginning of the building of Socialism. Thereby, it has done very serious damage to the proletarian dictatorship. But the behaviour of the Opposition not only harmed the C. P. S. U. and the Soviet Power. The Opposition has at the same time made the subject of a disruptive offensive that which has enthused the workers of the whole world, what gave them strength, even in an objectively unfavourable situation of a relative and transitory capitalist stabilisation, to continue to stand true and enthusiastic behind the banner of the revolutionary struggle, true and persistent, without wavering, firm, with unshakable faith behind the banners of the C. I.

During the last nine months, the situation has not always been as it is to-day. To-day we already have a situation in which we can speak of the Opposition with a certain calmness. This was possible only from the moment when the workers in the aeroplane factory in Moscow and in the Putilov works in Leningrad forced the Opposition to a consciousness of the limits of its power. But everyone should realise what a situation could arise for the C. P. S. U., for the proletarian dictatorship and for the whole C. I., if the masses of the Russian workers had not stood this test, had they been less mature, had e. g. even a third of the membership of the Russian Party and the workers in the factories supported the Opposition.

The Opposition did not scruple to apply quite conscious demagogic means, it did not hesitate to exploit the economic difficulties attendant upon the growth of production, political difficulties of the State power, and the really concrete every-

day needs of the workers in order to undermine among the workers the capacity of enthusiastically making big sacrifices for our great task, for our great aim. Faith in the great cause becomes an actual fact which gives the masses and the Party the strength to overcome big obstacles, to reach our great aim despite the obstacles. The Opposition did everything possible to destroy the faith of the masses in the great goal of building Socialism in Soviet Russia.

Just imagine that if during the months of civil war, someone had arisen at the moment in which 14 capitalist States were waging armed intervention against the proletarian revolution, against the not yet consolidated proletarian power in Soviet Russia, just imagine that at that time influential people had arisen from amidst the Communist Party with the intention of depriving these masses of their faith in success and victory. At that time, the possibility of success, the possibility that the little centre that had no Red army, that had at its disposal only volunteers from the ranks of the enthusiastic workers, that had so small a territory that our enemies, supported by the whole capitalist world, stood at the very gates of Leningrad and 30 versts from Moscow, at that time the idea that it was possible to resist the superiority of the enemies' forces, and to come out victorious, was just as difficult to understand and just as easily declared utopian, as is at this time the possibility of building Socialism on a sixth of the earth.

(Interjection: Hear! Hear!)

If at that time anyone had stood up and robbed the workers of the enthusiasm based on their great faith, he would have been a grave-digger of the revolution. And, comrades, to-day also, a great faith, a great courage, is necessary in us all, in the mass, in the Party, in the Soviet State, in the international labour movement, a faith and a courage that are transformed dialectically from ideological conceptions into a real force, that thanks to the firmness of the Bolshevik will, shall result in making also that which some consider as utopian into a truly great liberating fact and reality. (Applause.)

Comrades, for nine months I have had a chance to watch how the manoeuvres of the Opposition, day by day, I might almost say hour by hour, permeated into the simplest, most primitive life and basic needs of Party work. And I felt that even a Party that had a much smaller responsibility than the C. P. S. U., that was not responsible for the destiny, for the preservation of the proletarian power in the largest nation on earth, that did not have the duty of functioning as the leading Party of the Communist International — that even a much smaller Communist Party could not for any long time stand for such an Opposition employing such methods. A group of influential comrades were waging an opposition against the Party leadership at any price. They entered into blocs without any regard for any principle whatever. They take a position on every question without any consideration for principle, just so that if the Politbureau says "black" they will say "white". Had the Politbureau said "white" they would have insisted on the contrary. By their attack on the "Party regime" they rallied all elements crowded to the wall by the regime of proletarian dictatorship.

In the factories they went ahead with the claim that the Party leadership could immediately raise wages, only it did not want to. In a situation in which the raising of the productivity and discipline of labour and the carrying into effect of the economy regime are absolutely necessary premises for socialist construction, they come to the workers with the claim

that Socialism is not even involved, that the industry which is being built up on a most ambitious plan under the direction and according to the decision of the Party, is an industry that is capitalist in character. Before the workers it is maintained that the Party is instituting into the factories a regime of "Administrative autocracy", that the Party is changing into a kulak Party, that it is experiencing its Thermidor, etc. The leading Opposition comrades took no consideration upon the most primitive requirements for the functioning of the Party and its organs.

Their aid was not apparent in the daily practical work, but instead only in malevolent criticism for factional aims. Again and again they provoked a renewal of the discussion on questions which had already been settled by decisions of Party organs, and which should have been carried out with the concentrated forces of the whole Party. They negated the decisions of the Plenum of the C. C. and C. C. C. They did not hesitate at flagrant, repeated breaches of discipline. They did not take into consideration the fact that by their attitude they had created a series of severe political complications and organisational dangers.

Had they not remained so isolated in the aviation factory and in the Putilov works, had they succeeded in rallying around themselves a third of the Party membership and workers, then, under the impressions I received here in Moscow, I am personally convinced that they would not have hesitated in putting on the agenda, seriously and practically, the question of the unity of the Party. The comrades did not confine their disorganising activity solely to the C. P. S. U., they wanted to extend it also into other Sections of the Communist International. I repeat that such an opposition cannot be tolerated over a longer period by any Party, and especially not by the Party called upon for the first time in history to carry out the dictatorship of the proletariat and build Socialism in the largest nation on earth.

Comrades, these are the impressions that the Opposition by their actions evoked in a foreign comrade living in Moscow. How did the Opposition affect the Parties abroad? Here I will not give my subjective opinion. I have in my hand a written document which was formulated some time ago, by a member of our delegation who is now at this Plenum, Comrade Dobrovolny. I will read from his description only a brief but very characteristic citation. Comrade Dobrovolny first says in this document that upon the arising of the Opposition at the XIV. Party Congress there were individual comrades in Czechoslovakia who endorsed the Opposition attitude on individual questions, especially on the question of the warning of the kulak danger. This is therefore a proof that we had no prejudices against the Opposition at any price. By later information, and especially by the further factional activity of the Opposition, even these comrades who did not at first see things clearly, changed their position. And in this connection, Comrade Dobrovolny wrote:

"Likewise we were convinced that the C. P. S. U. did right when it rejected a discussion and all the factional activity of the Opposition. It was clear to us that by the development of a factional struggle in the C. P. S. U., under the leadership of such influential and popular comrades, the dictatorship of the proletariat might be destroyed, and with it all premises for the building of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. This would result in a tremendous strengthening of the self-consciousness of the capitalist world. The proletariat would thereby be flung into a condition of helplessness and terrible suffering for a whole generation. For after the crash of the proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R., it would for a time cease to believe in the possibility of Socialist construction and the feasibility of Socialism altogether. Very difficult would be a new rallying of its forces under far more difficult conditions, and its liberation would be deferred into the dim distant future. The action of the Opposition objectively calls forth the raising of great hopes in the camp of the counter-revolution, from the Social Democrats to the reactionary bourgeoisie."

Comrades, I believe that this citation is very characteristic. Comrade Dobrovolny is the chief editor of the Central organ of one of our strongest Sections. He is closely bound up with the masses and with life. If he was instinctively moved to

remember, in connection with the Russian Opposition, that thereby the downfall of our power in the Soviet Union came into question, if he had this possibility so sharply in mind that all of the terrific consequences to the whole world proletariat arose before him in such living form, then this, in my opinion, is a greater warning for all comrades, and especially for the Opposition, than could be given by the most passionate words of warning. I believe that this citation will suffice to indicate what sentiments the activity of the Opposition aroused among the foreign comrades and in the foreign Parties.

In conclusion, I will say very briefly: the time has come to make a final end to this. The Comintern is the highest forum for all Sections. The leading Opposition comrades, not content with the decisions of the highest organs of their own Party, have appealed to this international body. I am convinced that they will receive just as unanimous and decisive a reply as they were given by the Party conference of the C. P. S. U. There really must be an end to Oppositional factional activities. The work, the authority, the unity of the C. P. S. U., the interests of the proletarian dictatorship, the interests of the Communist International, must no longer be looked upon as a thing with which one can play in factional frivolity. The Opposition cannot leave this Enlarged Executive strengthened and encouraged to further factional manoeuvres, it cannot leave here with a programmatic platform for new efforts to organise factional activity on an international scale. In its own Party it has suffered an absolute rout. It is now also being energetically rejected and condemned by the forum of the Communist International. The whole Comintern will give them a last serious warning by its probably unanimous decision. Once more: we must finally make a complete, definite end to this!

Comrade TROTZKY:

Comrades, first I should like to ask you not to limit my time. The question upon the agenda turns, as on an axis, around the so-called Trozkyism. One of the younger comrades very fittingly made a list — and this list is not even fully complete — of those comrades in this hall that have spoken on so-called Trozkyism: Bukharin, Kuusinen, Treint, Pepper, Birch, Stern, Brandt, Remmele to say nothing of the three hour speech of Comrade Stalin.

This discussion which comes to a close here is a rather peculiar discussion. Our Central Committee, in January this year, addressed a circular to the brother Parties. In this circular it is stated: "The C. C. of the C. P. S. U. is unanimous in the view that the extension of the discussion on the Russian question into the ranks of the Comintern is not desirable." Consequently this international discussion did not take place officially, we, at least, did not participate in it. Yet here a discussion is to be closed which officially was never opened, a discussion which comes to a head in the charge of Trozkyism.

The theory of Trozkyism was artificially manufactured — against my will, against my convictions, against my real views. In order to prove that I am not the responsible political editor of the doctrine of Trozkyism ascribed to me, I will urge this gathering to grant me unrestricted time to speak. (Minimum two hours).

(Comrade Trozky was granted one hour.)

Comrades, I take the floor on this important question even though we have read in to-day's "Pravda", in our Central Organ, that the mere fact that Comrade Zinoviev spoke here is to be characterised as an attempt at factional activity. I believe that this is not correct. The decision of the Enlarged Executive, on the motion of Comrade Riese, to permit representatives of the Opposition of the C. P. S. U. to speak, was not conceived and adopted in this spirit. The speeches of Comrades Thälmann and Ercoli contained an entirely different tone, and the communication from our Central Committee which was read to-day did not say that by our appearance here we would violate our declaration of October 16. Nor is this so. Had the Central Committee said so, I should never have asked the Presidium to grant the floor. To be sure, the Central Committee said that an appearance here might give an impetus to the renewal of the factional struggle, but it left the decision on this to us. In the communication of the C. C., it is recalled that at the V. World Congress, despite an invitation, I declined to appear because the XIII. Congress of our Party had already decided the questions then involved.

Comrades, as against this, I must remind you that the V. World Congress condemned me in a decision because I did not want to speak. In this decision it was said that I was resorting to formal grounds to avoid appearing before the highest forum of the International and expressing my opinion here.

When Comrade Zinoviev and myself maintain that our appearance does not constitute an appeal, so this is of course intended only in the very definite sense that we, first, do not introduce any resolution, that we, insofar as it depends upon our intentions and our actions, will express our ideas in such a way that those comrades in the International who sympathise with us, will not be aroused to factional struggle, but, on the contrary, they will be restrained from factional activity. The charge that our appearance in itself constitutes a violation of the declaration of October 16th, is false, because the declaration of October 16th and the reply to it by the C. C. reserves for us the possibility of defending our ideas in the avenues provided by the statutes.

Comrades, I have already stated that the axis of the discussion is the so-called Trotskyism. Our honourable chairman translated me wrongly when he put the question as if I pretended to stand personally in the centre of the discussion. That is by no means the case. What is involved here is a political and not a personal question. What is involved here is a political question which, however, as already stated, against my will and wrongly, has been tied up with my person and my name, not by myself, but by comrades who criticise our views.

The speech of Comrade Stalin, at least as to its first half — for I have unfortunately been able to read only this in today's issue of the "Pravda" — is nothing else than one single charge of "Trotskyism" levelled against the opposition. This charge is built up upon citations torn from decades of political literary activity, in attempts to answer questions of this day, which arise out of a new stage of economic and social life with us and in the whole International, by diversion, by all kinds of logical manoeuvres with old differences that have been eliminated by the facts themselves. And again, this whole artificially fabricated construction turns around the fact that in my political life, in my political activity, I stood for years outside of the Bolshevik Party, and in certain periods combated quite vigorously the Bolshevik Party and important ideas of Lenin. This was a mistake on my part! The fact that I have entered the Bolshevik Party, and of course without setting any "conditions" — for the Bolshevik Party recognises no conditions in its programme, tactics, organisation and Party membership — this naked fact was a proof that everything which separated me from Bolshevism was discarded on the threshold of the Party.

(Interjection by Remmele: "How can such a thing be discarded on the threshold of the Party!")

This, comrades, is of course not to be interpreted in that formal sense in which Comrade Remmele seems to grasp it, but in the sense that the differences were overcome in the struggles and experiences of political life, for crossing the threshold of the Party means precisely that what was non-Bolshevik in my activity had been eliminated by the facts and by the ideological experiences that grew out of them. In any event I gladly grant Comrade Remmele and everybody else the right to consider himself a better Bolshevik, a more revolutionary Communist, than my humble self. After all, this is not involved. The responsibility for my career I alone must bear. The Party knows me only as its member, who now defends his ideas before this forum.

The differences of that time when I was outside of the Bolshevik Party were quite weighty. They concerned, broadly, the concrete appraisal of class relationship within Russian society and the perspective resulting therefrom with regard to the next Revolution. On the other hand, these differences concerned the methods and ways of Party structure and the relationship to Menshevism. In both of these questions — and I declared this in writing when such a demand was put to me — in both of these questions by far not all of the comrades that are here were in the right as against me, but Comrade Lenin, his doctrine and his Party, were absolutely right as against me. In a reply to comrades who doubted this I wrote:

"We proceed from the point that, as experiences has shown, in all more or less principal questions, whenever one of us disagreed with Lenin, the right was entirely on the side of Lenin."

And further:

"In the question of the mutual relations between proletariat and peasantry, we stand completely on the ground of the theoretical and tactical teachings which Lenin formulated on the basis of experiences in the revolutions of 1905 and 1917, as well as the experiences in Socialist construction (smytchka, fraternisation of workers and peasants)."

The theory which is now dragged into the discussion — quite artificially and not in the interest of the cause — the theory of the permanent revolution — I have never considered and not at that time either, when I did not recognise its "gaps" — as a universal theory which holds good generally for all revolutions — as a super-historical theory as Marx expressed himself in a letter. It was confined entirely to a definite stage of development in the historical evolution of Russia. I know only a single literary product — and this also came to my knowledge only a few weeks ago — in which an attempt was made to create from this theory a universal theory, and to present it as an improvement upon the theoretical conceptions of Lenin. I shall read this citation to you. I need not say that I have absolutely nothing in common with this interpretation:

"Russian Bolshevism, born in the nationally-limited revolution of 1905—1906, had to go through the purification ritual of liberation from all typical features of national peculiarity, in order to win full rights of citizenship in international ideology. Theoretically, this cleansing of Bolshevism from the national taint which clung to it, was carried out by Trotsky in 1905, who tried in the idea of the permanent revolution to bring the Russian Revolution into connection with the whole international movement of the proletariat."

This was not written by me, this was written in 1918 by a comrade by the name of Manuilsky.

(Interjection by Manuilsky: "Well, I said a stupid thing, and you repeat it!")

A stupid thing? I agree — absolutely. (Laughter.) But you need not worry about Comrade Manuilsky. Of course it is a very painful story, for he himself calls it a stupid thing. But Comrade Manuilsky, who has here ascribed to me a quite undeserved magnificent heroic deed, will promptly ascribe to me two equally undeserved mistakes, and in this way he will balance his bookkeeping. (Laughter.)

Comrades, on another occasion in recent years, have I encountered the theory of permanent revolution in that caricatured form which is from time to time retrospectively ascribed to me. This was at the III. Congress. Just recall the discussion that developed on my report on the international situation and the tasks of the Comintern. At that time I was accused of defending almost liquidatory tendencies — although I defended them in complete agreement with Lenin — against several comrades who maintained that the capitalist crisis would proceed permanently and that it would become sharper. My position, that we were confronted with possible stabilisation and marked improvements, etc., and that from this the tactical consequences must be drawn, was branded by some of the ultra-Leftists as almost semi-Menshevik. This was done in first rank by Comrade Pepper, who, as far as I remember at that time made his first maiden appearance upon the stage of the International.

(Interjection by Pepper: "But you had to accept my proposals for the resolution.")

So? Since Comrade Pepper, despite my restricted speaking time, interrupts me from the Presidium, I must remind him that I know of three gospels of Comrade Pepper. The first gospel at the III. World Congress was the following: The Russian Revolution requires a permanent, uninterrupted revolutionary activity in the West, and therefore he defended the false tactic of the March action (Germany 1921).

Then Comrade Pepper went to America and on his return brought back these glad tidings: the International must support the bourgeois La Follette Party because in America the revolution will be brought about not by the workers, but by the ruined farmers. That was his second gospel.

The third gospel we hear from him now: namely, that the Russian Revolution require neither the farmer-revolution in America, nor the March action in Germany, but that it will, quite unaided, build up Socialism in its own home. A sort of a Monroe Doctrine for the building of Socialism in Russia. This is the third gospel of Comrade Pepper. Despite my grey hairs I

am ready to learn also from Comrade Pepper, but it is impossible for me to re-learn so radically every two years.

Comrades, I do not believe that the biographical method can bring us to a decision in questions of principle. Of course, I have made mistakes in many questions, especially at the time of my struggle against Bolshevism. If from this it follows that political questions as such are not to be discussed according to their inner content, but according to biographies, then we should formulate a list of the biographies of all delegates. I, personally, can fall back upon a precedent. There once lived in Germany a man named Franz Mehring, who, after a long and energetic struggle against the Social Democracy entered that Party as a quite mature man, who first wrote a history of the German Social Democracy as its enemy — not as a servant of Socialism, but as its principal enemy — and then he wrote an excellent work on the German Social Democracy as its friend. On the other hand, there are Kautsky and Bernstein, who never opposed Marx openly, and who both stood under the thumb of Friedrich Engels; Bernstein is also known as the one who disposed of the literary heritage of Engels. Nevertheless, Franz Mehring went to his grave as a Marxist, as a Communist, whereas the other two still live as reformist lackeys of capitalism. So, while biography is important, it is not decisive.

Not one of us has a biography free from mistakes and shortcomings. Lenin made the fewest mistakes in his life, but even he was not altogether without mistakes. In our struggles with him we were always in the wrong when more important questions of principle were involved.

Comrade Stalin, who enumerates others' mistakes here, should not forget to count also his own. While the permanent revolution, insofar as it differed from the Leninist conception, was wrong, nevertheless, much was correct in it, which in turn led me to Bolshevism. The permanent revolution did not prevent me, after the experiences in the struggle with Bolshevism in which I was wrong, to embark upon the same tactics, in principle, in America in 1917, which Comrade Lenin proposed and carried out in the Party. After the February Revolution, Comrade Stalin launched upon false tactics which Lenin characterised as a Kautskyian deviation (in an article in "Pravda" and in the resolution on the conditional support of the provisional government). In the national question, in the question of the foreign trade monopoly, in the question of the dictatorship of the Party, and in other questions, Stalin also later made quite serious mistakes, but the most serious of all which he is making now, is his theory of Socialism in one single country.

The history of this question has been excellently portrayed here by Comrade Zinoviev, and I am absolutely convinced that every comrade who takes the pains to study the question carefully — of course not formally, according to the citations, but in the spirit of the writings from which the citations are taken — must inevitably come to the conclusion that the tradition of Marxism and Leninism is entirely on our side. Of course, tradition alone does not decide. One might say: from a Marxist standpoint we are now in duty bound to subject to revision the former decisions on the possibility or impossibility of building Socialism in a single country. Just let this be said! But I see no reason for such a revision. The old slogan retains its full justification, and I believe that the further this theme is developed — it is a very important theme for the whole International and this very thing has moved me to take the floor here — the more this theme is developed, the more the heralds of this new theory come into contradiction not only with the fundamental basis of our teachings, but also with the political interests of our cause.

Comrades, the premise of the theory is the law of unevenness of imperialist development. Comrade Stalin charges me with a refusal to recognise, or with insufficiently recognising this law. Nothing of the kind! The law of unequal development is not a law of imperialism, but a law of the whole history of mankind. Capitalist development in its first epoch intensified extraordinarily the economic and cultural differences between various countries; the imperialist development, i.e. the newest phase of capitalism, has not enlarged these differences of niveau but, on the contrary, has led to a rather extensive levelling. This levelling will never be complete. It will again and again break through the varying tempo of development, and thereby make impossible an imperialism stabilised upon a definite level.

On the whole, Lenin refers the unevenness to two things:

firstly to tempo and secondly, to the level of economic and cultural development of the various countries. With regard to the tempo, imperialism has increased the unevenness to the highest degree; but with regard to the level of the various capitalist countries, it has called forth a levelling tendency precisely because of the variation of tempo. Anyone who does not understand this, does not understand the kernel of the question. Take England and India. The capitalist development in certain parts of India is much more rapid than was the capitalist development in England in its beginnings. The difference, the economic distance between England and India — is this to-day greater or smaller than 50 years ago? It is smaller. Take Canada, South America, South Africa on one hand, and England on the other. The development of Canada, South America, South Africa, has proceeded during the last period with gigantic strides. The "development" of England is a stagnation, yes, even a decline. Therefore, the tempo is uneven as never before in history, but the level of development of these countries has been more closely approximated than 30 or 50 years ago.

What consequences are to be drawn therefrom? Very important ones! Precisely the fact that in certain backward countries of late the tempo of development has become more and more feverish, whereas in certain other old capitalist countries, the development has slowed down or even retrogressed; precisely this fact makes impossible the Kautskyian hypothesis of a systematic organised hyper-imperialism, because in the various countries which are approaching one another in level — without ever reaching this equality — needs for markets, raw materials, jealousies are being developed identically. For this very reason, the danger of war is again becoming constantly sharper and these wars must take on more and more gigantic forms. Precisely through this the international character of the proletarian revolution is assured and deepened.

World economy is no empty conception, comrades, but a reality which has become more and more consolidated during the last 20 to 30 years by the accelerated tempo of development of backward countries and whole continents. That is a fact of fundamental importance and precisely for this reason is it fundamentally false to consider the economic and political destiny of any single country apart from its relationship to the economic whole.

What was the imperialist world war? It was the uprising of productive forces not only against capitalist property relationships, but also against the national boundaries of the capitalist States. The imperialist war was a proof of the fact that these boundaries have grown too narrow for the productive forces.

We always maintain that the capitalist State is not able to master the productive forces developed by it, and that only Socialism can co-ordinate these productive forces which have grown beyond the limits of the capitalist States into a higher and more powerful economic whole. There is no road leading back to the isolated State!

What was Russia before the Revolution, before the war? Was it an isolated capitalist State? No, it was a part of capitalist world economy. This is the kernel of the thing. Anyone who ignores this disregards the fundamentals of all social and political consideration. Why did Russia enter the world war, despite its economic backwardness? Because it had bound up its destiny with European capitalism through finance capital. It could not do otherwise. And I ask you, comrades, what was it that gave the working class of Russia the opportunity to seize power? Above all things, the agrarian revolution. Without the agrarian revolution, without the "peasant war" — and this is what Lenin in his genius predicted and elaborated theoretically — the seizure of political power would have been impossible for the proletariat in our country. Did the peasant war also create the premises for proletarian conquest of power in other revolutions? No, at best, for the bourgeoisie.

Why did our bourgeoisie not seize power? Because it was an integral part of the world bourgeoisie, because with the whole imperialist bourgeoisie, it had embarked upon a downward grade before it seized power, because capitalist Russia was a fraction of world imperialism, and because it was the weakest link in the imperialist chain. Had the all-Russian State been an isolated State, had Russia stood aside from world development, from imperialism, aside from the movement of the international proletariat, if it had known neither the rule of finance capital in its industry, nor the ideological predominance

of Marxism in the vanguard of the proletariat, then, "on its own strength" it could not have reached the proletarian revolution so quickly. And anyone who believes that after the working class seize power, it could withdraw the country from world economy as easily as one turns out the electric light by turning the switch, has a basically false conception of things.

The precondition for socialism is heavy industry and machine building. This is also the most important lever of Socialism, is that not so? How are things with respect to the technical equipment of our factories and workshops? According to the expert statistical estimates of Warzar we find that prior to the war, 63% of our technical equipment, our tools, our machines, were imported from abroad. Only one third was of native production. But even this third was made up of the simplest machines, the more complicated, most important machines, were brought from abroad. If you will consider the technical equipment of our factories, you will see the crystallised dependency of Russia, also the Soviet Union, upon world industry. Anyone who refuses to notice this, who speaks on this matter without even touching the economic-technical basis of the question in its connections with world economy and world politics, remains stuck in bare abstractions and casually collected citations.

In the course of the last decade, we have made practically no renewal of the basic capital of our industry. In the course of the civil war and War Communism, we imported no machines from abroad. That might gradually give rise to the idea that this industrial equipment belongs, so to say, to the "natural resources" of our country and that upon the basis of "natural" foundation, we might, isolated, be able to build up Socialism to its completion.

But these are illusions. We have reached the end of the so-called re-establishment period, we have now reached approximately the pre-war level. However, the end of the reconstruction period is simultaneously the beginning of the re-establishment of our material connections with world industry. We must renew our basic capital, which is now going through a crisis; and anyone who thinks that already in the next years we will be able to produce with our own forces the whole equipment, or a large part of this equipment, is a phantast. The industrialisation of our country, which was set upon the agenda as one of the most important tasks of the Party by our XIV. Party Congress, for the immediate rather extensive future means not the lessening, but, on the contrary, the growth of our connections with the outside world, i.e. also our (of course mutual) dependence upon the world market, capitalism, its technique and industry, and at the same time the growth of the struggle against the international bourgeoisie. This means that we cannot separate the question of the building of Socialism from the question of what is going to happen during the period of the building of capitalist economy. These two questions stand in closest connection with one another.

If we are told: but, dear friends, surely you can build machines yourselves, we reply: "Of course, if the whole capitalist world goes to the devil, we shall in a few decades be able to build far more machines than now. But if we "abstract" ourselves from the capitalist world, — which, after all does exist — if we intend to make with our own hands all machines, or at least the most important of them, already in the immediate future, i.e., if we attempt to ignore the division of labour in world industry, and jump over our economic past that has made our industry what it is now, in one word, if, according to the famous "Socialist" Monroe-Doctrine which is now being preached to us, we are to make everything ourselves, this will unavoidably mean an extreme slowing down of the tempo of our economic development. For it is entirely clear that a refusal to exploit the world market for the filling of the gaps in our equipment, will very seriously slow up our own development. But the tempo of the development is a decisive factor, for we are not alone on the earth: the isolated Socialist State for the time being exists only in the powerful imagination of the journalists and resolution writers. In reality, our Socialist State is constantly — directly or indirectly — under the equalising control of the world market. The tempo of development is not an arbitrary one. It is determined by world development as a whole, because in the last instance world economy controls each of its sections even if the section in question is under the dictatorship of the proletariat and is building up a Socialist industry.

In order to industrialise our country we must import machines from abroad, and the peasant must export grain. Without export no imports! On the other hand, the domestic market cannot consume all the products of agriculture. Thus, through the requirements of the peasantry on the one hand, and of industry on the other, we have been integrated in world economy, and our connections with it (and consequently also our struggle against it) will from month to month become constantly stronger. We are more and more emerging from the isolation of war communism, and we are more and more entering the system of world economic connections and dependencies. And if one speaks about the theory of Socialism in one country and disregards the fact of "collaboration" and the struggle of our economy with the capitalist world economy, then I believe this is metaphysical sophistication.

Comrades, the rather one-sided discussion that has thus far taken place on this question, has in any event already had this good result of moving Comrade Stalin to express his ideas somewhat more clearly and sharply and just thereby show their complete fallibility.

I take the most important sections from the first half of Comrade Stalin's speech in which the fallibility of the whole theory stands before us, so to say, black on white.

Comrade Stalin asks: "Is the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union possible? But what is the meaning of 'building up Socialism if one translates this formula into the concrete language of classes? It means the overcoming of our Soviet bourgeoisie with our own forces in the course of the struggle. (Just observe these thoughts! L. T.) Therefore, when one speaks of whether it is possible to build Socialism in the Soviet Union, one wants to say thereby: is the proletariat of the Soviet Union, able with its own forces, to overcome the bourgeoisie of the Soviet Union? Thus, and only thus, stands the question in solving the problem of building Socialism in our country. Upon this question, the Party gives an affirmative reply."

Here the whole question is therefore reduced to that of whether we are able to overcome our own bourgeoisie, as if the whole solution of the building of Socialism was already contained in this. No, that is not the case! The building of Socialism presupposes the destruction of the classes, the substitution of class society by the Socialist organisation of all production and distribution. What is involved here is the overcoming of the contradiction between town and country, which again demands a deep going industrialisation of agriculture itself. And all this also while we continue among capitalist surroundings. This question cannot be identified with a naked victory of our internal bourgeoisie.

One must always bear in mind that in various cases the words "victory of Socialism" have been understood differently. If we say, as Lenin did in 1915, that the proletariat of a single country can seize power, organise Socialist production, and take up the struggle against the bourgeoisie of neighbouring countries — what did he mean by the organisation of socialist production? That which we already have accomplished in recent years: the factories and workshops were taken from the bourgeoisie, the necessary steps made for the assurance of production at State cost, so that the people can live and build and defend themselves against capitalist States, etc. This is of course also a victory of Socialism, it is likewise an organisation of Socialist production, but it is obviously only the first beginning. From here, to the building of a Socialist society is still a very long way.

I repeat: when we speak of the building of Socialism in the full sense of this word, this means the destruction of classes, and furthermore also the dying off of the State. Now, says Comrade Stalin, we will carry out Socialist construction in the full sense of the word when we shall have overcome our bourgeoisie at home. But comrades, we really need the State and the army against the foreign foe. These things remain, comrades, as long as the world bourgeoisie exists. Can one believe, further, that from our own internal sources, economic as well as cultural, the classes of proletariat and peasantry will dissolve into a uniform Socialist planned economy, even before the European proletariat will capture power? For this purpose, we must still develop our technique a very long way, and the premise for this is a growing grain export and a growing machine import. But for the time being, the machines are in the hands of the world bourgeoisie and it is also the purchaser of our grain. For the time being it dictates our prices, and thus we fall into a certain dependence upon and struggle with it.

In order to overcome this dependence it is by no means sufficient to overcome our own bourgeoisie, for what is involved is not the political elimination of the bourgeoisie — we already eliminated it politically in our country in 1917 — what is involved, is, despite the capitalist encirclement, i. e. the (economic, political and military) struggle with the world bourgeoisie, to build up the isolated Socialist State. This can be done only if the productive forces of this isolated, and, for the time being, still very backward state become stronger and more powerful than those of capitalism. Insofar as this involves not a year, or ten years, or even two decades, but a whole series of decades that are necessary for the complete building of Socialism, we can achieve this only if our productive forces show themselves more powerful than the productive forces of capitalism. The question, therefore, does not follow upon the struggle of the proletariat against its own bourgeoisie, but upon the decisive struggle of the isolated new socialist society against the capitalist world system. Only in this way can we put the question.

Now we hear further:

"If this were false" — says Stalin — "if the Party had no ground to maintain that the proletariat of the Soviet Union is in a position to build up Socialist society despite the fact that our country is relatively backward, then the Party would have no reason (no reason! L. T.) to continue to retain power, it would be compelled to surrender power and continue as an oppositional party".

Then he repeats:

"One or the other" — says Comrade Stalin — "either we are in a position to build Socialism, and to finally build it, to overcome our national bourgeoisie — and then the Party must retain power and in the name of the world-wide victory of Socialism, it must direct the work of Socialist construction in this country. Or else we are not in a position to overcome our bourgeoisie with our own power, since we cannot reckon with immediate (why: "immediate"?! L. T.) aid from abroad by the victorious revolution in other countries, and then we must openly and honestly withdraw from the government and take a new direction towards the organising of a new future revolution in the Soviet Union. Can the Party lie (Why: "lie"?! L. T.) to its own class, and in this case to the working class? No, it cannot. Such a Party deserves to be destroyed. Precisely because our Party has no right to lie to the working class, it must openly admit that the lack of certainty (not a defeat, but only the lack of certainty?! L. T.) with regard to the possibility of the building of Socialism in our country leads to the problem of power and the transition of our Party from the position of a governing party to that of an oppositional party".

All this is absolutely false. Now, comrades, what did Lenin say about this?

(The chairman, Comrade Kolarov, calls the speaker's attention to the fact that his time has expired).

I was told that I would get an hour, just like Comrade Zinoviev. The hour of Comrade Zinoviev, however, lasted an hour and 35 minutes. (Laughter.) I hope that you will give me the same time.

I have hardly said half of what I wanted to say to you. Of course, you have the full opportunity to deprive me of the floor now. That depends upon you. But I am only just beginning on the most burning questions.

Now, comrades, we have always maintained that our revolution is a part of the proletarian world revolution, which, while it may develop more slowly, is certain of its victory — and with this also our victory. We have always stigmatised the partiotic opportunists who considered the destiny of Socialism only in the isolated perspective of their particular state, regardless of whether they were flirting with the revolutionary idea, or like most of them, they openly discarded this idea and accepted the reformist standpoint. We have always said that the proletariat of one single country had no right to wait for another country if it had any chance whatever to go forward, to seize power, to develop Socialist construction or exert military pressure, or more exactly, whether the one thing or the other, for only in this way does the world revolution develop. That our Party at the head of the proletariat seized power, that we are successfully building socialism, that thereby we have given the world proletariat a great example, that we

are more and more consolidating our country economically and politically on a socialist road — all this is self understood — is there any dispute about this? But precisely because we are a section of the world proletariat, of the world revolution — and that we foster its victorious development by our Socialist construction — precisely for this reason we cannot demand any special guarantee that in our country we shall build up Socialism independent of the world revolution. But here it would seem that we, if we had demanded this guarantee (from whom?) and had not received it, we must resign, precipitate a ministerial crisis, and go over into the Opposition to the Soviet State. Surely, is not this a fundamentally false formulation of the question?

But Stalin himself probably scarcely thinks in the way that he formulated in his report. Otherwise he also should have resigned long ago. How did matters stand until very recently? Comrade Zinoviev has already read a citation by Stalin in 1924. Nevertheless I must repeat it, for, if things stand this way, that unless we get a guarantee in advance of the possibility of building Socialism in a single country, we must resign from power, then I must ask; how about Comrade Stalin in 1924, not before Christ, not before the imperialist epoch in which the law of the unevenness of development is supposed to have been still unknown, but only two years ago? I again remind you that Comrade Stalin at that time wrote the following:

"In order to overthrow the bourgeoisie the efforts of one country are sufficient. This is shown us by the history of our revolution. For the final victory of Socialism, for the organising of Socialist production, however, the efforts of one country, and at that of an agrarian country like Russia, will not suffice — for this we require the efforts of the proletarians of several highly-developed countries".

Yes, but in 1924 we did not resign from power, we did not go over to opposition to the workers' State! Just think this over! If the tradition of our Party, if Bolshevism, if Leninism really at all times demanded the faith in the possibility of the final victory of Socialism in a single country (and at that in a backward country) without a world revolution — if everyone who does not accept this is to be branded a Social Democrat, how does it happen that Comrade Stalin, who surely should know the traditions of our Party from his own experience, could write these lines even as late as 1924? Please explain this to me!

And now another riddle. I show you here the programme and statutes of the Russian Leninist Communist Youth League. If you wish I will lay this little booklet upon the Presidium table. This programme was adopted by our Party in Sept, 1921, as a guide to the training of our whole youth movement. In the fourth paragraph of the programme for the workers' youth movement it is stated (please pay close attention, especially you comrades from the Young Communist International, because our Russian Youth League is after all a part of the Young Communist International):

"In the Soviet Union State-power is already in the hands of the working class. In three years of heroic struggle against world capitalism the working class has established and fortified its Soviet power. Although Russia possesses enormous natural resources, it is nevertheless an industrially backward country in which a petty bourgeois population predominates. The country can arrive at Socialism only through a proletarian world revolution. Into this epoch of development we have already entered."

What is that? Perhaps pessimism? Discouragement? Perhaps even Trotzkyism? I am not at present in a position to judge. But this is found in the programme of our youth organisation, which contains more than two million young workers and peasants. And if in defence of the new theory of Socialism in a single country it is said: surely, but one must give our youth a perspective — that is a favourite argument with Comrade Stalin — otherwise they might succumb to pessimism, to discouragement, or — God save us from this, especially at this late hour! — to Trotzkyism, then I will ask: why has this misfortune not already overtaken us if the youth has already such a Trotzkyist programme for the last five years!

(Chairman, Comrade Kolarov, calls Comrade Trotzky's attention that his time is up by ringing the bell.) They always interrupt me in the most interesting places. I beg the Pre-

sodium and the Plenum to grant me the 35 minutes I have mentioned.

The Chairman: Your time has expired.

Comrade Trotsky: I am extremely sorry but of course I can do nothing but submit to the resolution that you intend to pass. The important arguments, however, which I wanted to present, will, though unexpressed, nevertheless retain their objective validity.

For this is not the last meeting of our International. And although this resolution will be adopted here unanimously — of that we are quite certain — especially after today's speech by Comrade Smeral, who so expertly accuses us of Social Democratic deviations — the facts nevertheless remain in existence. The facts will demonstrate their power, and the power of these facts will lend new strength to our arguments. This question will come up again at the sessions of our International, and I am firmly convinced that if not I then some one else will present before the Communist International the arguments that you have today refused to permit me to elucidate, and which for all this retain their validity on this extremely important question.

COMRADE KOLAROV (Chairman):

The next speaker will be Comrade Bukharin.

Comrade BUKHARIN:

(Comrade Bukharin's appearance in the rostrum was the signal for an outburst of cheering and the singing of the "Internationale".) Comrade REMMELE: "Long live the unity of the C. P. S. U.!" (repeated applause).

First of all I would like to make a few fleeting remarks concerning the speech of comrade Trotsky. I will analyse the most important questions Comrade Trotsky dealt with in his speech when I will deal with the speech delivered by Comrade Zinoviev. I have in mind that Comrade Trotsky said that Comrade Zinoviev "excellently proved" the falsity of our views.

First of all a slight formal remark. Comrade Trotsky said from this rostrum that he did not intend to appeal to the International, that all he wanted to do was to defend his "ideas". But definite political differences of opinion exist over these "ideas"; and the greater part of these disagreements have already been settled by our Party. To defend these "ideas" now, means to defend them in spite of the decisions of our Party. Of course, Comrade Trotsky has the formal right to do this, but in the German language, as indeed in all other languages, this is described as an appeal.

With regard to the V. Congress. The V. Congress invited Comrade Trotsky to speak, but as he did not speak, his silence was condemned, to a more or less degree. The present Plenum, however, did not invite Comrade Trotsky to speak here. Consequently, from the formal point of view the situation is altogether different. Since Comrade Trotsky has referred to the V. Congress, it would have been better on his part if he had not remained silent about the resolutions passed at that Congress, particularly on the question of Trotskyism. It is not in the least to the advantage of Comrade Trotsky to refer to the V. Congress. The second remark refers to the theory of permanent revolution. Comrade Trotsky here declared that in all the important disagreements between Comrade Lenin and the other comrades, Lenin always proved to be right in principle. This is true. We think that the theory of permanent revolution should be included in the complex of questions in which differences were revealed and in which Lenin proved to be entirely right. But in the speech which Comrade Trotsky delivered today he said that he saw some "gaps" in the theory of permanent revolution. He said that he had not noticed these defects in the theory of permanent revolution before. This is rather vague, to put it mildly. If you speak only of certain "gaps", certain "defects" in an essentially correct theory, then apparently the theory as a whole remains untouched. The theory is correct — says comrade Trotsky. As experience has shown, however, it suffers from certain gaps. But they are only gaps, and nothing more. Comrade Trotsky, registers this fact as it were. But I think this admission is far from adequate. Comrade Trotsky, in giving his estimation of this theory as a whole, never declared that it was incorrect. We have never heard such a statement made up till now, and I think we did not hear it made in the

speech which Comrade Trotsky delivered today. This is my second remark.

My third remark bears an altogether fleeting character. Comrade Trotsky said here that there was no sense in going over the biographies of certain comrades. But in the very next breath he began to deal with the biographies of Comrade Manuilsky and Comrade Pepper. When Comrade Trotsky, in dealing with the biography of Comrade Pepper, declared that the latter was advocating a Monroe doctrine to be applied to Socialist construction in the U. S. S. R., he of course also had in mind other comrades. But if we shall live, as well from the capitalist point of view in the U. S. S. R., within the framework of Socialist construction as America lived under the conditions of the Monroe doctrine, it will not be so bad. We shall then, at the proper time, begin to worry about our expansion.

As for his own biograph, his own life and acts, Comrade Trotsky among other things, said that in America he maintained the same line as Comrade Lenin, and that he almost anticipated this line. This is not true and I, so to speak, am a living witness of the very opposite. In America, Comrade Trotsky — and I think he will not deny this — was a strong opponent of the Zimmerwald Left Wing. On many occasions he asked me ironically: have you got a Zimmerwald Left Wing in the North Pole? (although as is known, America is not the North Pole). This position of Comrade Trotsky is an important line of demarcation. In America Comrade Trotsky was an opponent of the Zimmerwald Left, and now this is described as "conducting a Leninist policy". This, again, putting it mildly, is "a slight deviation from the truth", connected with what is certainly not a little boastfulness.

Now I come to the question of unevenness of development. In his speech Comrade Trotsky said that a process of levelling is going on, a growth of world economy, etc. This is an elementary truth, like twice two are four; no one will dispute this. Further, Comrade Trotsky made it appear that Comrade Stalin, in his report, completely ignored the levelling tendency. This is not true. No-one asserted anything of the kind.

As a result of this excessively simple and excessively vulgar approach to this question, Comrade Trotsky, in estimating the State of the U. S. S. R. arrives at an excessively vulgarised interpretation of the question. His principal thesis in this connection is: the more we will develop, the more we shall be dependent upon world economy. And here he puts a full stop. This is only a half truth, and therefore an untruth. The process of our development in connection with the world market is full of contradictions. On the one hand we become largely dependent on world economy, and on the other hand, although this may sound paradoxical, we become more independent. Our economic base becomes more stable as a result of our utilising our contacts with the capitalist countries abroad. Here there is a dialectical contradiction. We must not look only at one half of the process and completely ignore the other half. This is a wrong method of presenting the questions.

What perspective would we obtain if we took only the half assertion made by Comrade Trotsky concerning the state of the U. S. S. R.? It would be a perspective of the U. S. S. R. becoming a component part, an auxiliary of capitalist world economy (a voice "Quite right"), and nothing more. And yet this is a decisive point in Comrade Trotsky's logic. Of course, it is absolutely true that Russia of the past was dependent upon foreign capital. "Twice two are four!" We imported various kinds of machinery — "twice two are four!" We exported grain — "twice two are four!" It was quite jolly to listen to Comrade Trotsky's speech, but it was quite impossible to believe that what he said was serious.

Comrade Trotsky brought forward another argument: he said that we must not stamp underfoot the whole of our economic history. Could a revolutionary say things like this? In October 1917 we "stamped underfoot our economic history" rather zealously (laughter). Where is the sense in a statement like this? It has only one meaning, and that is, that there can be no definite "leaps" in economic development, that there can be no change in the direction development is taking. Of course we cannot entirely "abstract" ourselves from history, for we are proceeding forward with the past as our starting point. But when "we are brought" to an assertion that we "must not stamp underfoot our economic history", it is a "bit too much", it is not true, it is a denial of the revolutionary break with the past, it is — going back to the previous stage of history through

which we have already passed. Such a method of presenting the question is too vulgar and therefore it is wrong.

Now the last remark concerning Comrade Trotsky's speech, Comrade Trotsky disputed Comrade Stalin's thesis that: the construction of Socialism in our country means "overcoming our own bourgeoisie by our own forces". In doing so he told us that we have already overcome our bourgeoisie. In this formula of Comrade Trotsky's there is a "slight defect, namely, he has dropped the word "economic". Comrade Stalin did not speak about politically overcoming, not about overthrowing the bourgeoisie. This we have done, in spite of some resistance put up by certain comrades already in October; it must be said Comrade Trotsky helped us to overthrow them.

To bring forward arguments to prove this would be inipid. Twice two are four! But this is not the point of the argument. The argument is over the economic defeat of the bourgeoisie by our own forces. It means, shall we squeeze out the bourgeoisie from our industry and from our wholesale and retail trade? More than that; it means shall we overcome the permanent growth of capitalist tendencies, which again and again spring up on the basis of peasant petty bourgeois economy? If we fulfil this task, will it not signify the victory of Socialism? What else can it signify? Comrade Trotsky committed a "slight", a very slight mistake. He left out the word "economic". And it is just this word that is decisive.

Comrade Stalin is quite right in thus formulating the question of the victorious construction of Socialism in our country. All these are various formulations of one and the same problem. The possibility of constructing Socialism in our country, or, the possibility of overcoming our bourgeoisie by our own forces, or, the possibility of victorious Socialist revolution in our country — they summarise the question of the character of our revolution. I repeat all these are various formulations of one and the same problem. Hence Comrade Stalin was quite right.

Comrade Trotsky made another mistake in his argument. He spoke about the State dying out; he spoke of a situation in which the State has already ceased to exist, as being the fundamental feature of Socialism. But this would not be Socialism, but fully realised Communism. Now I will not talk about such "shades" and "trifles" as the difference between Socialism and Communism, although Comrade Trotsky ought to understand these things a little better.

If, for example, we assume theoretically that we have achieved great successes in the realisation of Socialism, then our State would already be in a moribund stage. If that was the state of affairs in our country, then, in view of the existence of capitalist States and consequently, the necessity for our having to maintain an army, that army would be an extremely peculiar army, an army without a class basis. The function of this army would be, as it were, to perform a public duty, and not to serve as an instrument of the State. It would be "the armed nation" but not the army of the State.

These are the remarks that I considered it necessary to make in connection with Comrade Trotsky's speech, insofar as he dealt with "his own" theme and did not develop Comrade Zinoviev's theme. But I will deal in detail with the deductions he makes on the questions which are really the subject of the debate when I reply to the speech of Comrade Zinoviev.

I now come to Comrade Zinoviev's speech, and in part to the most important sections of the speech delivered by Comrade Trotsky. This, however, I must again preface by several remarks of a formal character.

Unfortunately, I, like other comrades, was unable to read the stenographic report of Comrade Zinoviev's speech, although all the comrades observed that Comrade Zinoviev read his speech and therefore it must have been prepared. The manuscript, however, was retained, apparently for the purpose of depriving us of the opportunity of studying the contents of that speech and to prepare the reply to it. This is, so to speak, a hypocritical approach to petty affairs. But, similar ambiguity is revealed in the approach to much larger questions.

Comrade Zinoviev, and in part also Comrade Trotsky, says that they are not "appealing". As a matter of fact, this is not true. Here they referred to the decisions made by the Central Committee, but it is stated in black and white that our Central Committee would regard their appearance here as an appeal, although formally the comrades, of course, have a right to come here. Actually, they appeal, but at the same time they "formally"

declare: "We are not appealing". This is not a "proper" way of dealing.

Now with regard to the political aspect of the speeches. Comrade Zinoviev from this rostrum said: "I am not conducting a factional fight." But what is the actual position? The speeches delivered here at this Plenum imply nothing more nor less than the continuation of the factional fight on an international scale. In the introduction to his speech Comrade Zinoviev stated that he cannot refrain from speaking because he has been President of the Communist International for many years and that it would be indecent, so to speak, for him to remain silent. Well, we will let that go as an argument. Comrade Trotsky justifies his coming to speak here on the ground that the question of Trotskyism is an "urgent" question. Comrade Kamenev has also put his name down on the list of speakers. Is it because he has been at the head of the Commissariat for Trade? There are other comrades of the Opposition in reserve. The general outline of the picture is now becoming clear. The comrades, so to speak, have drafted a whole opposition platform. The first part was read here from a manuscript by Comrade Zinoviev. The second part was spoken by Comrade Trotsky, the third part will perhaps be read or perhaps spoken by Comrade Kamenev. Others will "supplement" it. What is the object of all these speeches? There is not the slightest doubt about what the calculations are based upon. Next to the opposition in our Party, the strongest opposition in the Communist International is that in the German Party. This opposition has revealed its complete incapacity for ideological production. It stands in need of international support. This is quite logical. Without the "state aid" of the opposition of the C. P. S. U. (laughter) without this aid the opposition in the German Party is "doomed", and these representatives of the backward non-Bolshevik, partly petty-bourgeois strata of the proletariat, would be liquidated. The theory of permanent revolution is triumphant in this point. "For the sake of appearances" the comrades say that they are not carrying on a factional fight, but actually we see preparations being made for new acute factional struggles on a much wider scale. Whether this fight will be successful is another matter, but that such an attempt has been made here, there is not the slightest doubt.

This also is hypocrisy, political hypocrisy. It is a diplomatic move and not a frank political line.

We see the same thing in other spheres. I would say that this is what happens in the discussion of almost every more or less important political question. Always this ambiguity, always this wriggling. Take for example the problem of stabilisation. We have repeatedly pointed out to Comrade Zinoviev that in one of his speeches he simultaneously expressed two different points of view. On the one hand he "admits" relative stabilisation, on the other hand, he "does not admit". We have repeatedly asked Comrade Zinoviev about this. He has had repeated opportunities to reply to this, but he has not done so.

What are we to understand by all this? What's the game? The meaning of it is that in paying their tribute to truth the members of the Opposition have to admit partial stabilisation; in posing as "Lefts" they have to deny it. Subsequently, according to circumstances, Comrade Zinoviev will say: "I have said before that there is no stabilisation." Or: "I have previously recognised the fact of capitalist stabilisation"; or "We were able properly to foretell", etc. All this is very clever, but too transparent. Thus, in this question the Opposition employs political hypocrisy.

Now I will deal with the celebrated question of the construction of socialism in the U. S. S. R. Comrade Trotsky in part and Comrade Zinoviev, to a considerably greater degree, are carrying out a definite strategy in this question, as almost in all others. This strategy is to present the question in a different way, not to bring out the fundamental radical points of difference for discussion, but those points which are outside of the discussion. And this is done "awfully" cleverly. I consider it my duty to expose this manoeuvre and to show that we approach this task in an absolutely correct manner, that we have firm convictions and a definite line, whereas the opposition is playing an ambiguous game in this question. I will prove this by a single quotation, and I think I will earn the gratitude of the members of the Plenum, if I will limit myself throughout the whole of my speech, to a single quotation and that quotation from Comrade Zinoviev himself.

In what way is this substitution of one question by another brought about? It is precisely with this we have to deal.

First, all of us without exception recognise the international character of the Russian Revolution, which is a component part of the world revolution. No one in our Party disputes this. Comrade Zinoviev, and in part Comrade Trotsky, ascribe the very opposite views to us. This is their manoeuvre: What has been said above is elementary truth. The postulate which lays it down that our revolution is and must be a component part of the world revolution, is an axiom, like two and two are four. On this question there is absolutely no disagreement. Something entirely alien is ascribed to us. This is a slander on our Party.

Second: we admit the other axiom which says that the final, practical victory of socialism in our country, without the aid of other countries and the world revolution, is impossible. The fundamental antagonism between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist countries can be settled only by world revolution. This is an elementary truth. To ascribe an opposite opinion to us means to slander the whole of our Party. For on this question there is not the slightest disagreement between our Party and the Opposition. Why then do they ascribe the opposite to us? In order to divert the attention of the comrades from the fundamental disputed problems to other problems concerning which there is absolutely no disagreement. The trump card in this game is quotations. Quotations are good things, especially if you quote properly (laughter). This should also be taken note of. Quotations in themselves are excellent things, but unfortunately, quotations are brought forward as proof of things which no one denies.

The Opposition says that Lenin was in favour of linking up our work of construction with the international revolution; that Lenin considered that the final victory of Socialism is impossible without a world revolution, that Lenin's point of view was an international point of view. All this is excellent, magnificent, and we all associate ourselves entirely with every one of these postulates and with all the quotations from Lenin. The misfortune, however, is that all this has nothing to do with the case. In order to understand what the argument is about it is necessary to make a differential analysis, and in the first place present the question in as clear and distinct a manner as possible.

In order to make the question clear it is necessary to analyse three fundamental questions:

1. Capitalist intervention or war against Soviet Russia.
2. World capitalist economy, world economy and the U. S. S. R.
3. The internal difficulties arising in the U. S. S. R. out of internal contradictions.

I will attempt to analyse the problem in these three cross-sections and you will be convinced that we are right.

I take up the problem from the cross-section: armed struggle, war, intervention. I have said already that there is a fundamental antagonism in principle between us and the capitalist world. Although we are relatively dependent upon foreign capitalist countries, yet, every day we become more and more independent. Socialism will continue to grow day by day in our country. At the same time the antagonisms in principle between us and the capitalist world surrounding us, will become more acute. Our revolution is laying the basis for world revolution, but our state and our economy, insofar as we are administrating them, serve as the crystallising point for the proletarian world revolution.

The world revolution is a process and a rather prolonged process. It is a whole epoch. Of course, I hope, I know that this epoch will be considerably shorter than the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, but it must be borne in mind that the revolution in England took place in the 17th century, the great French revolution took place at the end of the 18th century. A number of bourgeois revolutions took place later than that quite apart from the growth of capitalism, in certain mediterranean countries, Italian republics, in Spain, etc. The present revolutionary epoch will be much shorter. But even with an accelerated process of revolution we must not calculate on revolutions taking place in many countries immediately and simultaneously. There are more grounds for assuming that revolution will commence in one country, or in some complex of countries.

Wars and struggles will take place between Socialist countries and capitalist countries. Before Socialism is introduced in Central Africa, for example, prolonged wars will take place

between Socialist states and various large-scale capitalist coalitions. The process is developing unevenly. It will take up a whole, great, historical epoch. But history has bluntly put the question: who will triumph in the end? The world will belong either to us or to the bourgeoisie. This is quite elementary and it signifies that the final victory of socialism is equal to the introduction of socialism in the whole world. Only in this way, and in this way alone, can the question be presented. The bourgeoisie will conduct armed warfare against every Soviet State, against every proletarian state. What guarantee have we that we shall be able peacefully to construct Socialism in this or that country without the armed intervention of the capitalist states? Of course we have no such guarantee. The idea that proletarian organisations and capitalist states can continue eternally to exist side by side is of course Utopia. Such a state of affairs can only be temporary. This goes without saying. Consequently, our perspective is one of inevitable, armed conflicts between capitalism and ourselves. I declare, categorically, that the final victory of Socialism is the victory of world revolution, or at least the victory of the proletariat in all the decisive centres of capitalist power. We say quite definitely: unless we have world revolution, unless we have the victory of the proletariat in the decisive centres of capitalist states, the final victory of socialism is impossible.

This is the manner in which this question is answered.

Second question — world capitalist economy and the U. S. S. R. This is a special question, a question of another order. Is our national economy and our State industry dependent to any degree upon world capitalist economy or not? Of course it is. But along what line does this dependence proceed? First, along the line of exports and imports, i. e., along the line of exchange of commodities. Second, along the line of credit relations, and thirdly, along the line of concessions. These are the three principal lines of dependence upon foreign capitalist countries. Does this affect the internal state of our country? Of course it does. No one will deny this. But the approach to the question must differ somewhat here from the approach in the first instance. Let us see what would happen if the U. S. S. R. was in a state of complete economic isolation, i. e. in the event of our economy being completely blockaded. In my opinion such a complete blockade is impossible without war being conducted against us. But for the sake of argument, let us take the impossible as being practical. Let us assume a case of complete blockade without war. I would like the comrades of the opposition to give us a clear reply to this question: What would happen to us under such conditions? Would we be able to hold out or not? Is our doom inevitable or not? Have we sufficient forces or not? Are the difficulties surmountable in this case or not? Is our doom sealed under these conditions or not? The opposition does not give a clear reply to these questions? And yet they are of vital significance. In my opinion our doom would not be sealed. It would be better if the opposition, from this rostrum, openly gave us a reply to this question. If they did, it would help to clear up the situation. But these comrades waver on this question. In his speech yesterday, Comrade Zinoviev employed the following phrase: "We must always guard against, etc." Of course we must always "guard against": this, so to speak, is the principal feature of our Party but even in this there is no need to exaggerate. The perspective of danger, of the situation becoming complicated, of exaggerated difficulties, as drawn by Comrade Zinoviev does not serve as the key to his approach to this question: Is our doom sealed under these conditions or not?

Of course, we shall meet with many difficulties. Undoubtedly the rate of our development will slow down, but I am far from being convinced that even under these conditions the rate of our development will not be more rapid than the rate of development of capitalist countries. Comrade Trotsky only touched upon this problem, but he lost sight of certain circumstances. If there will be no blockade, and if we are not isolated, the rate of our economic development will be still more rapid. In this we are comparing the rates of our development under various conditions. To compare the rate of our development with the rate of development of capitalist countries is another matter. That is why I think that even in the event of a blockade the rate of our development will be more rapid than the rate of development in capitalist states. At all events, this is not excluded, for, we have a Socialist dictatorship, we have planned economy, which the capitalist countries have not got. The relations between town

and country are different in our country than they are in capitalist countries.

I am unable to deal with this problem in detail, it is an independent question in itself. However, I assert, and I can prove it at any moment, that the inter-relations which are being established here between town and country which relations are new in principle, arise from the more rapid rate of development. Our industrialisation serves as a means, not to ruin, but on the contrary, to fertilise our agriculture. And this circumstance gives rise to absolutely new relations between town and country.

Examining this complex of questions, I must say: We know one capitalist country where the rate of development is more rapid, and that is America. This is explained by the fact that feudalism was never developed in America, that wages there have been much higher, and that the relations between town and country developed differently than in old Europe. That is why the rate of development there is much more rapid.

In our country, however, we have the Socialist dictatorship; in our country quite different social relations are developing, industrialisation does not ruin but on the contrary, fertilises agriculture, it means not the restriction, but the rapid expansion of the agricultural market; in our country the rate of development will be much more rapid than in capitalist countries. Our agriculture and the new-in-principle-relations existing between town and country represent a trump card in our hands and determine the more rapid development. Of course we shall come up against a number of difficulties. In the event of a blockade we should have to construct our productive apparatus quite differently. It will be difficult for us to overcome the so-called shortage of goods. All this is quite true. Quite a number of social difficulties will arise. With this I agree. But in spite of all this, these difficulties will not be insurmountable. Comrade Zinoviev tried to line my "Abc of Communism" against me. But he misquoted from it. In the "Abc of Communism" three main ideas are developed which we defend even now, namely, 1. The guarantee against war and intervention is international revolution; 2. international revolution will help in our case of economic construction; without it it will be difficult to build, but these difficulties are not insurmountable. 3. Within the country there are the materials for constructing Socialist society.

Comrade Zinoviev reproached me for having forgotten the "Abc of Communism". I am very glad to return that compliment to Comrade Zinoviev.

One thing more. Comrade Zinoviev comes here and says: what are you doing? You are denying such an important factor like the world market! Marx said that crises in the home market are determined by crises on the world market, etc. etc.

Comrade Zinoviev dares to assert that these words of Marx must be understood literally and applied to the present state of affairs. But things are not so simple. Under no circumstances must this be understood in the absolute sense. Comrade Zinoviev has forgotten about our monopoly of foreign trade. I must remind you that in saying this Marx had in mind as a premise the existence of free competition. As long as Comrade Sokolnikov, who shares the views of Comrade Zinoviev, and who advocates the abolition of our monopoly of foreign trade has not succeeded in destroying this monopoly, the principal premise for Comrade Zinoviev's theory will remain absent. I again emphasise: even with our monopoly of foreign trade we shall still, to a certain extent, be dependent on the world market. Nobody will dispute this. But to place the present state of affairs on the same level with the past epoch of free competition, when there was no dictatorship of the proletariat and no monopoly of foreign trade, means to read Marx like a first-standard school-boy. Comrade Zinoviev fails to understand the peculiarities of the existing forms, just as he does in the political question, with which he dealt. Comrade Zinoviev quoted from Marx as if to say that revolution in Europe without a revolution in England is a "storm in a tea cup". Consequently you declare that our revolution, and for example a revolution in Germany is a storm in a tea cup. In that case you are indeed very "orthodox" Marxists. I recall that Marx wrote this in 1849. Many years have passed since then. There is no need to revise Marxism. But what would happen if, instead of analysing a new situation with the aid of the Marxist method, we merely quoted from Marx, as Zinoviev does? Marx said: Revolution on the Continent without England would be a "storm in a tea cup". Comrade Zinoviev forgot that at that time capitalism was not

developed on the Continent of Europe. He forgot that England at that time had the monopoly in the world market, which she has now lost. Comrade Zinoviev forgot that at that time there was no dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. Comrade Zinoviev forgot that at that time capitalism was advancing, while now it is in a state of decline, etc. All these things are "trifles" to Comrade Zinoviev, and that is why he comes to absolutely wrong conclusions.

Hence, on this question, the question of the relations between world economy on the one hand and the economy of the U.S.S.R. on the other we may say that even in the event of the most acute conflicts (blockade, isolation) our doom is by no means sealed. Considerable pressure will be brought to bear upon us which will give rise to considerable difficulties, but these difficulties are not insurmountable. As for a combined war of all capitalists against us, we have no guarantee that we will stand out against them. The disruption of capitalism in other countries will create such guarantees for us for the first time.

The third question, strictly speaking, is the central point of the whole discussion. This question may be formulated as follows: is it possible victoriously to construct socialism under the present conditions within our country or not?: or are we inevitably doomed to destruction owing to our technical and economic backwardness, unless we obtain "the state aid of the Western European proletariat"? Is there anything that cannot be understood in this manner of presenting the question? No! This presentation is perfectly clear. As I formulate it, this is a question of the character of the Russian Revolution, or, to employ Comrade Stalin's formula, it is a question of the possibility of economically overcoming our own bourgeoisie. Can we regard this questions a superfluous one? No! On the eve of the XIV. Conference Comrade Kamenov said that we are doomed owing to our technical backwardness. Comrade Smilga also said at the Communist Academy that without the aid of Western European countries we are doomed, because of our technical and economic backwardness. Comrade Trotzky's theory of permanent revolution, which Comrade Trotzky still advocates, also says that owing to our backwardness we are inevitably doomed, unless the world revolution comes to our aid. All this talk includes the talk about building Socialism "in a single street", in a "single house", and similar bouquets of questionable odour. These are off-shoots of social democratic views. The question arises, have we really the prerequisites for Socialist construction, or not? This gives rise to a question of an objectively material character (the question of the economic foundations of construction and the adequacy or inadequacy of this construction) and also the question of the relations between social classes.

There is a connection between the relations of economic forms and the corresponding relation of classes. Social Democrats openly declare: with the prerequisites that exist in Russia, the weakly developed industry, the numerical preponderance of peasant enterprises in economics, to imagine that it is possible to construct Socialism in that country, means to be anti-Marxian and Utopian. Owing to all these causes a Socialist revolution in Russia is impossible. If this revolution should take place, then the objective laws of development, in the opinion of the Social-Democrats would lead to the rise and the consolidation of a new capitalism under the mask of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Is this not the point of view of the Social Democrats? We want our opposition to give a straight reply to this question. Is the victorious construction of socialism in our country possible or not? This is the disputed question. The question is not whether our revolution is a "national" revolution or part of the international revolution. It is quite superfluous to argue about that. Only a non-communist would oppose the interpretation of our revolution as a component part of the international revolution. But to our question we want to have a reply and a clear reply. But our opposition does not give us a clear reply.

But it is precisely the question of the character of our revolution that is of vital significance. The point of view of Lenin on this question is absolutely clear. In his report, Comrade Stalin made two quotations from Lenin: the first quotation is the one in which Lenin says that in our country we have "all that is necessary for the construction of complete Socialist society". Is this not sufficiently clear? In another passage Comrade Lenin says that we are destined to be victorious in the economic struggle if we are not crushed by intervention and

war. This is how Comrade Lenin answered the question. The opposition has declared that the question must not be dismembered in this way; that this is "scholasticism". But if this is scholasticism, comrades of the opposition, then complain to Lenin, who said "if" (if we are not crushed), i. e. who has clearly "dismembered" the question. How can you explain this? Not one of the comrades of the opposition said a single word about this decisive quotation from Lenin.

I know that "magister dixit" — "the teacher said" is not a sufficient argument. Lenin also "made mistakes" as Comrade Trotsky said in order to excuse his own mistakes. But in this case Lenin was absolutely right. There can be no middle position on this question. Are we faced with doom or degeneration in the process of constructing socialism owing to our technical and economic backwardness or not? And if, on the other hand, we can construct Socialism, then please point to the border line beyond which the possibility of constructing Socialism merges into the impossibility. If we have the pre-requisites, the starting points, a sufficient basis and even certain successes in constructing Socialism, then where is the limit beyond which is "doom". There is no such limit.

Comrade Zinoviev pointed out here that this question "was not discussed", etc. etc. This is not true. We discussed this question officially at the XIV. Conference and all the comrades, including comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev voted for the resolution that was passed at the Conference which is drafted on our lines.

But these are only the buds, the flowers have yet to come. Permit me to read to you a quotation from the speech delivered by Comrade Zinoviev at the XIV. Conference. After reading a quotation from Comrade Lenin, Zinoviev said literally the following?

"It is absolutely clear that Vladimir Ilyich (Lenin) considers the complete construction of Socialism in a country like ours possible even with co-operation alone, if we will be guaranteed against international intervention." (Stenographic report of the XIV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. p. 237.)

This is Comrade Zinoviev's formula. The same thing has happened here as took place with the question of stabilisation. Every good leader must be a good prophet and therefore, they foretell all the possible cases, enumerate all the "pros" and all the "cons" all the "semipros" and all the "semi-cons" being perfectly sure beforehand that whatever happens one of the "possibilities" is sure to occur and in a year's time they will say "I rightly foretold what would happen with regard to stabilisation; I was "able to anticipate the line on the question of the possibility of constructing Socialism in a single country, etc." In this way they make various formulae, each completely contradicting the other, in order to be able to refer to them later on. They try to have it both ways. We have no guarantee that Comrade Zinoviev will not come in a few years' time and say to us: "I told you so. Look at this quotation from my speech!"

(The Chairman, Kolarov warns Comrade Bukharin that his time will soon be up.)

I will try to finish with this question quickly.

If these, almost Social Democratic theories which are advocated by our Opposition on the question of the construction of Socialism were right, then their theory of our inevitable degeneration is also correct. If we are too weak to construct Socialism and the international revolution will not come in time, we will be compelled to make more and more concessions. First one concession, then another, then a third; more and more we shall be compelled to retreat. But this cannot go on without end. Sooner or later quantity will change into quality. At last the moment of our degeneration will arrive. And it is this that lies at the basis of the theory of our opposition.

Comrade Zinoviev quoted from my book "Attack" on the question of degeneration. Even now I would sign my name to every word of this quotation. But it has nothing at all to do with the question. In that book I deal with altogether different problems besides, and not only with the question of the possibility of our degeneration. I deal with the imminent tendencies of every proletarian revolution, with the dangers with which every revolution in pregnant. But this is not the question we are discussing. It is a most remarkable thing! Comrade Zinoviev comes here and speaks. He is followed by Comrade Trotsky, and perhaps tomorrow Comrade Kamenev will speak, and not one of them says a word about what their position was for-

merly. This, both from the theoretical and political point of view is dishonest. What about "Thermidor"? Silence. What about the kulak policy? Silence. Divergence between the interests of the masses of the people and the policy of our Party? Silence. And yet we want a clear reply. Comrade Zinoviev tried to pass these questions over in silence at the XV. Conference. We argued with him there. Comrade Zinoviev has probably not forgotten this. Why does he not reply here. Perhaps this is another one of the secret ailments of our Opposition.

We will now go further. What was the strongest argument of the Opposition against the Central Committee of our Party? (I have in mind the autumn of 1925). Then they said: the antagonisms are growing incredibly, but the Central Committee of the Party cannot understand this. They said the kulaks in whose hands all the grain stocks are being concentrated, have organised a "grain strike" against us. That was why the grain was coming in so badly. As a matter of fact the situation is as follows: the figures of the amount of grain purchased in October of this year are higher than that of last year. The figures for November exceed that of last year by 50,000,000 poods. On the whole, the grain purchases have increased by 35% over last year, and this undoubtedly is an achievement in this sphere. According to what the Opposition says the very opposite should have taken place. The Opposition falsely declares that we are helping the kulaks to organise a grain strike. But the actual results prove the very opposite. Perhaps they will say that this is due to a miracle. But indeed, is not the "epoch of monopolist capitalism" the epoch of miracles?

And so it is not we who are mistaken, but the opposition. It was the Opposition that wrongly estimated the class forces, the economic forces. It was the Opposition that was mistaken in its calculations, just as it was mistaken in its calculations at the Avtopribor Works. The very foundations of the principal theory of the Opposition have collapsed. In this sphere, the artificial ideology and the principal arguments of the Opposition have been beaten.

Now a few words about "Thermidor". In this approach to our development there is concealed the embryo of counter-revolutionary ideas. I use a strong expression, but that is the position, and moreover, I cautiously use the term "embryo". Secondly, the comrades who advocate this theory of course, silently ignore the fact that they are revising the principles of the economic doctrines of Marxism. And this again is connected with the question of Socialist construction in our country. A few words about "Thermidor". Martov used this expression as far back as 1921. But we will forget about all the Martovs in the world. Our Opposition again used this expression, perhaps because Martov is already dead and he must have, to use the pleasing expression, a "successor".

Let us examine the question closely. Why was Thermidor victorious and had to be victorious during the great French Revolution? Because all the important economic trump cards were in the hands of the big bourgeoisie. The big bourgeoisie represented large scale production, while the Jacobin dictatorship defended the interests of small production. And this contradiction between the great revolutionary political role of the petty-bourgeoisie and its small producer ideals inevitably led to the victory of the big bourgeoisie, owing to the fact that the proletariat at that time was not yet developed and could not come forward as an independent and leading revolutionary force. But what is the position in Russia? Please explain this, you comrades who chatter about "Thermidor"! Please tell me on whose side is the most progressive economic principle. It is absolutely absurd, sheer ignorance to talk about Thermidor in Russia. Only a very elementary acquaintance with the French Revolution and with our history is required to understand that to talk about Thermidor in Russia is absolutely absurd, and that it reveals vulgarity and downright ignorance.

Take the other problem, the problem of the kulak danger: the kulak will overthrow us, etc. Of course, this is a very serious question. I would ask those comrades who reproach us with "revising Marxism" to explain the following to me: large scale industry is in our hands; small islands of middle size production are in the hands of the private capitalists. In the sphere of trade — wholesale trade is in our hands, and in the hands of the private capitalists is only part of the retail trade. Soviet economy, the principal levers — co-operation, the commanding heights, are in our hands. I would like to know, what is the

starting point. What theory of political economy do the comrades employ who talk about the frightful probability, almost inevitability of the victory of small scale production over large scale production in our country?

There are other questions concerning which some comrades, for example Comrade Zinoviev, has argued with me about. I have said for example, that if the kulak deposits his savings in our savings bank, it would not represent a danger to us, because we would operate with his money, as we thought fit. But the comrades declare that this is the "growing into" the theory of revisionism. For in this process the kulak, etc. may easily obtain a victory over us. But remember, comrades, the theory of the so-called "Democratisation of capital", the founder of which is Edward Bernstein; his followers are now preaching from the housetops the ideology of American capitalism. Bernstein said that to the extent that cooks deposit their savings in capitalist banks, or buy stocks with these savings, capital becomes democratic, or in other words, the lower classes will lay their hands upon capital, peacefully seize industry and overcome large capital.

But in Russia large scale industry is in our hands and all the banks are socialised. Large scale industry is in the hands of the proletariat. Please explain to me then, whether or not our Opposition is interpreting the theory of "the democratisation of capital" in its own way. The only difference is that according to their theory, it is not petty folks who are advancing against capital, but that the democratic kulaks, the small traders, will lay their hands upon the large scale industry of the proletariat. But I think that even here victory will be on the side of large-scale production. A concentrated force must inevitably be victorious. The other approach to the questions is dictated by absolutely revisionist premises. The manner in which the Opposition presents the question does not contain an atom of the economic doctrines of Marx. Confidence in our victory lies deep rooted in the doctrines of Marx concerning the superiority of large scale production. In addition to this, we have the planned management of industry which is unknown to and impossible in the capitalist world. It is upon this that the firm conviction of the correctness of our position is based.

Thus, as far as the theoretical basis of all these theories are concerned, it is not merely a social democratic slip of the tongue, it is thoroughly saturated with the elements of Bernsteinism. We have only to put a mirror to the face of our Opposition and they will see where real revisionism has its habitation.

I will not say much on the theme of the danger of our degeneration. The danger of our degeneration to my mind is closely connected with various manifestations of bureaucracy in our State economic apparatus. But the policy of raising prices would only intensify the state of bureaucracy. Comrade Zinoviev declared that he does not support the raising of prices, but Comrade Piatakov insisted upon this, and he was supported by Comrade Preobrazhensky. They form a bloc. If there are disagreements among them on any question, they ought to come out here and say so openly, for this is one of the most important questions of our economic policy. They do not dare to say this, however. They refuse to understand that a bloc is created with great difficulties.

I will not deal at length with other questions, for example the juggling with quotations from Lenin. Just a few words about that. At the beginning of the war, Lenin wrote for example, that we were on the eve of a bourgeois revolution, and Comrade Zinoviev says that Lenin expressed himself in favour of a democratic republic, and pretends that since then nothing has happened. This is concealed defence of October mistakes committed by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev, and nothing else. (a voice: quite right).

If you really think this, then the theory of degeneration coming as a result of the backwardness of the country is nothing more nor less than a relapse to these mistakes in a new form.

I am now coming to the end, although I ought to deal with various other problems, for example, attitude towards the peasantry, etc.

Comrade Zinoviev dealt with several specifically Comintern questions. He stated that the "Lefts" were being squeezed out and that the Rights were being treated "tolerantly". I would like to say a few words about that. Did Comrade Zinoviev agree with the "open letter" to the Germany Party? He said that the "open letter" was one of the best documents ever issued by the Communist International. But did not the "open

letter", of which I was one of the authors, point out that the so-called "ultra-left" deviations in their attitude towards the U. S. S. R. were a reflection of the bourgeois orientation "towards the West"? At that time, Comrade Zinoviev considered this to be quite correct and that nothing could be more apt.

Now I ask you, has this sharply defined tendency of a Western orientation of the German bourgeoisie increased or diminished? Undoubtedly it has increased. And its reflection? Undoubtedly this has increased also. It is not difficult to understand what follows from this. From this it follows that the so-called ultra-Left deviation, which formerly could be tolerated in our Party has now become intolerable. I have in mind Korsch, and Schwarz and other leaders like them, who formerly were much more "decent" people than they are now. It would be stupid to ignore these changes. The situation is such that we must speak of the grouping of the most powerful forces of capitalism against the U. S. S. R. We are convinced that the U. S. S. R. is the point of crystallisation of all the world proletarian energies. Hence our strong attitude towards ultra-Left deviations. With a clear conscience, we can say: The Korschists and semi-Korschists cannot be tolerated in the proletarian Communist Party for the reason that the "Left" deviation is becoming converted into actual counter revolution (Applause).

With regard to the Right deviations, I ask you: Can we really be charged with being tolerant towards Right deviations? No we cannot. We criticised the Polish Party very sharply, more sharply than did Comrade Zinoviev. We criticised certain of the mistakes of the British Party, and the British Party has admitted these mistakes. Is it good or bad, that we have succeeded in avoiding a conflict and in convincing these comrades of their errors? Of course it is very good. If Ruth Fischer had admitted her errors sincerely and entirely, we should not have expelled her. But she refused to admit her errors, and refuses to do so now, as also do the so-called ultra-Left leaders in Germany whom we have also expelled. Ruth Fischer and the others continue to conduct their own "line". They are progressing in the direction of Korsch. This is a fact. We have criticised all the Right deviations and have achieved successes in this sphere. But Comrade Zinoviev's explanations concerning Souvarine, the Right wing renegade, are absolutely unfounded. He said: I "merely" proposed that Souvarine be sent to England or to China. The baby was "only a little one", still, it was there. Why does not Comrade Zinoviev propose that we send Kautsky to Java? A rebellion is going on in Java. Perhaps Kautsky will be able to correct the mistakes of the Javan Communists. It was proposed to send Souvarine to China! Since when has China become a place of banishment. I have never heard about it. China is confronted with great world revolutionary problems, as we have placed on record here at this Plenum. To China we must send our most revolutionary and most able comrades, who are most loyal to the Comintern. (Applause.) Comrade Zinoviev says: I advised to send Souvarine not to England, but to China. Thank you very much for this proposal; This is how Comrade Zinoviev decrees banishment and scatters favours.

In conclusion, I would like to say the following: The position is such that the Opposition comrades of our Party had the opportunity of speaking here — of course they wished to make a declaration "in connection with Comrade Zinoviev remaining President of the Comintern". But that was not the point at all. The point was that the Opposition comrades are trying to lay down a well drawn up platform as a basis for the whole opposition, including those who have been expelled. This was precisely the object of Comrade Zinoviev's speech yesterday. We must give our reply to this, and I think the Executive Committee will do so. That reply will be made in the resolution. The Parties have now matured, have become Bolshevised. They do not now weakly hope, but are firmly convinced of the possibility of the revolutionary development of the U. S. S. R. They have already become consolidated and they will not tolerate opposition sorties in the Comintern. Comrades, this question must be put bluntly, because only in this way shall we be able to lead the Comintern along the path of revolution.

This is our aim, this is our task, and this task we shall fulfil by maintaining a course for the further development of the revolution right up to the victory of the world proletariat. (Loud Applause.)

(Close of Session.)