

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 72

22<sup>nd</sup> December 1927

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

## CONTENTS

Tang Shin She: Soviet Canton and its Defeat.  
M. M. Roy: Imperialism and Counter-Revolution in China,  
Appeal of the E. C. C. I. on the Events in Canton.

### Against Colonial Oppression.

Willi Münzenberg: Growing Revolutionary Militancy among the Colonial Peoples.

The Brussels Conference of the League against Imperialism.

### The Labour Movement.

August Enderle: The Arbitration Award in the German Steel Industry.

To the Aid of the German Metal Workers!

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

Towards a Latin American Trade Union Secretariat.

The Children's Movement.

The English Press and the Children's Delegation to the Soviet Union.

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

Report of Comrade Stalin (Conclusion).

Report of Comrade Kossior.

Resolution of the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. on the Report on the Activity of the C. C.

The Discussion Before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

L. B.: Discussion Supplement No. 8—10 of the "Pravda".

## Soviet Canton and its Defeat.

By Tang Shin She.

On the 10th December, after eight months uninterrupted fighting since the treachery of Chiang Kai Shek, the first Soviet power was proclaimed in Canton. It put forward a clear programme: Land for the peasants; rice and meat for the workers; away with the Kuomintang, the protector of the counter-revolutionary generals; only the workers and peasants can release the population from its misery. This programme was far more satisfactory to the workers and peasants than that brought forward in August last by the Nanchang Revolutionary Committee, which, because it still worked under the name of the Kuomintang, was mistrusted and therefore had to be dissolved. Now, when the counter-revolutionaries attacked Canton, even the imperialist telegraph agencies had to report that the population sided enthusiastically with the Reds against the Whites. That means that the population is in agreement with and in fact enthusiastically in favour of the Soviet programme.

From the 10th—12th December the counter-revolutionaries were driven from Canton by the workers, peasants and soldiers. Only a portion of the counter-revolutionary troops concentrated on the island of Honam facing Canton, and from there undertook two attacks. The first was repulsed, but the second was successful. As the London "Times" reports, the second attack was successful only because it was supported by warships which fired twelve shots on Canton. Never before had Chinese warships played any role in civil war. If now there is talk of such a great achievement by warships, then it is perfectly clear what warships are referred to here. The British impe-

rialists, the deadly enemies of the workers and peasants, have not only afforded direct help to the Chinese militarists, but they have with the sanction of Parliament squandered three million pound Sterling on war in China. In Shanghai they supported and promoted General Chiang Kai Shek, both in suppressing the workers as well as in the direct, provocative attacks on the Soviet Union. Thus it is the British imperialists who have just crushed the Soviet Power in Canton, and it is they also who are now conducting the fight against the revolutionary front along the whole line.

The Soviet power in the city of Canton has been overthrown. But in the province of Kwangtung, particularly in the East, there still exist numerous district and regional Soviets. In Hunan, Hupeh and Kiangsu, even in the immediate neighbourhood of Shanghai, the insurgent peasants have numerous districts in their hands. In Shanghai and Hankow the strike-wave, as a result of the recent events in Canton, has assumed even larger proportions. The gigantic forces of the workers and peasants cannot be annihilated by isolated defeats. On the contrary, every defeat increases their rage and fighting spirit against the oppressors.

The disintegrating North Chinese militarists and the weak Kuomintang bourgeoisie are not the people who could seriously check the workers in their fight for emancipation. It is the international imperialists against whom the Chinese revolutionaries have to fight. To prevent the attacks of the imperialists and to help the Chinese working masses to victory, that is the

task of the international proletariat. Once already, in the last stage of the Chinese Revolution, the international proletariat, thanks to its reformist leaders, failed to support its Chinese brothers, in that it did not prevent the imperialists from sending warships, troops, aeroplanes, arms and munitions, and thereby helped the bourgeoisie to victory. This time, in the direct fight against the imperialists, the international proletariat must not fail in its duty, but must stand at the side

of the fighting Chinese masses. It must demand immediately: the withdrawal of the imperialist forces from Chinese waters and territory; refusal to grant any means for conducting war in China or any loans for the Chinese military rulers; embargo on transport of arms and munitions to China. Under the slogan of "Hands off China!", the international proletariat must come forward in support of Soviet China and the Chinese proletariat and against the imperialists, against the Chinese bourgeoisie!

## Imperialism and Counter-Revolution in China.

By M. N. Roy (Moscow).

The Soviet power in Canton is suppressed with inhuman ferocity. Even the imperialist news agencies, which have no sympathy with the workers and peasants occupying Canton, report 5000 killed on the first day the counter-revolutionary troops occupied the city. The communists, even those suspected of having communist sympathy, were massacred wholesale.

Dead bodies of revolutionary workers and peasants were carried in carts to be dumped in the river. The streets are strewn with murdered communists.

A good one fourth of the city has been totally destroyed not by the workers and peasants, but by the counter-revolutionary army. Thousands of houses are burnt down as a result of the bombardment of the city. The Soviet Consulate was raided, all the inmates arrested and five, including the vice-consul and a women employee, shot.

This gruesome terror of death and destruction was let loose because a government of the workers and peasants was established in Canton. The bourgeoisie would demolish the city rather than see it in the possession of and governed by the workers. For four years the workers and peasants had defended the nationalist Canton against imperialist aggression. But for the heroic efforts of the workers the nationalist government of Canton would have been overthrown. Now the nationalist bourgeoisie have made a united front with imperialism against the workers and peasants. As soon as the establishment of Soviet-Government was declared British battleships rushed to the scene and American field guns were levelled upon the city. This was to encourage the counter-revolutionary army in its bloody undertaking.

Complete surrender of the nationalist bourgeoisie to imperialism is testified by the decision to break off relations with the U. S. S. R. While issuing the order for the closure of the Soviet Consulates, trade missions and the Far-Eastern Bank, Chiang Kai-Shek stated: "In the early stage of the revolution Soviet assistance was beneficial, but during the past few months communist intrigues have created class dissension that has disrupted the Kuomintang and threatened to destroy its work in China". This is a very significant statement. It means that as long as the Chinese bourgeoisie were carrying on a revolutionary struggle, they needed and appreciated the assistance of the Soviet Republic; but since they have abandoned the revolution and seek the support of imperialism in the counter-revolutionary struggle against the workers and peasants, they must turn back upon the former benefactor.

Class dissension indeed disrupted the Kuomintang. To defend feudal and capitalist interests the Kuomintang betrayed its revolutionary tradition. The disruption of the Kuomintang began as soon as it turned against the working class. Chiang Kai-Shek, who accuses the communists of having disrupted the Kuomintang, was the first to deal a blow to it. Until the Kuomintang won the confidence and secured the active support of the workers and peasants, it could not organise an effective struggle against imperialism. It was with the help of the communists that the Kuomintang found its way to the masses and succeeded in organising them in a gigantic struggle against imperialism. Under the pressure of the masses the Kuomintang became a revolutionary democratic party. Chiang Kai-Shek began the destruction of the Kuomintang when he raised the banner of anti-communism. As the majority of the Kuomintang

would not accept his counter-revolutionary lead, Chiang Kai-Shek split the party and made a united front with imperialism.

The work of disruption thus begun is complete to-day. The Kuomintang does not exist except as a flag of counter-revolution. It is broken up into warring factions who are, however, united in their hatred for the communists, determination to drown the workers' and peasants' movement in blood and their willingness to surrender before imperialism.

Hostility to the workers' and peasants' movement and servility to imperialism are the two sides of the same policy. Experience has demonstrated that an effective struggle against imperialism can only be carried on by the working class. It has also been experienced at the same time that a revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle unavoidably quickens the social struggle. The workers and peasants demand something concrete from the national independence for which they willingly suffer and sacrifice. Anti-imperialist struggle develops by attacking such classes of native society as are related to imperialism.

National revolution must be a social revolution. The Kuomintang turned against the national revolution as soon as its social character became manifest. It became hostile to the workers and peasants because they attacked native reaction simultaneously with imperialism. By turning against the working class the Kuomintang forfeited the support of the only class which can conduct a real struggle against imperialism. With the support of the workers and peasants the Kuomintang became a terror for imperialism; as an enemy of the workers and peasants it must surrender before imperialism.

Rent with internal dissensions, personal jealousy and mutual suspicion, the Chinese bourgeoisie are not able to cope with the powerful workers' and peasants' movement. As nationalists fighting against imperialism and its agents, they had the support of the U. S. S. R. By betraying the national revolution they have forfeited that support. Now they must sell themselves to imperialism or be swept away by the mighty tide of revolution. They have sold themselves to imperialism. The native bourgeoisie have made a united front with imperialism against the national revolution and all its supporters.

The nationalist government's declaration to break with the U. S. S. R. coincided with the following statement by the assistant Minister of Foreign Affairs, Ko Tai-Chi:

"Since Western-educated Chinese are convinced that the Anglo-Saxon road is best for China, they will exert their influence in support of the nationalist government to bring about a new orientation of Kuomintang policy."

This declaration of surrender to Anglo-American imperialism was preface by the usual diatribe against Communism. The worthy spokesman of the Chinese bourgeoisie declared China was determined "to rid herself of communist influence, which is threatening to wreck the revolution". Of course, a "nationalist" government of China massacring workers and peasants to win the good graces of imperialism could not possibly have the friendship of the U. S. S. R. On the other hand Anglo-Saxon imperialists demand a break with the U. S. S. R. as the *sin quo non* for any agreement with the nationalist government. In order to prove themselves fit to "co-operate with the Powers on a basis of equality" (words of Ko Tai-Chi) the

Chinese bourgeoisie break with the U.S.S.R. and flood the country with workers' and peasants' blood.

The above are not words accidentally pronounced. The day before Ko Tai-Chi declared in Shanghai that the foreign policy of bourgeois nationalist China has changed from Soviet to Anglo-Saxon orientation, a very important meeting took place in New York. At that meeting representatives of British imperialism met American financial magnates to define the attitude of Anglo-Saxon imperialism towards the Chinese bourgeoisie that have deserted the revolution and broken up relations with the U.S.S.R. The leading lights of the meeting were Sir Frederick Whyte, former President of the Indian Legislative Assembly, J. P. Rockefeller Jr. and Thomas Lamont. As head of the British delegation to the Honolulu Conference on Pacific relations, Whyte spoke with knowledge of the situation in the East. He said: "China, having — at least temporarily — spurned Russian influence in her internal affairs, is now open to the help that America and Great Britain could give her, and would welcome it."

When this statement made in such a gathering in New York is read together with that made in Shanghai the next day by the spokesman of the Chinese bourgeoisie, the full implication of the situation becomes clear. It is seen how the Chinese bourgeoisie have completely capitulated to Anglo-American imperialism, under whose pressure they break off relations with the U.S.S.R. and perhaps before long will aid in the preparation of war against it. The debacle of the Kuomintang, the betrayal of the national revolution by the bourgeoisie, is hailed by imperialism with great relief. It is hoped that with the aid and encouragement of imperialism the Chinese bourgeoisie will defeat the revolution and make China once again a happy hunting ground for finance capital. The Wall Street magnate Lamont, who had just returned from the East where he had been to arrange about the 40,000,000 dollar loan to the South Manchurian Railway, spoke optimistically about the situation in China. He declared:

"If only our friends the Chinese, realising how keen our sympathy and interests are, could compose their differences to the point of jointly inviting the amicable co-operation of foreign interests, I am certain that the American, British and Japanese would go a long way in assisting national interests in an earnest and sincere endeavour to serve the common cause."

Undoubtedly Ko Tai-Chi's declaration as regards the Anglo-Saxon orientation of the nationalist government was the invitation Lamont asked from the Chinese. If the Chinese bourgeoisie can beat down the revolutionary movement, they will render such a great service to imperialism that this will reward them, may be, with the revision of the unequal treaties.

By themselves the Chinese bourgeoisie are not strong enough to stem the tide of revolution for any length of time. The strength of the Chinese counter-revolution lies in the fact that world imperialism stands behind it. The forces of world revolution must be mobilised in aid of the Chinese workers and peasants.

## Appeal of the E. C. C. I. on the Events in Canton.

Moscow, 15th December 1927.

To all Workers, Oppressed Peoples and Soldiers of the Capitalist Armies!

In Canton, the immortal city of revolutionary struggles, the workers and peasants seized power and the soviet banner, the red flag of the revolution waved over the capital of South China. The unexampled heroism of the workers of Canton is an event of the greatest importance, an event of really world historical importance.

All the forces of the counter-revolution have come into action against the workers and peasants: the foreign imperialists and the bloody hangmen generals of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie of China. These forces are fighting bitterly in Canton. They have surrounded Canton and cut it off from the outside world. Bourgeois telegraph agencies report that red Canton has already fallen and that mass executions of workers and communists have begun, but that the revolutionary

workers detachments of the red army of China have escaped from the ring.

Should this be true, then the victory of the counter-revolution in Canton can by no means be firm and permanent. In five districts of the province of Kwangtung the soviet power is still firm. New struggles are unavoidable. The movement is extending despite partial defeats. The bourgeois counter-revolutionary hangmen generals will be defeated and the imperialist robbers driven out of China. At the present moment however, they are swinging the executioner's axe over the heroic Chinese workers and peasants revolution.

Hasten to assist the revolution! Assist the Chinese Soviets! Prevent the transport of soldiers and sailors, of cannon and rifles to crush the Chinese revolution! Refuse to load munitions! Mobilise your forces! Demand the immediate removal of the imperialist armies from China!

Long live the Soviet power in China! Long live the world revolution!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International.

## AGAINST COLONIAL OPPRESSION

### Growing Revolutionary Militancy among the Colonial Peoples.

The Second Brussels Conference of the League against Imperialism.

By Willi Münzenberg (Berlin).

The Communist International has always taken the greatest interest in the colonial problem. The Communist International was the first, and is today the only workers' International which is attempting to solve the colonial problem in a truly revolutionary sense. The Second International and all its affiliated parties have constantly refused to proceed to a revolutionary solution of the colonial problem. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the various countries leading members of the social-democratic parties were, and are even today, at the same time members of the bourgeois governments, and as such cannot do other than conduct a bourgeois imperialist colonial policy. MacDonald as Prime Minister of the King of England chose air bombs in order to bring the gospel of his socialism to the insurgents of Mesopotamia.

The revolutionary movement broke out in its strongest and most comprehensive form in the largest semi-colonial area, in China. The combined efforts of the leading imperialist countries and the Chinese white Generals in their pay succeeded in damping and driving back the revolutionary movement for the time being. But the latest events in China, the capture of Canton and the peasants' revolts, which are constantly spreading, prove that the Chinese revolution may have been thrown back, but that it is not crushed. Once it gets under way the Chinese revolution is bound to merge into a proletarian revolution. It is true, the one-time revolutionary Kuomintang has completely changed its attitude. Today it is no longer a revolutionary factor but has become a counter-revolutionary factor.

But in China, just as in India, in Arabia, Syria, as well as in Africa, gigantic forces are growing up which are opposing oppression by foreign imperialists as well as capitalist oppression in general. It is true the social revolutionary forces are still hidden in the background, in part pushed back by national revolutionary groups and persons who only in the course of a great revolutionary movement will be pushed on one side.

In the Anti-Imperialist League which was founded at the beginning of the present year in Brussels, there have come together mainly national-revolutionary organisations and groups which united with the representatives of a greater number of really revolutionary, but also a number of pacifist bourgeois organisations of the old capitalist countries.

For us as Communists there can be no doubt as to our attitude towards this Anti-Imperialist League: either the false, un-Leninist attitude of the Opposition, which describes this League straightaway as a plaything as does Zinoviev in his new 21 conditions — or the true Leninist attitude, that is, to support within the League a number of proletarian-revolutionary minded classes and groups and to promote their influence in the League.

The Second International has chosen the same point of view as Zinoviev, and has refused to support or to affiliate to the Anti-Imperialist League. It is true it puts forward as its reason for so doing that the Anti-Imperialist League is nothing else but a Communist, a purely Russian organisation. The tacticians in the Second International have exceedingly regretted the decision of the Executive of the Second International. The consequences of the decision have been that not only the social-revolutionary organisations and groups united in the League have opposed the Second International, but that especially the leaders of the strongest national-revolutionary movements, as those of China, Syria, Arabia and India have turned against the Second International in an even more passionate manner and have characterised the decision of the Second International as "a support of the capitalist-imperialist governments".

It was the venerable old leader of the Indian National Congress Nehru, who spoke in the sharpest terms against the Second International and scathingly denounced the policy of the Second International, particularly that of MacDonald, as being an immediate support of the British imperialist policy in India. Emir Arslan, the representative of the Arab-Syrian National Congress, one of the leading men of the Arab-Syrian emancipation movement, devoted a whole speech to the rejective attitude of the Second International and poured withering scorn upon the social democracy.

It was a member of the Second International Schmidt of Amsterdam, who brought in the resolution against the Second International which was then unanimously adopted with the support of numerous social democratic representatives, as the English member of Parliament Wilkinson, and also Bridgeman, Lefebvre (Holland) etc.

The discussion at the second Conference of the League regarding the Second International and the latter's support of imperialist policy showed that the national-revolutionary and social-revolutionary forces in the colonial and semi-colonial countries are already strong and independent enough to go their own revolutionary way, separated from the socialist leadership, and if the social democratic parties stand in the way of this development, to oppose them also. The course of this discussion proves in the most striking manner the correctness of our view that it cannot be the task of the Communists to stand apart from the Anti-Imperialist League, but that it is necessary to collaborate in the Anti-Imperialist League and to support and to promote all those forces in the League which are compelled by their economic position to strive not only for a national-revolutionary but also for a proletarian revolution.

How far the revolutionary attitude even among the national-revolutionary groups in the colonial countries goes, is proved by the fact that the second Brussels Conference pronounced unanimously and with all sharpness against the Kuomintang Party as a counter-revolutionary organisation.

In the question of India also the Conference went far beyond the moderate proposals of Nehru and adopted a decision demanding the complete independence of India and its separation from the British Empire.

Stimulated by the Brussels Congress and the Anti-Imperialist League, strong organisational nuclei of anti-Imperialist Leagues, consisting in the main of social revolutionary elements, have been formed in numerous countries in the course of the last few months.

In India the task of organising the Anti-Imperialist League has been undertaken by the Bombay Trades Council, which has affiliated en bloc to the Anti-Imperialist League. Similar efforts to make the trade unions the bearers of the Anti-Imperialist League in India are in progress in other towns.

Among the 50 big affiliated bodies now belonging to the Anti-Imperialist League, more than one half are important trade unions in colonial and semi-colonial countries which hitherto had no international connections whatever, as for instance the South African Trades Union Congress, the Railway Workers Union in Sierra Leone, the African Trade Unions, the Mexican Trade Unions etc.

The question of the relations of the Anti-Imperialist League to the trades unions rightly occupied the centre point of the discussions at Brussels.

The Anti-Imperialist League has also achieved great progress in South and Central America, especially in Mexico, Uruguay etc.

The League also has an important section in the Philippines, which sent a special delegate to Brussels.

In the world-historically important fights of North American imperialism against Mexico and the other Latin American Republics, the anti-imperialist opposition in these countries acquires special significance, as was rightly pointed out by Professor Alfons Goldschmidt of Berlin in his report on the threatening war.

What importance the imperialist States attach to the anti-imperialist movement and League is proved, among other things, by the severe persecution of the movement which has already set in. The British government has caused to be issued through its expert for foreign policy, Augur, a particularly lying pamphlet. The British government has prohibited the whole Indian press from printing articles of the Anti-Imperialist League, and is proceeding against the League with every means of force.

In Holland the government has arrested leaders of the League, including Hatta, a member of the Executive, and intends to have them tried for high treason.

The Negro Senghor, the passionate champion at the Brussels Congress of the black race against the white imperialist oppressors, was imprisoned in France on account of his speeches and has died as a result of an illness contracted in prison.

The significance of the second Brussels Conference compared with the first Conference lies more in the organisational than in the political field. The Brussels Congress, owing to the participation of numerous eminent persons and leaders, was a powerful, stirring political demonstration which awoke a strong echo in all countries. At the second Brussels Conference there were already present representatives of firmly grounded organisations of the League which have been formed in the course of the last half year in numerous countries. The organisational questions of the Anti-Imperialist League, the building up of national sections, the connections with the international Bureau, the building up of the International Bureau — all these organisational questions were the chief subject of the discussions.

The Conference was unanimously of the opinion that the Anti-Imperialist League can solve its tasks only if it succeeds in winning the millions of workers and peasants as bearers of its idea; a further guarantee that the Anti-Imperialist League will not lose itself in narrow national-revolutionary movements, but that it will help to extend the national-revolutionary movements into the proletarian revolution.

Among the members newly elected to the Executive there is the well-known Communist leader and representative of the Indian freedom movement in the British House of Commons, Comrade Saklatvala.

The Second Brussels Conference of the Anti-Imperialist League has contributed considerably to the organisational consolidation and strengthening of the anti-imperialist League and created the preconditions for a further broad development.

## The Brussels Conference of the League against Imperialism.

(Continued.)

Brussels, 11th December 1927.

In this morning's session of the General Council of the League against Colonial Oppression and Imperialism, the representative of the Philippines, Alminiano reported upon the struggle of the people there for freedom. He declared that he was the first representative of the Philippine people to make a report in Europe on the struggle for independence going on there. (Applause.)

The Emir Shekib Arslan the representative of the Arabian National Committee described the struggle of the Arabs for national freedom. He also reported upon the insurrectionary movement in Syria against France and appealed to all workers to support the national struggle for independence in Syria.

Herclot declared in the name of the French trades unions, above all of those affiliated to the C. G. T. U., that the French workers would fully support the struggle of the Syrians.

Salvador de la Plaza then gave a report on the struggle of Latin-America against Dollar imperialism. He described the policy of intervention and oppression pursued by the United States in Central and South America, and this policy was be-



coming ever more energetic. But the defence against the imperialism of the United States was also becoming stronger. The League against Imperialism was making considerable progress in Latin-America. (Applause.) The speaker then moved a resolution in the spirit of his remarks.

Professor Goldschmidt (Berlin) supported the resolution moved by the preceding speaker. He then described the situation in Central and South America and the action of American imperialism.

The representative of Indonesia then reported upon the revolutionary movement for emancipation against Holland's colonial policy. Despite severe repression, the movement was growing and still greater struggles were to be expected in the future.

Brussels, 11th December, 1927.

At to-day's session a representative from Tunis reported upon French colonial policy in North Africa.

Comrade Li Chen who has just arrived from China described in detail the development of the Chinese revolution from the first stage of the struggle, the block of the Chinese workers and peasants with the Chinese bourgeoisie up to the defection of the Chinese bourgeoisie into the camp of the imperialists. The Kuomintang which a year ago was the leader of the Chinese revolution, is now almost completely destroyed and is being utilised by the counter-revolutionary generals. For the revolutionary movement the Kuomintang is dead. Despite this however, the situation of the Chinese revolution is not unfavourable. The bourgeoisie can neither free nor centralise China. Above all, however, it cannot solve the workers and peasant question. Despite the most dreadful white terror the peasant masses of China are in a ferment. The proletariat is continuing its struggle. One can predict with certainty the quick advance of the Chinese revolution.

The speech of Li Chen was received with storms of enthusiastic applause, as also were the speech of Comrade Katavama and the telegram of greetings from the widow of Sun Yat-sen.

In place of Henry Barbusse, who has fallen ill, Professor Dr. Goldschmidt (Berlin) spoke upon the danger of war.

Gumede (Johannesburg) reported upon the situation in South Africa.

The session then unanimously adopted the resolutions presented in connection with the situation in China, India, Indonesia and Persia.

## THE LABOUR MOVEMENT

### The Arbitration Award in the German Steel Industry.

The Bourgeois Bloc Government Obeys the Orders of the Steel Trust.

By August Enderle (Berlin).

After days of negotiations there was pronounced on the 15th December the eagerly-expected Arbitration Award in the conflict of the German iron and steel industry. The award gives the employers more than they could have expected, and means a provocation of the workers such as was not predicted by even the greatest pessimist. The Award, which is a fairly lengthy document, declares in essence as follows:

On the 1st January next, in the whole of the German steel industry, the eight-hour day with the three shift system will be introduced practically nowhere. The Award provides for its introduction "by stages", that is, it will come into force at a different time in each works. At the same time it is left to the employers to decide at what rate they shall carry out the "reorganisation of work necessary for the introduction of the three-shift system". As a compensation for this "shortening of working hours" and "burdening of the employers, the Sunday rest hitherto provided for — from 6 o'clock on Sunday morning to 6 o'clock on Monday morning — is to be reduced to 12 hours in accordance with an order of the Imperial Federal Council issued in the year 1895.

This means in practice that throughout the whole of the year 1928 the twelve-hour shift will still predominate in the German steel industry. Insofar as the eight-hour day will be

introduced at all, there follows automatically, by the deprivation of the Sunday rest, a prolongation of the working week by one shift, so that even in the best case the 56-hour week becomes the normal working time. As a matter of fact the abolition of the Sunday rest will mean for thousands of workers in the big iron industry even a prolongation of the present working hours.

As regards the wages question, the Award provides for an increase of 2%, further a levelling up of wages in the case of shortened working time by 50% in case of work paid by the hour and 60% in the case of piece workers. That means, apart from the ridiculously small general wage increase of 2%, a reduction of the earnings of all workers whose hours will be shortened, because only a hundred per cent. equalisation of wages would secure them their present earnings.

That the Award is directed in every respect against the workers becomes most evident when it is compared with the demands of the trade unions: a real eight hour day from the 1st of January for all the 250,000 metal workers in big iron industry, the full, i. e. 100% equalisation of wages, and in addition an increase of 10 Pfennigs an hour for all workers.

The arbitration award is based entirely upon the official attitude of the bourgeois bloc government, which found expression in a written reply of the Minister of Labour, Brauns, dated 10th December, to the request of the steel industrialists. According to the well-known demagogic model of all labour laws in recent years in Germany, in order to deceive the working masses, the eight-hour decree of the 16th July 1927 is maintained "in principle", but at the same time so many exceptions are provided for that there is really nothing left of the eight-hour day. Further, the abolition of the Sunday rest is provided for as an extra present to the employers from the "christian" bourgeois bloc Minister.

The monstrous provocation of the workers by the bourgeois bloc government, by the arbitration award, is the result of the passive and treacherous attitude of the S. P. G. and of the trade union leaders. Whilst the employers not only opened the struggle with a most brutal attack in proclaiming the closing down of their works, but also increased their fighting measures from day to day by discharging workers, stopping the import of raw material, increasing prices etc., the trade union leaders not only neglected but even prevented any preparation for the struggle on the part of the workers. Whilst they were very generous with their sham radical phrases about sticking to their demands, their whole policy was directed to negotiating with the arbitrator. Thus it came about that at the arbitration negotiations the enormous pressure of the big capitalists could not be counter-balanced by the least pressure on the part of the working class.

It is now necessary to do everything in order that the scandalous arbitration award shall be unanimously rejected by the whole of the workers, and the fight, i. e. the strike decided upon for the 1st of January. The mood of the masses is very militant; all the workers in the factories are waiting for the concrete fighting slogans of the trade unions.

### To the Aid of the German Metal Workers!

Moscow, 16th December 1927.

The International Propaganda Committee of the revolutionary Metal workers, miners and transport workers has addressed an appeal to the miners, metal workers and transport workers of all countries. The appeal declares inter alia:

300,000 metal workers of the German iron and steel industry are threatened with a lock-out by the magnates of the German steel trust in answer to the demand of the metal workers for the re-introduction of the eight hour day which was abolished in 1923. The leaders of the German Metal Workers Union and the leaders of the Berne metal workers international who, first of all agreed to the abolition of the eight-hour day and who secondly announce that the steel trust will bring "peace", cannot be expected to carry on any determined struggle for the eight hour day. We appeal to you to oppose the offensive of capital with a united front of the

German proletariat. All metal workers, miners and transport workers must be immediately mobilised. A fighting alliance of the workers unions of these basic industries must be formed. Immediate actions of solidarity must be prepared on the part of the workers of all countries, in particular however of those countries embraced by the steel trust. International strike-breaking must be prevented. The struggle against the lengthening of the working day in Germany is a struggle for the maintenance of the eight-hour day in France, Belgium, the Saar and other countries.

Metal workers of Germany, your task is to answer the offensive of the capitalists with a 100% strike!

Metal workers, miners and transport workers of all countries, your task is to prevent strike breaking!

No single ton of strike-breaking metal, pig iron, steel or coal!

Support the German metal workers by your struggle!

## FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

### Towards a Latin American Trade Union Secretariat.

Since November 15th the Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labour Unions has held several meetings with trade union representatives from Central and South America who attended the October Celebrations.

The immediate result of these meetings has been an extremely important decision, adopted unanimously on December 11th last, on setting up a Latin American Trade Union Secretariat.

Below we give the text of this Decision, which opens a new page in the history of the Trade Union Movement of Latin-America:

"We, the delegates of class trade unions in Argentina, Brazil, Columbia, Cuba, Mexico Uruguay, Chili and Ecuador, meeting in Moscow during the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, and coming together on the 11th December, 1927, in the Red International of Labour Unions, and discussing the question of the position of the working class and trade unions in Latin-America, have come to the following conclusions:

"Whereas United States imperialism is becoming more and more aggressive towards all countries in Central and Southern America, and the United States is endeavouring to convert the whole of Latin-America into a colony for American capital;

"Whereas the Pan-American Federation of Labour created by the reactionary American trade union leaders is nothing but a tool for Wall Street and as such, an enemy of the toiling masses both of Southern, Central, and North American;

"Whereas the reaction raging in the Latin-American countries is chiefly directed against the working class and whereas nothing but the united forces of the toiling masses all over Latin-America can resist both United States imperialism and the aggressive policy of the bourgeoisie in the Latin countries, it is unanimously resolved:

"To inaugurate preparatory work in all Latin American countries for the unification of all trade union class organisations for the struggle against United States imperialism, the imperialist Pan-American Federation of Labour and the attack of the national bourgeoisie, and for the establishment of close fraternal ties with the international labour movement and the creation of an all-embracing class International uniting the trade unions of all countries, races and continents in order with combined forces to struggle against imperialist wars and for the complete emancipation of labour from the domination of Capital:

"We, the undersigned, undertake to do everything possible in our country for the convocation at the end of 1928

in Montevideo of a conference of class trade unions in the whole of Latin-America for the purpose of setting up a Latin American Trade Union Secretariat."

The foregoing Decision was signed by the following Delegates:

Atilio R. Biondi, A. Resnik, Martin S. Gacia: Trade Union Federation of Argentina.

Antonio Maruenda, Trade Union Council of Province of Cordoba (Argentina).

Francisco Castrillejo, Independent Trade Unions of Uruguay.

Guillermo Hernandez Rodrigues, Central Labour Union of Columbia.

Bernardo Lobo, National Labour Confederation of Cuba.

Rufino Rosas, Labour Federation of Chili.

Pablo Mendez, National Peasant League of Mexico.

Prospero Malvestitti, Town Federation of Trade Unions of Buenos Ayres and Independent Trade Unions of Buenos Ayres.

Ricardo Paredes, Railwaymen's Federation of Ecuador and Labour Federation of Chimborazo (Ecuador).

Representatives from: Miners' Federation of State of Hidalgo, Mexico — Comrade Sisneros.

Union of Workers of Oil Works in State of Tamsulipos, Mexico (Comrade Montemajor); Transport Workers Confederation of Mexico (Comrade Contreras), took part in the preliminary discussion of this question and supported the formation of the Latin-American Trade Union Secretariat, but owing to their departure were unable to sign the present Resolution.

Moscow, December 11, 1927.

Press Bureau Red International of Labour Unions.

## THE CHILDREN'S MOVEMENT

### The English Press and the Children's Delegation to the Soviet Union.

Since the return of the children's delegation, the British press devotes much of its space to it. Many newspapers and journals again published as before their departure photographs of the children. One of the London publications "The Sphere" of October 8th, 1927, printed a photograph of the children with the following comment:

"The child Communists who were sent to study 'conditions' in Russia returned to England enthusiastic for anarchy, atheism, and annihilation."

Immediately after their return the delegation took the tram and went straight to the C. C. of the Y. C. L. where they were received and in the evening they spoke at a meeting in Bethnal Green. The speeches of the delegation attracted big crowds and were very successful.

Let us see what the press had to say about it:

"In truth they were glowing, and the audience found it impossible to restrain its admiration, as speaker followed speaker in a catalogue of the joys of Bolshevism, the schools where the children only did the work that pleased them, the summer camps, the gorgeous mansions overlooking the Black Sea inhabited solely by 'workers', the centres for free food or free clothing, and the rest homes for the unemployed — gilding the lily with a vengeance this last.

"Our sympathy was the more poignant when we heard that in almost every case the delegation had arrived just too late (or just too early) to see the particular miracle in the performance. But we could rejoice that they were told of them, and that they were able to pass on to us the glad tidings.

"It is difficult to imagine what would be the state of mind of the average 'bourgeois' parent, if his 12-year old son were to address him in these words: 'Father, it is my

bounden duty to give you a report on Soviet Russia. I have determined to fight to the last drop of my blood to be free of the bondage of capital."

"But last night's audience seemed overcome by its admiration. One speaker repeated, with evident emotion, that age-long illusion, 'if we have made a mess of things, the kids are going to put it right.'

"The children, it must be confessed, were by no means deficient in the arts of the orator.

"These young comrades all wore scarlet neck-cloths and Lenin breeches." (*Morning Post*", October 8th, 1927.)

\* \* \*

"The Communist Party gave a welcome to the little travellers at a crowded meeting in Bethnal Green Town Hall last night and the children told their stories of the trip.

"Nancy Hall, a pretty young girl, began. She told the audience how exciting, how wonderful, and how thrilling her first real holiday had been.

"The other children followed in Nancy's footsteps until the last boy speaker, Comrade William Baker, of Kentish Town arose. He is a pale boy of 13, but is already a Communist orator.

"He had nothing to say about his holiday. He talked threadbare clap-trap and now and then a threadbare profanity, but his burning belief in what he said, his absolute and complete sincerity, held his audience spell-bound.

"His utterances might have come at any time from any Communist, yet they were made terrible by the simplicity of the child.

"Amid a tumult of applause the pale little boy sat down. He seemed weary.

"He can never have believed in fairies." (*The Westminster Gazette*", October 3, 1927.)

\* \* \*

"Wearing red neckties, the six children stood on a London platform, decorated with Russian revolutionary flags, and sang songs in Russian. This was but one of the astonishing scenes which were witnessed at a meeting which was held at the Bethnal Green Town Hall last night to welcome the children back to this country." (*South Wales News*", October 3, 1927.)

\* \* \*

The next day the children parted for their home towns and at home they were given grand receptions. Here is what the "*Cardiff Evening Express*" wrote:

"Some hundred children at the Tylerstown station greeted the return here of Clifford Roberts, one of the six Young Communists who have just returned from a three months tour of Russia.

"Clifford is said to be the youngest fighter in the Communist ranks, and the boy who defeated Mr. Joynson Hicks and the Cabinet.

"The headmaster and the teachers of Clifford's school were present at the welcome ceremony.

"Clifford wore a vivid Red necktie and he was carried shoulder high through the town, followed by a straggling procession of 500 children and a sprinkling of parents.

"George Smith of Trealaw said there were three sections of the Young Communist League before Clifford went to Russia. There were now 10, and, as a result of the propaganda to be carried out by Roberts, there will be at least 30 sections in South Wales in the very near future.

"Clifford Roberts, who displayed a precocious power, as orator, conveyed the greetings to the Tylerstown children from the Pioneers of Russia.

"He declared later that if Mr. Chamberlain makes war on Russia they will give them a run." (*Cardiff Evening Express*", October 4, 1927.)

\* \* \*

"The six little Reds just returned to England from their tour in Russia, where the rare and refreshing fruits of the trees of Sovietism were poured into their juvenile laps.

"This propaganda work by the disciples of Lenin will no doubt be hailed with enthusiasm by comrades of the cause. But it will strike others as being rather futile and a little pitiful." (*Newcastle Evening Chronicle*", October, 3, 1927.)

\* \* \*

Communications were sent to the newspapers on the danger of Communist influence among the children, letters contending that the children do not say what they think, but what they have been driven to say, etc.

The "*Morning Post*" published the following letter:

"Sir, it is with interest, if with disgust, that I have read the report of your special representative at the meeting held at Bethnal Green Town Hall to welcome home the 'child Communists' from their tour in Russia.

"Nothing could be more nauseating to the average Englishman in this account of deliberate perversion of the minds of English boys and girls; and the thoughts of most readers must have turned instinctively to the Boy Scout and Girl Guide movements as the best antidote to the poison which is being administered to the minds of these unfortunate children.

If our laws provide no means of eradicating this evil at its root, surely the regulations governing the sale of poison should be amended or amplified; and the scope of the criminal law relating to poisoners should be extended. We have laws which restrict the sale of poisons liable to destroy our bodies, and which render the users of such poisons liable to capital punishment. We have no laws to safeguard the minds of our children from these poisoners; or, if any exist, they are not enforced.

To poison the adult body, or to poison the mind of the child, which is the greater crime?

E. K. Loring, Vice-Admiral  
Court-House, Ruspur, Sussex."

Here is another letter published in the same paper:

"Sir, your account on the meeting held at Bethnal Green to welcome the return of the Communist children from Russia would land one in delicious laughter were there not a tragic side to it.... Here, then, is a threat, not to be blown on one side by a mere puff of ridicule; and there can be no doubt that the class principally threatened is the well-to-do class. What are they doing to meet the onset? We of the Boy Scout Association believe that that movement is one of the best — perhaps even the best — scheme for providing a counterblast. The boys love it, and would crowd into the ranks in additional thousands, but for one thing — the want of young men to lead them. Is the threatened class doing its duty in this respect? In an agricultural country, the answer is certainly not. It is the young men of the place we want — squire's son, parson's son, clerk — and without him we are completely blocked in that locality.

If the youth of this generation cannot come forward... then they deserve the various gifts that Communism, working from the bottom up, will bestow upon them.

S. M. Burrows,  
County Commissioner, Oxon,  
United Service Club, Pall-Mall, S. W. 1."

Letters are also published with the usual "revelations" concerning conditions in the U. S. S. R. In one of her speeches greeted with tumultuous applause, Nancy Hall said that the capitalist press can lie about Soviet Russia as much as it pleases, and that she is here to refute the falsehoods and do her utmost to bring the truth about Soviet Russia to the workers.

The schools blush for their "Red pupils". The "*South Wales News*" published a letter from a superintendent of a boys school saying that Clifford Roberts, member of the British Children's Delegation never went to the Tylerstown School.

All papers remark that the children improved their health. They also describe their Red Neckties and "Soviet clothes".

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

## Political Report of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. at the XV. Party Congress.

Full Report of Speech of Comrade Stalin.

(CONCLUSION.)

### II. The Achievements of Socialist Construction and the Internal Position of the Soviet Union.

Permit me, comrades, now to pass over to the achievements of our Socialist development and to a discussion of the internal position of our country, to the achievements of our socialist construction, to the question of the destiny of the dictatorship of the proletariat, its development and consolidation.

The XIV. Party Congress of our Party instructed the Central Committee to conduct the interests of the development of our national economy in accordance with the following main directives: Firstly, that our policy may promote the progressive growth of production throughout economy; secondly, that the policy of the Party may promote the acceleration of the rate of development in industry and the guarantee of its leading rôle in economy in general; that in the course of the development of economy, an increasingly powerful growth of the specific weight of the Socialist section of economy as opposed to the private and capitalist section be ensured; fourthly, that our entire economic development, the organisation of new branches of industry, and the production of certain classes of raw materials be carried on along such lines as guarantee the general development and economic independence of our country, so that it may not develop into a dependency of the capitalist system of international economy; fifthly, that the dictatorship of the proletariat, the bloc of the working class and the peasantry, and the leadership of the working class within that bloc may all be confirmed; and sixthly, that the material and cultural level of the working class and the village poor may constantly advance.

What has the Central Committee of our Party done in the period under review in fulfilment of the tasks set it by the Party?

#### 1. ECONOMY AS A WHOLE.

The first question refers to the development of economy as a whole. I shall here quote some leading figures in regard to the question of the growth of economy as a whole and of industry and agriculture in particular during the period under consideration. I will these figures from the well-known calculations of the State Planning Commission in which connection I refer to the returns of that commission for the year 1927/28 and to the draft of the five-year plan.

a) Growth of the production of the entire economy within two years. While in 1924/25, according to the new calculations of the State Planning Commission, the gross output of agriculture had reached 87.3 per cent. of that of pre-war times and the output of the entire industry stood at 63.7 per cent. of the pre-war level, now, after the lapse of two years, the output of agriculture is 108.3 per cent., and that of industry 100.9 per cent. of the pre-war returns. In its control-estimates the "Gosplan" for 1927/28 envisages a further rise of the output of agriculture to 111.8 per cent. and of the production of industry to 114.4 per cent. of the pre-war figures.

Growth of the commercial turnovers in the country in the course of two years. If we put the extent of the turnovers in 1924/25 at 100 (14,613 million tchervonetz-roubles), we may see in the year 1926/27 an increase of 97 per cent. (28,775 millions), while for the year 1927/28 a further rise is estimated to 116 per cent. (33,440 millions).

Development of our credit system in two years. If we put the balance figures of all our credit institutes at 100 to represent October 1st, 1925 (5,343 million tchervonetz-roubles), we may see, by July 1st, 1927, an increase of 53 per cent. (8,175 millions), and there can be no doubt but that the year 1927/28 will show a further rise of our national credit system.

Development of the railway-transport system in two years. If on our entire railway system we had, in the year 1924/25, a freight traffic of 63.1 per cent. of the pre-war total, we now stand, for 1926/27, at 99.1 per cent. and shall in the year 1927/28 have reached 111.6 per cent. At the same time it should be pointed out that our railway system has grown in these two years from a total length of 74,400 to one of 76,200 kilometers, which means an increase of 30.3 per cent. over pre-war times and of 8.9 per cent. over 1917.

Growth of the State budget in the course of two years. If the total budget (uniform State budget plus local budgets) for 1925/26 was 72.4 per cent. of the pre-war budget level (i. e. 5,024 million roubles), we are now (1927/28) at 110—112 per cent. (over 7,000 millions), the growth in two years figuring at 41.5 per cent.

Growth of foreign trade in two years. If the total turnover of foreign trade in 1924/25 stood at 1,282 million roubles, or about 27 per cent. of the pre-war figure, we have now, in the year 1926/27, a turnover of 1,483 millions, or 35.6 per cent. of the pre-war level, while the turnover of 1927/28 is estimated at 1,626 millions or 37.9 per cent. of pre-war. The reasons for the slowing-down in the rate of development of foreign trade are on the one hand the fact that the bourgeois States not infrequently put difficulties in the way of our foreign trade, often amounting to a veiled blockade, and on the other hand the circumstance that we cannot do business according to the bourgeois formula "Let us export even if we have not satisfied our home requirements". An asset in this connection is the favourable foreign trade balance of 57 million roubles for 1926/27, the first year since 1923/24 to show a surplus in the foreign trade balance.

As a total result, we have the following aspect of the general growth of our national income in the course of two years: If we put the national income of the Soviet Union in 1924/25 at 15,589 million tchervonetz-roubles, the year 1925/26 shows a total of 20,252 millions, or an increase of 29.9 per cent., and the following year one of 22,560 millions, or an increase for that one year of 11.4 per cent. According to the control-estimates of the "Gosplan", we figure for 1927/28 at 24,208 millions, or a further growth of 7.3 per cent.

If we take into account that the average yearly growth of the total national income of the United States of America does not exceed 3—4 per cent. (only once, in the eighties of the last century, had the United States a growth of 7 per cent. of their national income), while the yearly growth of the national incomes of other States, e. g. Germany or Great Britain, is no greater than 1—3 per cent., it must be recognised that the growth of the national income in the Soviet Union during the last few years may be looked upon as a record achievement in comparison with the great capitalist countries of Europe and America.

The conclusion is that the national income of our country is advancing rapidly.

It is thus the task of the Party energetically to promote the development of our country's economy in all lines of production.

b) The growth of economy, moreover, is not progressing blindly, not in the direction of a mere quantitative increase in production, but along definite and strictly regulated lines. In the development of economy in the last two years the decisive factors are twofold: Firstly, the development of our national economy is influenced by the industrialisation of the country and by the growing significance of industry as opposed to agriculture. Secondly, the development of national economy and the industrialisation both move in the direction of an increase in the specific gravity of the predominant rôle of the Socialist forms of economy, as regards both the production and the circulation of goods, at the cost of the private and capitalist sections.

Figures referring to the proportional importance of industry in economy, with the exclusion of transports and electrification. While the share of the gross output of industry in the total production of economy amounted in 1924/25 to 32.4 per cent., and that of agriculture to 67.6 per cent., the share of industry in 1926/27 stood at 38 per cent. and that of agriculture at 62 per cent. In 1927/28, the share of industry is to rise to 40.7 per cent., while that of agriculture is to fall to 59.3 per cent.

Figures as to the growth of the proportional importance of the output of tools and other means of production, forming the backbone of industry, in relation to the whole of industry during the last two years: In 1924/25 the share of the output of means of production stood at 34.1 per cent., in 1926/27 it was 37.6 per cent., and for 1927/28 it is estimated at 38.6 per cent. The growth of the proportional significance of the output of the means of production in the State heavy industries stood at 42 per cent. in 1924/25, at 44 per cent. in 1926/27 and at 44.9 per cent. in the estimate for 1927/28.

As regards the output of commodities in industry and its proportional importance in relation to the whole bulk of commodities, the share of industry rose in two years from 53.1 per cent. in 1924/25 to 59.5 in 1926/27 and is to figure at 60.7 per cent. in 1927/28, whereas the share of the goods output in agriculture moved from 46.9 per cent. in 1924/25 to 40.5 per cent. in 1926/27 and to a presumable 39.3 per cent. in 1927/28.

The conclusion in this case is that our country is developing into an industrial country.

The consequent task facing the Party is the promotion by all means of the industrialisation of the country.

Some figures showing the growth of the specific weight and of the predominant position of the Socialist forms of economy at the expense of the private and capitalist sections. Whereas the capital investments in the socialised section of economy (State and co-operative industry, transport, electrification, etc.) rose from 1 231 million roubles in 1924/25 to 2 683 millions in 1926/27 and are in 1927/28 to reach the total of 3 456 millions, representing a growth of investments from 43.8 per cent. in 1924/25 to 65.3 per cent. in 1927/28, the investments in the non-socialised section of economy dropped relatively throughout this period, showing only an insignificant absolute increase from 1 577 million roubles in 1924/25 to 1 717 millions in 1926/27, with the prospect of figuring in 1927/28 at 1 836 millions which amounts to a regression in the specific importance of the investments in the non-socialised section from 56.2 to 34.7 per cent. in 1927/28.

While the gross output of the socialised section of industry moved from 81 per cent. of the total industrial output in 1924/25 to 86 per cent. in 1926/27 and is to rise to 86.9 per cent. in 1927/28, the rôle of the non-socialised section has receded from year to year, viz., from 19 per cent. of the total industrial output in 1924/25 to 14 per cent. in 1926/27, with a presumable drop to 13.1 per cent. in 1927/28. As regards the rôle of private capital in the heavy metal (the so-called "census") industry, this is not only relatively on the decline (3.9 per cent. in 1924/25 and 2.4 per cent. in 1926/27), but also absolutely (169 million pre-war roubles in 1924/25 as against 165 millions in 1926/27).

The same ousting of the private-capitalist elements may be observed in the turnover of goods within the country. While the share of the socialised section in the total commercial circulation-turnover amounted in 1924/25 to 72.6 per cent.,

in wholesale trade to 90.6 per cent., and in retail trade to 57.3 per cent., the specific importance of the socialised section rose in 1926/27 to 81.9 per cent. of the total turnover (in wholesale trade to 94.9 per cent. and in retail trade to 67.4 per cent.); the share of the private section of economy moving in the same time from 27.4 per cent. of the total commercial circulation turnover to 18.1 per cent. thereof (in wholesale trade from 9.4 to 5.1 per cent. and in retail trade from 42.7 to 32.6 per cent.). For the year 1927/28, a further drop in the proportional importance of the private section is envisaged.

The conclusion is that our country is advancing speedily and confidently to Socialism, ousting the capitalist elements step by step out of our economy.

This fact reveals the basic question of "Who will beat whom?" Upon the introduction of the New Economic Policy in 1921, Lenin formulated this question in the following way: Shall we succeed in connecting our socialised industry with the economy of the peasants by eliminating the private traders and capitalists and ourselves learning to do business, or will private capital prove too strong for us by creating a split between the proletariat and the peasantry? That was then the question asked. We can now assert that in general we have already achieved the decisive success. Only blind men or imbeciles can deny it. But now the question of "Who will beat whom?" assumes another character. Now this question is transferred from the realm of commerce to that of production, especially workshop production and agricultural output, in which private capital still possesses its preponderance and from which it must be systematically ousted.

It is therefore the task of the Party to see that our commanding position in all branches of economy, both in town and in the country, is extended and consolidated, the objective in view being the elimination of the capitalist elements in economy.

## 2. THE RATE OF DEVELOPMENT IN OUR SOCIALIST HEAVY METAL INDUSTRY.

a) The growth of the nationalised heavy metal industry, comprising more than 77 per cent. of the total industry of the country. While the increase of output (in pre-war roubles) of the nationalised heavy metal industry figured, in relation to the preceding year, at 42.2 per cent. in 1925/26, at 18.2 in 1926/27, and at 15.8 per cent. in the estimate of 1927/28, it will according to the draft of the inordinately low estimate of the five-year plan of the Gosplan, show an increase in the next five years of 76.7 per cent., with an annual average growth of 15 per cent., while in the case of an extension of industrial output in the year 1931/32 it will rise to the double of the pre-war production.

If we take the gross output of the entire industry of the country, the light and the heavy industries of the State and of private enterprises, the annual increase in output, according to the five-year plan of the Gosplan, will figure at about 12 per cent. (arithmetic mean), which represents an increase in the year 1931/32 of all industrial production by almost 70 per cent. over the pre-war level.

In America the annual increase of industrial output during the five years from 1890 to 1895 figured at 8.2 per cent., in the five years from 1895 to 1900 at 5.2 per cent., between 1900 and 1905 at 2.6 per cent. and between 1905 and 1910 at 3.6 per cent. In Russia the annual average increase during the ten years from 1895 to 1905 stood at 10.7 per cent. and between 1905 and 1913 at 8.1 per cent.

Both the percentage of the yearly increase of the output of our Socialist industry and that of the production of industry upon the whole are record percentages, such as not a single big capitalist country can point to.

And this in spite of the fact that both the American industry and also the Russian pre-war industry were assisted amply by an influx of foreign capital, whereas our nationalised industry is forced to depend on its own accumulated means.

All this, also, in spite of the fact that our nationalised industry has already entered upon the period of construction, in which the adaptation of old works and the construction of new ones are of special importance for the increase of industrial production.

As regards the question of the rate of development, our industry in general and the socialised sections thereof in particular are catching up to and outstripping the development of industry in the capitalist countries.



b) How is this extraordinary rate of development in our heavy metal industry to be explained?

Firstly by the fact that it is a nationalised industry and therefore free of the selfish company interests of the capitalist groups and enjoying the possibility of a development from the standpoint of the interests of society as a whole.

Secondly thanks to the fact that among all the existing industries of the world it is the most compact and concentrated, whereby it has every possibility of defeating the private capitalist industries.

Thirdly, because a State controlling a nationalised transport system, nationalised foreign trade, and the general State budget, has all possibilities at its command of conducting the nationalised industrial economy on systematic lines in the sense of an economic unit, which gives this industry a tremendous advantage over all other industries and accelerates tremendously the rate of its development.

Fourthly, owing to the fact that, as the most important and most powerful of industries, the nationalised industry has every possibility of carrying out a policy of undeterred reduction in regard to all initial costs, and in regard to the sale price of its commodities, thus extending the market for its products, raising the absorbing capacity of the home market in general, and providing itself with an increasingly productive source for the further development of its output.

Fifthly, thanks to the circumstance that for many reasons, among them its policy of price-reduction, a nationalised industry develops in an atmosphere of the gradual approach between town and village, between the proletariat and the peasantry, in contradistinction to the capitalist industry, whose development is accompanied by a growing enmity between the bourgeois city exploiting the peasantry on the one hand and the decaying village on the other.

Finally, because the nationalised industry is supported by the working class, which enjoys the hegemony of our entire development, and therefore has the possibility most easily to promote technical progress on the one hand and the productivity of labour on the other, at the same time introducing the administration and rationalisation of output with the support of the broad masses of the working class, which is not and cannot be the case with the capitalist system of industry.

All this is undoubtedly confirmed by the rapid growth of our technic during the last two years and the speedy development of new branches of industry, as regards machinery, lathes, turbines, automobile and airplane construction, chemistry, etc.

It is also confirmed by the rationalisation of production carried out in our country with a simultaneous shortening of working hours (seven-hour day) and of the constant advance in the material and cultural status of the working class, another factor which does not and cannot exist under the capitalist system of economy.

The unparalleled rate of development in our Socialist industry is the immediate and irrefutable proof of the superiority of the Soviet system of production over the capitalist system.

Lenin was right in saying in September 1917, even prior to the seizure of power by the Bolsheviks, that in establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat we could and necessarily must "outstrip in economy even the most advanced of countries." (Vol. XIV/2, Page 213 of the Russian edition.)

The task with which the Party is thus faced is that of consolidating the present rate of development in our Socialist industry and accelerating it yet more in the near future with a view to creating the favourable premises requisite for the purpose of catching up and outstripping the capitalist countries.

### 3. THE RATE OF DEVELOPMENT IN OUR AGRICULTURE.

a) In the rural districts, on the other hand, we witness a relatively slow growth of production. While in 1925/26 the growth of gross production (in pre-war roubles) was 19.2 per cent. over that of the preceding year, the percentage increase in the following two years being 4.1 and 3.2 respectively, the increase according to the five-year plan of the Gosplan, whose figures are decidedly too low, should amount to 24 per cent. in the period of five years, or an arithmetic mean of 4.8 per cent. average yearly increase, and, taking into account an extension of output in the year 1931/32, to 28 or 30 per cent. in relation with the pre-war level.

This is a more or less passable annual increase for agricultural production. It cannot, however, be considered either a record growth in comparison with capitalist countries or as

sufficient for the purpose of maintaining in the future the necessary equilibrium between agriculture and our nationalised industry.

In the United States of America the annual growth of the gross production of agriculture figured in the ten years from 1890 to 1900 at 9.3 per cent., between 1900 and 1910 at 3.1 per cent., and between 1910 and 1920 at 1.4 per cent. In pre-war Russia the annual increase of agricultural production in the ten years between 1900 and 1910 ranged from 3.2 to 3.5 per cent. True, the annual increase of our agricultural output during the five years from 1926/27 to 1931/32 is estimated to figure at 4.8 per cent., which would show the percentage increase of agricultural production under Soviet rule to have risen over the growth recorded under the capitalist regime. But it must not be forgotten that, while the gross output of our nationalised industry appears for the year 1931/32 to be double that of our pre-war industry and the output of the entire industry in that year shows an advance of 70 per cent. over the pre-war level, the agricultural output will at that time only exceed the agricultural pre-war output by 28 or 30 per cent., or by less than one third.

In view of this fact, the rate of development of our agriculture cannot be considered sufficiently satisfactory.

b) How can such a relatively slow rate of development in the case of agriculture in comparison with the rate of development of our nationalised industry be explained? The explanation lies in the extraordinary backwardness of our agricultural technics and the inordinately low level of culture in the rural districts, as also particularly in the fact that our scattered agricultural production has not those advantages at its disposal which benefit our great united nationalised industry. Before all the agricultural production is not nationalised and not united, but scattered and in disorder. It is not carried on systematically, and the greater part of it is subjected to the primitive processes of small agricultural holdings. It is neither united nor consolidated in the sense of collective principles, so that it is still a profitable object of exploitation for the kulak elements. These facts deprive our scattered agriculture of all the tremendous advantages of a wholesale, united, and systemically conducted production, such as is enjoyed by our nationalised industry.

How can agriculture find a way out of this difficulty? Perhaps in slowing down the rate of development of our industry in general and our nationalised industry in particular? By no means. That would be the most reactionary, most Utopian, and most anti-proletarian measure. ("Hear, hear!") Our nationalised industry must and will be developed with increasing rapidity. Therein lies the guarantee for our progress towards Socialism. Therein, too, lies the guarantee for the ultimate industrialisation of agriculture itself.

Where then is the way out of the difficulty? It lies in the direction of a development of the small, scattered peasant farms into large united estates on the basis of socialised cultivation of the soil, a collective tillage of the soil on the basis of new and more progressive technics. The solution of the problem can be attained if the small and very small peasant farms gradually but constantly (not in answer to any pressure, but by reason of good examples and serious conviction) unite to form larger farms, operated on the lines of a socialised, co-operative, and collective tillage of the soil, with the use of agricultural machinery and tractors and the employment of scientific methods for intensifying cultivation.

There is no other way. Otherwise our agriculture will not be able to catch up or outstrip those capitalist countries which show the greatest degree of agricultural development, e. g. Canada. All other measures towards restricting the capitalist element in agriculture, towards developing the Socialist element in the rural districts, towards ensuring the introduction of peasant economy in the broad system of co-operative development, towards the systematic influencing of the rural districts by the State, towards the proper comprehension of the peasant farms in regard not only to distribution but also to consumption — all these measures, I say, are certainly decisive measures but are yet not sufficient for the purpose of remodelling agriculture on a collective basis.

c) What has the Party done in this direction in the course of two years? It has done not a little, though by far not so much as might have been done. As regards the comprehension of agriculture, so to say from outside, by means of the supply of agriculture with the most necessary commodities and by

means of the sale of agricultural products, we can point to the following achievements: The agricultural co-operatives now unite about one third of all the peasant farms; the consumers' co-operatives have increased their supplies to the villages from 25.6 per cent. in 1924/25 to 50.8 per cent. in 1926/27; the co-operative and State organs enlarged their comprehension of the sale of agricultural products from 55.7 per cent. in 1924/25 to 63 per cent. in 1926/27. As regards the comprehension of agriculture from within, so to say, by means of agricultural production, lamentably little has been done by us in this direction. Suffice it to point out that the collective farms and Soviet farms supply at present somewhat more than 2 per cent. of the entire agricultural output and more than 7 per cent. of the agricultural production of goods.

There are naturally plenty of reasons to be advanced for this fact, both subjectively and objectively, such as an injudicious manner of approaching the matter, insufficient attention paid to the subject by our collaborators, conservatism and backwardness on the part of the peasants, insufficiency of the means required to finance the transformation of the peasant farms into collective undertakings, etc. No small means are needed in this connection. At the Xth Party Congress Lenin pointed out that we are not yet in possession of sufficient funds for the purpose of subjecting agriculture to the State or collective principle. I believe we now have these funds, or at least that they will increase in the course of time. In the meantime the matter has taken such a turn that without a collection of the scattered peasant farms, without transition to socialised tillage of the soil there is no possibility of seriously advancing the intensification or mechanisation of agriculture or of so arranging affairs as to enable our agriculture to attain the same level as the agriculture of a country like Canada, for example.

Therefore the task arises of causing the attention of our rural functionaries to concentrate on this important matter. I believe the leasing offices attached to the organs of the People's Commissary for Agriculture and to the agricultural co-operatives should play the leading part in this connection.

Let me give you an example of how the Soviet farms may sometimes assist the peasants in passing over to a collective tillage of the soil with the greatest degree of advantage to the peasants. The case I have in mind is the assistance rendered by the Union of Ukrainian Soviet Farms to the peasants of the Odessa district by means of the loan of tractors and the letter recently published in the "Izvestiya", in which the peasants in question expressed their thanks for the help they had received. Permit me to read to you the contents of this letter. (Cries of "Do".)

"We, the settlers on the Shevtchenko, Krassin, Kalinin, Tchervona, Sirka, and "Sunrise" farms, express to the Soviet authorities our profound gratitude for the tremendous help afforded us in the reconstruction of our farms. Most of us are quite poor, devoid of horses or implements, and not in a position to till the ground allotted us; indeed, we were forced to let the ground to the kulaks in return for part of the crops. The yield was poorly, for a farmer will not till leased ground as well as his own. The small credits we received from the Government we consumed, and year by year we found ourselves poorer and poorer.

"This year the representative of the Union of Ukrainian Soviet Farms came to us with the suggestion that in the place of money credits we should accept the tillage of our soil by tractors. All the settlers, with the exception of certain small kulaks, gave their consent, though they did not really believe that the work could prove profitable. To our great joy and to the chagrin of the kulaks, the tractors negotiated the whole length and breadth of our fields with full steam five or six times over, whereupon the entire area was sown with a good variety of wheat.

"Now the kulaks no longer laugh at the work done in the tractor-ploughed area. This year the lack of rain caused the peasants in our district to sow hardly any winter grain at all, and in the few places sown with such grain there has been no crop as yet. On our settlements, however, hundreds of dessyatines of first-class wheat are flourishing, finer even than in the very best German colonies. Besides ploughing the ground for winter wheat, the tractors have prepared the entire area for the spring seed. Now there is not a single dessyatine of ground that is not cultivated or leased out. There is not a poor peasant among us without at least a few dessyatines under winter wheat."

"After witnessing this work of the tractors, we have no wish to go back to our small crofter's methods, but have decided to organise a socialised economy with tractors without the least remnant of our old farming methods. The organisation of the new economy has already been undertaken for us by the Soviet farm of Tarras-Shevtchenko, with which we have concluded a contract." ("Izvestiya", No. 267 of November 22nd, 1927.)

Had we but more such examples, comrades, it would be possible to advance this work most vigorously.

The Party is here confronted with the task of a wider comprehension of the peasant farms by means of the co-operatives and State organs in the direction of sales and supplies; of an execution of the daily practical programme of our constructional work in the rural districts in the sense of the gradual transformation of the dispersed peasant farms into united, big undertakings; and finally of the socialised collective tillage of the soil on the basis of an intensified and mechanised agriculture, with a view to accelerating by this means the rate of agricultural development and the elimination of the capitalist elements in the rural districts.

These are, roughly speaking, the results and achievements in the direction of economic construction.

This does not mean that all is in order in this country in the above connection. No, comrades, all is by no means in order.

We have, e. g., some of the symptoms of a dearth of commodities. This is certainly a shortcoming in our economy, though it is a shortcoming which is for the time being inevitable. For the very fact that we are developing the production of tools and other means of production more rapidly than the production of commodities makes it inevitable that during the next few years we should experience a dearth of the latter. We can, however, not act otherwise if we desire to promote the industrialisation of the country at all costs. There are people, e. g. our Opposition, who complain of this dearth while at the same time demanding an over-industrialisation. That is stupidity, comrades. Only ignorant persons can argue like that. We neither can nor will stop our heavy industries for the sake of the all-round development of other industrial branches. These latter, indeed, cannot be promoted unless the progress of the heavy industries is accelerated. We might increase the importation of finished goods and thus meet the dearth of commodities a measure the Opposition advocated for some time. This is such a stupid measure, however, that even the Opposition had to give up demanding it after a while. On the other hand the question arises as to how far we have reasonably pursued a policy of mitigating the dearth of commodities, a policy which is well within the bounds of the possible and on which the Party has long insisted. In this respect I believe all its not quite as it should be.

We are furthermore faced with the fact that there is a relatively not inconsiderable number of capitalists both in our industry and in our commerce. The proportional significance of these elements is not quite so slight as some of us seem to imagine. This is another shortcoming in the balance of our economy. I recently read the very interesting book which Comrade Larin has written on "Private Capital in the Soviet Union". I should advise you all to read it. You will see how cleverly and cunningly the capitalist hides behind the flag of the professional co-operatives, agricultural co-operatives, and certain commercial organisations.

Is really everything being done that might be done for the purpose of repressing, crippling, and finally overcoming the capitalist elements in the sphere of our national economy? I fear not enough has as yet been done in this direction. I know, e. g., that particularly in the leather and textile trades there is a not inconsiderable number of new millionaires, who make the artisans and the small producers dependent upon them. Are all possible steps taken with a view to economically restricting and repressing these exploitative elements by the connection of the respective branches of production with the co-operative or with the State organisations? It can hardly be doubted that all such steps are by no means taken, though this question is one of the greatest importance to us.

On the other hand we have the growth of the kulaks in the rural districts, another shortcoming in the balance of our economy. Is everything being done to weaken and isolate the kulak? I believe not. The fault lies with those comrades who think that the kulak can be mastered by administrative means.

That is an easy way, but by no means efficacious. The kulak must be approached with measures of an economic nature on the basis of revolutionary legislation. And this is no empty phrase. It naturally does not exclude the use of necessary administrative means against the kulak. But such administrative measures must not disturb those of an economic nature. Serious attention must be paid to all deviations from the directives of our Party in regard to our struggle against the kulak system as practised by our co-operative organs, especially in connection with agricultural credits.

We are, furthermore, faced with a fact like the extraordinarily slow rate in the diminution of the initial costs of industry, the factory prices of industrial goods, and the retail prices in the towns. This is yet another shortcoming in our economic balance. It must be admitted that we are here up against a tremendous resistance on the part of the apparatus, both the State apparatus and that of the co-operatives and the Party. Our comrades fail to see that the policy of reducing the prices of industrial goods is one of the best levers for the improvement of our industry, the expansion of the market, and the strengthening of the same source from which alone our industry can gain its power of development. It can surely not be doubted that it is only by fighting against this inertia of the apparatus in the execution of the price-reduction policy that this shortcoming can be eliminated.

Finally we are face to face with shortcomings such as the rôle still played by spirits in our budget, the extraordinary slow rate of development of foreign trade, and the insufficiency of the reserves.

I think it should be possible gradually to do away with spirits as a source of revenue and to let their place be taken by things like the wireless or the cinema. Indeed, why should we not take these important things in hand and put them in the charge of energetic individuals from the ranks of the genuine Bolsheviks, who will successfully set things going and thus make it possible for us finally to put an end to the spirit trade.

As regards foreign trade, it seems to me that a whole series of difficulties with which we are faced in the realm of economy, are to be attributed to the insufficiency of that economy and the insufficiency of exportation. Can we enhance our exports? I believe we can. Is everything possible being done to enhance them? I believe not.

The same thing must be said of the reserves. Those comrades are wrong that assert, either out of carelessness or because they are unacquainted with the matter, that we have no reserves. No, comrades, we have certain small reserves. All the organs of our State, from the district and provincial organs to the regional and central organs, are endeavouring to keep something in reserve for a "rainy day". These reserves are very small, it must be admitted. Therefore it is up to us to enlarge the reserves as far as possible, even if it is at the cost of certain current necessities.

These are the shortcomings of our economic construction, to which attention must be drawn and which must at any cost be removed, so that we may then advance at a quicker rate.

#### 4. THE CLASSES, THE STATE APPARATUS, AND THE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUNTRY.

From the question of the economic position of our country we now pass over to that of its political position.

a) **The Working Class.** The figures available in regard to the quantitative growth of the working class and to wage-earners in general show that, minus the unemployed, there were 8,215,000 wage-earners in 1924/25 and 10,346,000 in 1926/27. An increase of 25 per cent. Of the above totals, the manual workers, including land and seasonal workers, figured at 5,448,000 in 1924/25 and 7,060,000 in 1926/27. An increase of 29.6 per cent. Of these again the leading industries occupied 1,794,000 in 1924/25 and 2,388,000 in 1926/27. An increase of 33 per cent.

As regards the material position of the workers, the share of the wage-earners in the national income amounted in 1924/25 to 24.1 and in 1926/27 to 29.4 per cent., which latter figure surpasses the pre-war level of the same share by 30 per cent., whereas the shares of the other social groups in the national income, including that of the bourgeoisie, have receded in the same period (that of the bourgeoisie moving from 5.5 to 4.8 per cent.)

The actual wages of the workers in the entire State industry amounted, without social contributions, to 25.18 Moscow index-

roubles monthly in 1924/25 and to 34.14 roubles monthly in 1926/27, which represents a rise in two years by 27.0 per cent. and is 5.4 per cent. above the pre-war level. Together with the social contributions, for social insurance, cultural requirements, communal purposes, etc., wages stood in 1924/25 at 101.5 and in 1926/27 at 128.4 per cent. of the pre-war average. The social insurance funds rose from 461 million roubles in 1924/25 to 852 millions in 1926/27, i. e. by 85 per cent., which made it possible for 513,000 persons to be provided for in homes and sanatoria, 460,000 unemployed and 700,000 pensioners (invalids from industrial casualties and from the civil war) to be supported, and sick workers to be paid full wages.

The expenditure, i. e. the cost of constructing workers' dwellings stood at somewhat more than 132 million in 1924/25, at 230 millions in 1925/26, and at 282 millions in 1926/27. In 1927/28 they are to figure at more than 391 millions, including the 50 millions granted by the manifesto of the Central Executive Committee. Altogether the last three years saw an expenditure for the construction of workers' dwellings, without the inclusion of individual building costs, of 644.7 million roubles on the part of industry, transports, the executive committees and the co-operatives, this sum, together with the amount granted for 1927/28, making a total of 1,036 million roubles. This assignment for three years has rendered it possible to build over 4,594,000 square metres of dwelling area and to provide 257,000 workers, with families totalling almost 900,000 persons, with accommodation.

Regarding the question of unemployment, I must point out that there is a divergence in estimates between the Central Council of Trade Unions of the Soviet Union on the one hand and the People's Commissariat for Labour on the other. I choose the figures of the latter office only because they comprise the actual unemployed element in connection with the Labour Exchanges. According to the indications of the People's Commissariat for Labour, the number of unemployed increased in two years from 950 000 to 1,048,000. Of these, 16.5 per cent. were industrial workers and 74 per cent. unskilled workers and brain workers. Our unemployment is therefore caused by the overpopulation of the villages and only in the second place by a certain lack in the provision of industry with a definite minimum of industrial workers.

The outcome is thus an undoubted improvement of the material level of the working class as a whole.

The resulting task for the Party is that of continuing in the direction of an improvement in the material and cultural position of the workers with a view to a further rise in the wages of the working class.

b) **The Peasantry.** I believe it is unnecessary to quote any figures in regard to the differentiation of the peasantry, since my report is already long enough and these figures are known to all. There can be no doubt that a differentiation under the proletarian dictatorship must not be confounded with a differentiation under the capitalist system. Under capitalism we see a growth of extremes, of the kulaks on the one hand and the village poor on the other, while the middle peasant gradually disappears. With us, however, the middle peasant is developing at the cost of a certain portion of the poorest class, many members of which have risen to the level of middle peasants; at the same time the kulaks increase and the village poor decrease. This speaks for the fact that the middle peasant is and remains the main representative of village life. A bloc with this class, supported by the village poor, must therefore be of decisive importance for our entire work of development and for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In regard to the general growth of the material position in the rural districts, we can produce figures showing the increasing income of the rural population. The income of the peasant population amounted two years ago, in 1924/25, to 3548 million roubles and in 1926/27 to 4792 million roubles, showing an increase of 35.1 per cent. with an increase of the peasant population within this period by 2.38 per cent. This is an indubitable proof of the improvement in progress in the material position in the rural districts.

I do not mean to say that the peasants have improved their material position throughout the country. These last two years have in some instances seen very poor crops, while the failure

of the 1924 crop is even now making itself felt. Hence the State aid afforded the working peasantry in general and the poor peasants in particular. The State aid for the working peasantry amounted in 1925/26 to 373 million roubles and in 1926/27 to 427 millions. The special aid accorded to the poor peasants figured in 1925/26 at 38 million roubles distributed amongst the poorest farms, 44 millions in tax remissions in favour of these poorest undertakings, and 9 millions in the way of social privileges for the poorest class of the peasantry, making a total of 91 millions. In the year 1926/27, the special aid accorded the village poor under these three heads stood at 39 millions, 52 millions, and 9 millions, respectively, making a total of 100 millions.

The total balance in this connection is therefore an improvement in the material position of the great bulk of the peasantry.

The task that results for the Party is that of pursuing the course of an improvement of the material and cultural position of the bulk of the peasantry and especially of the poorer peasant class, of confirming the alliance between the peasantry and the working class, and of raising the authority of the working class and of the Party in the rural districts.

c) **The New Bourgeoisie. The Intelligentsia.** The most characteristic trait of the new bourgeoisie is the fact that, in contradistinction to the working class and the peasantry, it has no reason to be satisfied with the Soviet regime. Its discontent is no mere matter of chance, it is rooted in the general conditions of life. I spoke to you of the growth of our economy, of the growth of our industry, of the growth of the socialist element in our economy, of the decrease in the relative significance of private trade, and of the pushing back of the small traders. But what does all that mean? It means that if our industry and our commercial organs grow, tens of thousands of small and middling capitalists must be ruined. How many small and middle-sized shops had to close down in these last few years? Thousands of them. And how many employees have been dismissed in connection with the simplification of our State apparatus? Hundreds and thousands.

The progress of our industry, the progress of our commercial and co-operative organisations, and the improvement of our State apparatus mean an advantage for the working class, an advantage for the bulk of the peasantry, but mean a drawback for the new bourgeoisie, a drawback for the middle class altogether, and especially for the urban middle class. Is it therefore surprising that dissatisfaction with the Soviet regime should grow apace in these classes? Obviously not. Hence the counter-revolutionary sentiments in those circles; hence the Smeno-Wech ideology, which has become fashionable among this new bourgeoisie.

It would, however, be wrong to imagine that the employees in general or the entire intelligentsia is a prey to dissatisfaction. Alongside the growing dissatisfaction in the new bourgeoisie, we have a differentiation among the intelligentsia by reason of a secession from the Smeno-Wech principles, a secession of hundreds and thousands of the working intelligentsia, who are ranging themselves on the side of the Soviet power. This fact, comrades, is very welcome and deserves to be specially pointed out here. The leading element in this respect is supplied by the technically trained members of the intelligentsia, whose close contact with the process of production shows them clearly that the Bolsheviks stand for progress and improvement in our country. Such giant enterprises as the Volchovstroy, Dnieprostroy, Svirstroy, the Turkestan railway, the Volga-Don canal and a number of other works with the fate of which the fate of whole strata of technically trained intelligentsia is closely allied, cannot fail to make a definitely good impression on these classes.

Nor is it here a question of existence for the intellectuals in question. It is rather a question of a point of honour and a creative force which very naturally brings them nearer to the working class and the Soviet regime. I need not even speak of the working intellectuals in the rural districts, in particular the teachers, who have long declared for the Soviet regime and zealously welcome the development of education in the villages. Alongside the growing discontent among certain circles of the intelligentsia, we have thus also an alliance of many intellectuals with the working class.

It is the task of the Party to continue in its policy of isolating the new bourgeoisie, while consolidating the alliance of the working class with the active Soviet-intellectuals in town and country.

d) **The State Apparatus and the Fight against Bureaucracy.** So much is said about bureaucracy, that there is no cause for me to expatiate on the subject here. That in the State, co-operative, and Party apparatus there are elements of bureaucracy is a fact no one can deny. That these elements of bureaucracy are things to be fought against and that it is imperative for us, so long as we possess State authority, to engage in this fight, is likewise an undeniable fact.

But there must be limits. To wage the fight against bureaucracy in the State apparatus to the point of throttling the entire State apparatus and to the point of its consequent dissolution, would be to proceed against Leninism itself and to forget that our apparatus is a Soviet apparatus, representing the most perfect type of a State apparatus in comparison with the State apparatus of all other countries in the world.

Wherein lies the power of our State apparatus? It lies in the fact that it combines its power with the millions of peasants and workers in the country, in the fact that the Soviets are a school of administration for thousands and tens of thousands of workers and peasants, in the fact that the State apparatus does not separate itself from the broad masses of peasants and workers, but is fused with them by a tremendous number of mass-organisations and all sorts of commissions, sections, conferences, assemblies of delegates and so forth, which fill the Soviets and thus support the organs of power. And wherein lies the weakness of our State apparatus? In the existence within it of bureaucratic elements which spoil and distort its work. The removal of bureaucracy from this apparatus is a task that cannot be accomplished in a year or two; the State apparatus must to this end be systematically improved, brought nearer to the masses, rejuvenated by the introduction of new elements devoted to the cause of the working class, and remodelled, but by no means broken or dissolved, in the spirit of Communism. Lenin was quite right in saying:

"Without an apparatus we should have been ruined long ago. Without a systematic and obstinate fight for the improvement of the apparatus we shall yet be ruined ere we proceed to laying the foundation of Socialism."

I shall not enter into details in regard to the shortcomings of our State apparatus, which are obvious enough. I refer in the first place to the "traditional system of procrastination", in regard to which I have plenty of documentary evidence at my disposal, clearly proving the criminal negligence of a number of legal, administrative, co-operative, social, and other organisations. We have, for instance, a peasant who appears twenty-one times at the same institution of national insurance in order to obtain his rights, without attaining anything. Or again, another peasant, a man of sixty-six years of age, who has covered 600 versts on foot for the purpose of obtaining information at the social relief office of his circuit, and likewise fails to realise his object. Then again we have a peasant woman of fifty-six, who in answer to a summons of the popular court has come 500 versts on foot and more than 600 versts by cart, and all in vain. There is any number of such cases. It is not worth while enumerating them all, but such conditions comrades, are nothing to be proud of. How can such things be countenanced?

Finally, we have the question of the "deferred" workers. It is apparent that alongside the "preferred" workers, who have been "pushed up", there are also "deferred" workers who are "kept down", who are kept in the background by their fellow workers, and that not on account of incapacity, but rather because of their conscientiousness and honesty. Thus we have the case of a locksmith and instrument-maker who in view of his capacity and incorruptibility was accorded a certain position. He worked for a year, then for another year, worked honestly, made order, fought against negligence and waste. In thus acting, however, he infringed the interests of some "close" clique of "Communists", whom he disturbed in their ease. And what was the result? These "Communists" throw obstacles in his way and force him to retire. "Wanted to be cleverer than we", they say, "won't let us live and attain anything. Get out with you."



Or in another case, a workman, likewise a locksmith, advanced to a certain position in his factory in view of his capacity, worked hard and seriously, but disturbed the circles of some one else. And what was the result? Some pretext or other was found to get rid of him. With what feelings did this man, once advanced on account of his ability, now quit the works? Hear what he says himself on the subject:

"Wherever I was placed I endeavoured to justify the confidence reposed in me. That position in which I was so unfairly treated, I shall not forget. I was dragged through the mud. My desire to preserve good order remained unfulfilled. Neither the factory committee nor the factory administration nor the nuclei would listen to me. I shall accept no more such posts, not even if I am paid my weight in gold." ("Trud", No. 128, of June 9th, 1927.)

Comrades, is this not something we ought to be ashamed of? May such abuses be tolerated?

It is up to the Party, in its fight against bureaucracy and for the improvement of the State apparatus, to destroy such abuses root and branch.

e) On the Leninist Slogan of the Cultural Revolution. The safest means against bureaucracy is the elevation of the cultural level of the workers and peasants. It is easy to grumble at the bureaucracy in the State apparatus, to attack and deride the bureaucracy in our Party practice; but so long as there is no definite level of culture in our broad working masses, creating the possibility and the desire for a control of the State apparatus from below by the force of the working masses, bureaucracy will continue to exist. Therefore the cultural development of the working class and of the toiling peasantry (not only in the form of instruction in reading and writing, though these are the foundations of all culture, but mainly in the form of an acquisition of habits and of an understanding for the administration of the country) must be the main factor in the improvement of the State apparatus and every other apparatus.

This is the sense of the Leninist slogan of the cultural revolution. This is what Lenin said in March 1922, before the opening of our IXth Party Congress, in a letter addressed to the Central Committee in general and Comrade Molotov in particular:

"What we mainly lack is culture and administrative ability. Economically and politically, the "NEP" fully justifies the establishment of the foundations of a Socialist economy. It is only a question of the cultural forces of the proletariat and its advance-guard."

These words of Lenin must not be forgotten comrades. Hence it is the task of the Party to increase the fight for the cultural promotion of the working class and of the active portion of the peasantry.

### III. The Party and the Opposition.

a) The Present State of the Party. I shall not dwell here, comrades, on the numeric and growth of the Party; I shall quote no figures, for these will be provided in detail by Comrade Kossior. Nor yet shall I speak about the social composition of our Party or the figures in that connection, on which subject Comrade Kossior is about to give you comprehensive information. I should, however, like to say something about the elevation and qualitative improvement of the guiding activity of our Party both in a political and in an economic sense. There was a time, comrades, two or three years ago, when some of our comrades, under the leadership, I believe, of Trotzky, (Laughter; cries of "I believe?") criticised our provincial committees and our Central Committee, declaring our party organisations to be incompetent and to be interfering without any advantage in the economic matters of the country. Yes, indeed, there was such a time.

To-day there is hardly any one that would dare to advance such an accusation against the Party organisation. That the provincial and regional committees have taken the economic lead into their own hands and that the party organisations are at the head of the work of economic construction and not in tow

And what conclusion may we draw as to the political position of our country?

We may conclude that the Soviet rule is the most solid of all regimes existing in the world. (Vociferous applause.)

But if the Soviet regime is the firmest existing regime in the world, which all and every bourgeois Government can well envy us, that does not mean that all things are satisfactory in this respect in our country. No, comrades, we have many shortcomings in this connection, which we Bolsheviks neither can nor must conceal.

In the first place we have unemployment. This is an evil we must abolish or at least restrict as far as possible. Secondly, there are deficiencies in the construction of dwellings for the workers, there is a housing crisis which we must also reduce to a minimum. There is also a remnant of anti-Semitism, not only in certain middle-class circles but also in certain sections of the working class and even within the Party. This is an evil we must inexorably combat. Nor must we ignore the fact that the anti-religious fight has slackened in certain quarters. Finally there is still a tremendous cultural deficiency, not only in the general, but also in the particular sense of the word, in the sense of elementary knowledge, for the percentage of illiterates in the Soviet Union is still considerable.

All these and similar shortcomings must be removed if we are to move forward at an accelerated pace.

So as to close this section of my report, allow me to say a few words as to the very characteristic appointments which have taken place in the period under review. I do not intend to speak of the appointment of Comrade Rykov, Deputy-Chairman of the Council of People's Commissaries of the Soviet Union, nor yet of the appointments to the positions of People's Commissary for the Supreme Economic Council, People's Commissary for Trade and the Political Administration of the Soviet Union.

I should like to speak of three appointments of characteristic significance. You will know that Comrade Lobov, a metal worker, has been appointed chairman of the Supreme Economic Council of the S. R. F. S. R., that Comrade Uchanov, likewise a metal-worker, has been appointed chairman of the Moscow Soviet in the place of Kamenev, and that Comrade Komarov, also a metal-worker, has been appointed chairman of the Leningrad Soviet in the place of Zinoviev. The "Lord Mayors" of our two capital cities are thus both metal workers (Applause). They are not sprigs of the nobility, but they will conduct the economy of our capitals better than any nobleman. You will say there is a tendency towards metalisation. I believe there is nothing the matter with that. (Cries of "On the contrary, that is all right".) I could wish that capitalist cities like London or Paris could imitate us in this respect and also elect their own metal workers as "Lord Mayors".

thereof, are such obvious facts that only blind men or imbeciles would venture to deny them. The mere fact, however, that we have determined to advance the question of the five-year scheme of economic construction at the present Party Congress, shows that the Party is far advanced in the question of a systematic conduct of our economic construction, both at the centre and in the provinces. Many think there is nothing remarkable in that. But I assure you, comrades, that it is something particular and noteworthy, which calls for our special attention. Reference is often made to German or American economic organs as having also conducted economy according to a definite plan. But I can assure you, comrades, that that is a thing they have not yet achieved, nor will they ever achieve it so long as the capitalist order prevails there. For the purpose of a systematic conduct, the system of industry must be different, it must be a Socialist and not a capitalist system; at the very least there must be a nationalised form of industry, a nationalised credit system, nationalised land, a Socialist union with the rural districts, the rule of the working class throughout the country, and so forth. True, they have also something in the nature of systems. But they are systems after the manner



of prognoses, of presumptions binding on no one, on the basis of which the economy of a country cannot be conducted. The case is quite different with us; our plans are neither prognoses nor presumptions, but directives which are obligatory for all leading organs and which determine the direction of our economic development in the future for the entire country. You will see that we have here a difference of principle. Therefore I say that the very fact of the treatment of the question of the five-year plan of economic development at the Party Congress is an indication that our guiding and systematic activity has gained a higher level.

Nor shall I expatiate on the increase of the internal democracy within our Party. None but blind men fail to see that the internal democracy is growing and developing with the actual activity of the masses of party members.

All this talk about democracy! What is democracy within the Party? Democracy for whom? If democracy is understood to mean the right of a few intellectuals, severed from the actual revolution, to twaddle without limit and to have their own press organs, we need no such democracy, for that is the democracy of a tiny minority opposing the will of the tremendous majority. If, however, democracy is understood in the sense of liberty for the broad masses of the Party to solve the problems of our development, if democracy is understood to mean the promotion of the activity of the party members, their inclusion in the party management, and the development of the sentiment within them that the Party is their Party, then we certainly do possess such a form of democracy, we need it, and we shall continue to develop it at all costs. (Applause.)

Furthermore, comrades, I have no wish to talk here at any length about the fact that together with the democracy within the Party good fellowship also progresses step by step in the leadership of our Party. Let us just take, for instance our Central Committee and our Central Control Commission. These two together form a leading central organism of 200 or 250 comrades with the task of regularly summing up and deciding the most important problems of our development. This is one of the most democratic and comradely working centres our Party has ever had. And is it not a fact that the decision in regard to the most important matters of our programme pass more and more out of the hands of a small number of leaders into those of this broad central authority, which is most seriously connected with all the branches of construction and all parts of our great country?

Nor yet, comrades, shall I speak to-day about the increase of our party cadres. It cannot be doubted that in these last few years the gaps in the old ranks of our Party were filled up by fresh progressive forces mainly consisting of workers. If formerly our ranks numbered hundreds and thousands, they to-day number tens of thousands. I believe that the ranks of our party functionaries, which consist mainly of workers, number no fewer than 100,000 persons at present, if we take the whole of the Soviet Union and include the lower organisations, the workshop and group organisations up to the supreme organisations. This is the greatest increase recorded in our Party. It is the greatest growth of our cadres, a growth of its Communist culture.

Finally, one more question on which no detailed expatiations are necessary but which deserves to be mentioned. It is the question of the increasing authority of the Party among the non-party workers and in general among the working masses of our country, as also among the oppressed classes of all the world. There can be hardly any doubt but that our Party represents the banner of freedom for the working masses of the whole world, while the name of Bolshevik has become an honourable distinction for the very pick of the working class.

That, comrades, is in general the aspect of our achievements in the way of party development.

That does not mean that we are without shortcomings in the Party. There are such shortcomings, and serious ones too. Permit me to say a word on this subject.

Let us take, for example, the management of the economic organisations and other similar bodies by the party organisations. Is everything in order in this connection? By no means. Questions arising not only in the provinces but even in the centre, are very often settled in what may be called a familiar, homely manner. Let us assume that Ivan Ivanovitch, member of the management of some organisation or other, has committed a serious blunder and harmed the cause thereby. But

Ivan Fedorovitch does not wish to criticise him or make the matter known, as he "doesn't want to make bad blood between them". A mistake has been made, harm has been done, it is a matter of no small importance. But which among us never makes mistakes? I shall spare Ivan Ivanovitch to-day, for what guarantee have I that I shall never make a mistake myself? One must be good and decent. Peace and goodwill. Is the error committed not of disadvantage to our great cause? That does not matter. We shall get out of it somehow or other.

Such, comrades, are the ordinary reflections of some of our responsible functionaries. But what does this mean? If we Bolsheviks, who are ready to criticise all the world and, as Marx said, to storm the heavens, eschew self-criticism for the sake of the peace-of-mind of some of our comrades, is it not obvious that tremendous harm can result for our cause. (Cries of "Hear, hear") Marx said that the proletarian revolution was distinct from all other revolutions also in the fact that it criticised itself and was strengthened through self-criticism. This is a very important remark by Marx. If we, champions of the proletarian revolution, close our eyes to our errors and settle matters in a familiar and convivial way by preserving silence as to our mutual mistakes and thus driving the festering ulcers into the interior of our party organism, who will finally correct these errors and shortcomings? Is it not obvious that we shall then cease to be proletarian revolutionaries, that we shall probably go under if we countenance a growth of this "family and neighbour" system in the settlement of important matters? Is it not obvious that by eschewing an honest and direct self-criticism, an open and honest correction of our errors we are barring our way to progress, to the promotion of our cause, and to new successes of our great enterprise? Our development is not uniform and all-comprehending. No, comrades, we have still classes among us, there are still contradictions in this country, we have a past, a present, and a future, between which there are great differences, so that we cannot progress easily and, so to say, on the crests of the waves. Our progress must take the form of a struggle, by the development, recognition, and overcoming of those contrasts and differences. So long as there are classes in our midst we shall never be in position to say "Now, thank God, all is in order!" This will never be the case among us. Here something is constantly dying, but it refuses to die without a struggle, it fights for its obsolete existence. At the same time other things are born, but they are not born quietly either, they struggle into the world, immediately defending their right to existence. (Cries of "Very true!" Applause.) The fight between the old and the new, the dying and the developing, is the very basis of our existence. If we do not openly and honestly, as becomes Bolsheviks, show up the faults and shortcomings in our work, we bar our own way to progress. But we desire to progress. And just because we desire to progress we must look upon an honest revolutionary self-criticism as one of our foremost tasks. Otherwise no progress and no development can be attained. But just in this connection there is still much that calls for correction. Nay, worse than that: a certain success suffices to cause all shortcomings to be forgotten; conscience is appeased and vanity begins to assert itself. Two or three big achievements and all is self-satisfaction; two or three more and self-satisfaction knows no limits. But the faults remain and the shortcomings continue, the ulcers being driven into the interior of the party organism.

Yet another weak point consists in the bringing of the method of administration into the Party. The method of conviction, which is of paramount importance for the Party, is replaced by the administrative method. This error is no less dangerous than that described above, since it embodies the danger of a transformation of our party organisations from independent bodies into soulless bureaucratic institutions. If we assume that we have no more than 60,000 particularly active functionaries, distributed among all sorts of economic, trade-union, or State institutions and fighting there against bureaucracy, we must admit that some of them are likely themselves to be infected with bureaucratic ideas and to introduce them into the party organisations. This is, indeed, no fault but rather a misfortune for us, for as long as there is a State this evil will be apparent in a smaller or greater degree. And just because this process is not without its natural connection with human life, we must do our best to fight against it by raising the activity of the party masses, causing

them to participate in the solution of all questions of party management, and systematically developing the democracy within the Party.

A further shortcoming consists in the desire on the part of very many of our comrades to swim with the current, calmly and easily, without any prospects, without looking ahead, with something in the sense of a festive atmosphere on all hands with solemn sessions day by day and the chance for every one of us in turn to become honorary member of some select body or other. (Laughter, Applause.) This irrepressible wish to see a holiday atmosphere on all sides, this craving for decorations, for all sorts of jubilees, with or without just reason, this wish to swim with the current as long as there is the possibility of swimming without looking to see whether it leads (Laughter, applause), all this goes to make up the third shortcoming of our party practice and one of the reasons of deficiency in our party life. Have you ever seen rowers rowing honestly and with all their might but not looking whether the current was taking them? I have seen such rowers on the Yenisei. They were honest, unfiring rowers. The misfortune is that they did not see and would not see that they might be dashed by a wave against the rocks, where disaster awaited them. The same thing is happening to some of our comrades. They row bravely without interruption, they skim lightly along, allowing the current to carry them, but they do not know whether they are going, nor do they want to know it. Work without any perspective, without rudder or tiller, that is what results from floating with the current. And the ultimate outcome is obvious. First they get mildewed, then they sink into the mire of the petty bourgeoisie, until finally they become thorough bourgeois. This is the path of absolute deterioration.

These, comrades, are some of the shortcomings in our party practice and our party life, on which subject I felt obliged to speak a few bitter words.

And now permit me to pass to the actual questions of discussions and the question of our so-called Opposition.

b) **The Balance of Discussion.** Is there any sense or value in discussion? Sometimes we hear it said: The devil take it all, why make such a lot out of discussion? Would it not be sufficient to thresh the things out among ourselves instead of making everything so tremendously public? This is wrong, comrades. A discussion is sometimes quite indispensable and altogether useful. It is only a question as to what sort of a discussion it is. If it is carried on in a spirit of comradeship, within the limits of the Party, and if it sets itself the task of self-criticism and of a criticism of party shortcomings, if it thus advances our cause and makes our working class more capable of defending itself, such a discussion is necessary and useful. But there is another kind of discussion, which aims not at the improvement of our common cause but at its aggravation, not at strengthening the ties of our Party but at loosening them. Such a discussion generally leads not to a more militant spirit among our workers but rather to their disarmament. Such a discussion as this we do not want. (Applause.)

When some three months before the Party Congress, prior to the elaboration of the theses of the Party Congress, prior before the publication thereof, the Opposition demanded a general discussion, they were trying to force a discussion upon us which would inevitably have furthered the cause of our enemies, the cause of the enemies of the working class the cause of the enemies of our Party. It was just for this reason that the Central Committee opposed the plans of the Opposition and thus enabled us to guide the discussion in the right direction by basing it on the theses of the Central Committee for the Party Congress. And now we can say, without hesitation, that upon the whole the discussion has resulted in a gain for us. As regards the accusation of too great a publicity, that is all nonsense. We have never feared and shall never fear to criticise ourselves and our faults in the eyes of the entire Party. The power of Bolshevism consists in the fact that it fears no criticism and that it derives from the criticism of its shortcomings the energy for its further progress. The present discussion is therefore a sign of strength on the part of our Party, a sign of its power.

It must not be forgotten that in every great party and quite particularly in one like our own, which has the power in its hands and which comprises a certain portion of the peasant and employee elements, a certain number of indi-

viduals accumulated in the course of time who are indifferent to the questions of party tactics, who vote with closed eyes, and who drift with the current. The presence of a great number of such elements is an evil to be fought against. These elements form the dregs of our Party, and it is to these dregs that the discussion is directed. The Opposition appeals to them, so as to sever part of them from us. And they really do succeed in severing the worst part. At the same time the Party appeals to them, so to separate the best part of them from the rest and to lead it back to active party work. Consequently the members of the "dregs" are placed before the necessity of choosing in spite of all their inertia. And indeed, they react on this necessity, some of them joining the Opposition and some the Party, so that the "dregs" cease to exist as such. In the total balance of our party development this is an advantage. As a result of our present discussions we have retained fewer "dregs", and even those will soon cease to exist. Herein lies the advantage gained by the discussion.

And the numeric balance of the discussion? Up to yesterday, we learn, 724,000 comrades have voted for the Party and slightly more than 4000 for the Opposition. The Opposition declared vociferously that the Central Committee had separated from the Party and the Party from the working class, and that, supposing this and that were to happen, supposing hair to grow out of the palm of the hand, they would have 99 per cent. on their side. But since hair does not grow out of the palm of a hand, the result is that the Opposition did not even gain 1 per cent.

How could it come about that the Party in its entirety, and subsequently the working class too should have abandoned the Opposition so completely? At the head of the Opposition there are persons of note, persons that know how to beat the booster's drum, persons that are not afflicted with modesty. (Applause), but know how to get out of any difficulty. What happened happened because the leading group of the Opposition turned out to be a group of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, separated from the revolution, from the Party, from the working class, and from actual life. (Applause.) I spoke some time ago of the success of our work, of the achievements in industry, commerce, and economy in its entirety, as also in foreign politics. The Opposition does not trouble about these achievements, it does not see them, or it refuses to see them partly by reason of its stupidity and partly by reason of a certain obstinacy on the part of the intellectuals who are estranged from life.

c) **The Main Deviations of the Opposition from the Party.** You will wish to know in what the actual differences of opinion between the Party and the Opposition consist and to what problems these differences refer. They refer to all problems. (Hear, hear!) A short while ago I read the declaration of a non-party workman in Moscow, who is now entering, or has now already entered, the Party. He expressed the differences between the Party and the Opposition as follows:

"Formerly we sought to know in what the differences of opinion between the Party and the Opposition consisted. Now there is hardly a point in which the two agree. The Opposition is opposed to the Party in all matters, and thus, if I were a member of the Opposition, I should not enter the Party." (Laughter and applause.) (v. "Isvestia", No. 264.)

Hear, how briefly and accurately workers sometimes express themselves. I believe this to be the most accurate and most comprehensive characterisation of the relations between the Opposition and the Party in regard to ideology, programme, and tactics. Just because the Opposition deviates from the Party in all questions, the Opposition forms a group with its own ideology, with its own programme, with its own tactics and its own principles of organisation. All that is needed for a new party we find in the Opposition. It lacks but a "trifle", the necessary strength to stand alone. (Laughter, applause.)

I could mention seven main questions, in regard to which there are differences of opinion between the Opposition and the Party.

Firstly. The question of a possibility of a victorious Socialist construction of our country. I shall not go into detail into the documents and declarations of the Opposition in this connection. They are known to all and it is unnecessary to

repeat them. It is obvious to all that the Opposition denies the possibility of a victorious building up of Socialism in our country. By denying such a possibility, however, they pass immediately and openly to the position occupied by the Mensheviks. Such an attitude on the part of the Opposition to this particular question is not new in the case of the present oppositional leaders. It was from this standpoint that Kamenev and Zinoviev started when they refused to take part in the October revolt. They then said expressly that if we started the insurrection we should be going to our ruin, that we ought to wait for the Constituent Assembly, that the premises for Socialism had not yet ripened and would not ripen so soon. The same standpoint was occupied by Trotzky when he decided to take part in the insurrection. He said openly that, supposing a victorious revolution in the West did not afford us help very soon, it was foolish to imagine that the Russian revolution could withstand the conservative Europe.

And in what manner did Kamenev and Zinoviev on the one hand and Trotzky on the other hand eventually participate in the insurrection? This is a very interesting question, to which it is well worth while devoting a few words. You know very well, comrades, that it was only under pressure that Kamenev and Zinoviev took part in it at all. Lenin drove them to it by threatening to expel them from the Party. (Laughter, applause.) They had to drag themselves into the revolt. (Laughter, applause.) Trotzky took part of his own free will, but he did not do so without a certain small reservation, which even then brought him nearer to Kamenev and Zinoviev. It is interesting that shortly before the October Revolution, in July 1917, Trotzky considered it appropriate to re-publish his old pamphlet on the "Peace Programme", as though he wanted to say that he was entering the revolution under his own flag. What was the subject matter of this pamphlet? It was a discussion with Lenin as to the possibility of a victory of Socialism in one country, which idea of Lenin he considered wrong, affirming that it would certainly be necessary to seize power but that, supposing no help to be forthcoming from a victory of the workers in the West of Europe, it was hopeless to think that revolutionary Russia could withstand conservative Europe. He added that all who failed to understand his criticism were lacking in common sense. I may here read you an extract from the said pamphlet of Trotzky.

"Without waiting for the others, we commence the fight and carry it on within the limits of this country in the confident expectation that our initiative will give rise to a similar action in other countries. If this should not be the case, it would be hopeless, as both history and our own theoretic calculations prove, to imagine that revolutionary Russia could withstand conservative Europe. To limit the prospects of the Socialist revolution to national boundaries would mean falling a victim to the same national limitations that formed the programme of the social patriots." (Trotzky, "1917", vol. III, Part I, Page 90.)

This, comrades, was the reservation of Trotzky, which in many ways explains his present collaboration with Kamenev and Zinoviev.

And how did Lenin enter the revolution? What was the attitude of the Party? Also with a reservation? No, Lenin and his Party proceeded without the least reservations. Here is an extract from the excellent article by Lenin, "The War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution", published abroad in September 1917.

"Socialism victorious in a single country by no means immediately obviates all further wars. On the contrary, it presumes them. The suppression of capitalism ensues very differently in the different countries. This cannot be otherwise in the case of commodity production. Hence the irrefutable conclusion that Socialism cannot win through simultaneously in all countries; it will succeed first in one country or in a certain number of countries, and the other countries will for a time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois. This will be the cause not only of conflicts but also of the direct intention on the part of the bourgeoisie of other lands to annihilate the victorious proletariat of the socialist State. In such an eventuality, a war on our part would be necessary and justified. It would be a war for Socialism and for the emancipation of the other peoples

from the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, "War Programme of the Proletarian Revolution", Records of the Lenin Institute, 2nd Edition, Page 7.)

You see what a different standpoint this is. If Trotzky went into the revolt with a reservation, which brought him nearer to Zinoviev and Kamenev, by declaring that the proletarian rule in our country could be of no avail if it were not afforded timely help from without, Lenin went into the fight without a reservation, declaring that the proletarian rule in our country must serve as a basis, to enable the proletarians of other countries to emancipate themselves from the yoke of the bourgeoisie.

This is how the Bolsheviks entered the October Revolution, and this is the reason why in the tenth year of the revolution Trotzky has found a common platform with Zinoviev and Kamenev.

We might well imagine a dialogue conversation between Trotzky on the one hand and Zinoviev and Kamenev on the other on the occasion of the foundation of the Oppositional bloc.

#### Kamenev and Zinoviev to Trotzky:

Look here, dear comrade, we were ultimately right in saying it was a mistake to enter the October Revolution and that it would be better to wait for the Constituent Assembly. To-day all recognise that the country and the Government are in a state of decay, that we are faced with ruin, and that there will be no Socialism at all in our country. It was a mistake to go in for the revolt. But you entered it of your own free will. You made a great mistake in doing so.

#### Trotzky replies:

No, my dear colleagues, you are unjust to me. True, I went in for the revolt, but you have forgotten to mention how. I did not go in for it unreservedly, but with a reservation. And since it has now turned out that we can expect no help from outside, we are obviously going to our ruin, as I predicted would be the case in my "Peace Programme".

#### Zinoviev and Kamenev:

That will probably be the case. We had forgotten your reservation. It is now obvious that our bloc is on a sound ideological foundation. (General laughter and applause.)

This is the way in which the standpoint of the Opposition came about in regard to their denial of the possibility of a victorious Socialist construction in this country.

And what is the actual purport of this standpoint of theirs? It stands for capitulation. To whom? Obviously to the capitalist elements in the country. To whom else? To the international bourgeoisie. And how about the "Left" phrases and the revolutionary gestures? They have disappeared as chaff in the wind. Shake our Opposition thoroughly to remove their revolutionary phraseology, and you will see that what remains is nothing but a spirit of capitulation.

Secondly. The Question of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Have we a proletarian dictatorship or have we not? A somewhat remarkable question. (Laughter.) Nevertheless, it is advanced in every declaration of the Opposition. The Opposition accuses us of Thermidorian deterioration. What does that mean? It means that we have no dictatorship of the proletariat, that our economics and politics have come to grief and are on the decline, that we are not approaching Socialism but capitalism. All this is both curious and foolish. But the Opposition insists on these points. We have here, comrades, yet another point of deviation. It is this which forms the basis of the well-known theses of Trotzky on Clemenceau. If the power has degenerated or is in process of degeneration, is it worth while to spare it, to defend it, to protect it? Obviously not. If a favourable occasion arises for the "removal" of such a power, let us say, when the enemy approaches to within 80 kilometres from Moscow, is it not obvious that the situation must not be allowed to pass unused for the purpose of removing this power and of setting up another power, more in a Clemenceauist, i. e. a Trotzkyist sense. It is quite apparent that there is nothing of Leninism in all this; it is Menshevism

of the purest water. The Opposition has got as far as Menshevism.

**Thirdly.** The question of the bloc between the workers and the middle peasants. From the beginning the Opposition concealed their adverse attitude to the idea of such a bloc formation. Their platform and their counter-theses are not so remarkable for what is said in them as for what the Opposition has attempted to conceal from the working class. Now, however, a man has been found in L. N. Smirnov, also one of the Opposition leaders, who had the courage to tell the truth about the Opposition. And what is the result? It appears that we are fast approaching an abyss. If we wish to save ourselves, we shall have to bring about a breach with the peasantry. Not very intelligent, but altogether lucid. Here the hoof of the Mensheviks is only too apparent.

**Fourthly.** The question as to the character of our revolution. If the possibility of building up Socialism in our country is denied, if the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is questioned, and if doubt is cast upon the necessity of an alliance of the working class with the peasantry, what remains of our revolution and of its entire Socialist character? Nothing at all. The proletariat has come into power and has crowned the bourgeois revolution. The peasantry has nothing to do with revolution now that it has received the land; the proletariat may go, to make way for other classes. That is the standpoint of the Opposition. If we get down to the bottom of the Oppositional view of things, we may see the entire capitulatory attitude of our Opposition. It is not in vain that they have earned the praise of Abramovitch.

**Fifthly.** The question of the Leninist attitude in the guidance of the colonial revolutions. Lenin started from the difference between imperialist countries and oppressed nations, between the policy of Communism in the imperialist countries and the policy of Communism, in the colonial countries, and, starting from this difference, he said even before the conclusion of the war that the idea of the defence of native country, which is counter-revolutionary and unacceptable for the Communists in imperialist countries, is altogether just and acceptable in oppressed countries fighting against their imperialist oppressors. For this reason he admitted for a certain time and for a certain stage in the revolutionary operations the possibility of an alliance with the national bourgeoisie in the oppressed colonial countries, supposing the latter to be desirous of waging war on the imperialist oppressors and under the provision that the Communists are not hindered in their task of educating the workers and the rural poor in the spirit of Communism. The fault of the Opposition in this connection lies in the fact that they have finally broken with this standpoint, gravitating towards that of the Second International, which denies the advisability of supporting the revolutionary wars of the colonial countries against the imperialists. This explains all the false conclusions drawn by the Opposition in connection with the Chinese revolution. This, therefore, represents a further deviation.

**Sixthly.** The question of united-front tactics in the labour movement of the world. The fault of the Opposition in this case consists in the fact that they have broken with the tactics of Lenin in regard to the question of a gradual winning of the millions of workers for Communism. The millions of the working class are not to be won for Communism only by means of a proper policy on the part of the Party. A proper party policy is a very good thing but it is not everything. If the millions of the working class are to go over to the cause of Communism, it is requisite that the masses should convince themselves, from their own experience, of the correctness of the Communist policy. To this end, however, there is need of time, as also of a reasonable and clever activity on the part of the Party for the purpose of bringing the masses in closer touch with its positions and of convincing the masses of the correctness of its policy. We were right in our attitude of April 1917, for we knew that it was a question of overthrowing the bourgeoisie and setting up the power of the Soviets. But we did not then call upon the broad masses of the proletariat to rise. And why not? Because the workers had not yet the possibility to convince themselves of the accuracy of our really correct policy. It was only when the petty-bourgeois parties of the Social-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks had definitely failed in the decisive questions of the revolution, and when the masses had begun to convince themselves of the correctness of our policy, that we led them into open insurrection. And that is why we

were then victorious. Therein lie the roots of the principle of a united bloc. At bottom the tactics of the united front were employed by Lenin so as to render a transition to the cause of the Communists easier for the millions of workers in the capitalist countries, who are infected by the prejudices of the Social Democratic compromisers. The fault of the Opposition lies in the fact that they altogether rejected these tactics. Carried away for a time in a foolish and incomprehensible manner by these tactics, they welcomed an understanding with the General Council in England, which they believed to be "one of the most serious guarantees of peace, one of the most serious guarantees against intervention, and one of the most serious means of counter-acting reformism in Europe". (v. Zinoviev's report at the XIVth Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.) Thoroughly disappointed in their hopes of a frustration of reformism with the help of Purcell and Hicks, they subsequently changed to the other extreme by wholly rejecting the tactics of the united front. Here, comrades, we have another deviation, which demonstrates the complete departure of the Opposition from the Leninist tactics of the united front.

**Seventhly.** The question of the Leninist party solidarity, the Leninist unity within the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern. The Opposition here wholly breaks with the organisatory standpoint of Lenin and chooses the way of organising a second party and a new international.

There are thus seven main questions which show that the Opposition has deteriorated to the level of Menshevism.

Can this Menshevik attitude of the Opposition be considered compatible with the ideology of our Party, with the programme of our Party, with its tactics, with the tactics of the Comintern, or with the organisatory attitude of Leninism? No, by no means, not for a moment.

You will ask: How ever could such an Opposition come into existence? What were its social roots? I believe that the social roots of the Opposition consisted in the decay of the petty-bourgeois elements in the towns as a result of our development, in the discontent of these classes with the dictatorship of the proletariat, and in the endeavour of the same classes to change the regime by "improving" it in the sense of a bourgeois democracy. I remarked before that as a result of our progress, as a result of the growth of our industry, as a result of the growing specific weight of the Bo'shevist form of economy, part of the petty-bourgeoisie, especially in the cities, was ruined and forced to the wall. The Opposition reflects the complaints and dissatisfaction of these classes with the regime of the proletarian revolution.

Herein lie the social roots of the Opposition.

**(d) And what next?** What is now to happen to the Opposition? Before passing over to the discussion of this question, I should like to tell you the history of an attempt at collaboration with Trotzky, made by Comrade Kamenev early as 1911. This is a very interesting question, all the more so as it may afford us a key for the understanding of the question just raised. In the year 1910, the Plenum of our Central Committee assembled abroad. It discussed the question of the relations of the Bolsheviks to the Mensheviks, and especially between the former and Trotzky (At that time we formed a common party with the Mensheviks and designated ourselves as a mere fraction). The Plenum decided in favour of a reconciliation with the Mensheviks and thus also with Trotzky, in spite of Lenin, against the will of Lenin, who had remained in the minority. But how about Kamenev? Kamenev attempted to collaborate with Trotzky. Nor did he realise this collaboration without the knowledge and consent of Lenin, who desired to prove to Kamenev on the basis of experience the harmfulness and inadmissibility of a co-operation with Trotzky against the Bolsheviks.

Let us hear what Comrade Kamenev reported on the subject.

"In 1910 the majority of our fraction made an attempt at a reconciliation and an understanding with Comrade Trotzky. Vladimir Ilyitch was altogether opposed to this attempt and insisted — so to say as a punishment for my obstinacy in trying to bring about this understanding — that I should be deputed by the Central Committee as its representative to work with Comrade Trotzky in the office of his newspaper. In the autumn of 1910, when I had worked for some months in the said office, I was per-



suaded that Vladimir Ilyitch was right in his adverse attitude towards my 'conciliatory' line, and with his consent I quitted working on the newspaper. Our rupture with Comrade Trotsky at that time was characterised by a series of vehement articles in the central organ of the Party. Just at that time, Vladimir Ilyitch suggested that I should write a pamphlet summing up our differences of opinion in relation with the Menshevists and with Comrade Trotsky. 'You have made an attempt at a reconciliation with this extreme Left wing of the anti-Bolshevist group', said Vladimir Ilyitch to me, 'you have persuaded yourself of the impossibility of such an understanding. You must therefore publish a pamphlet summing up the results of your investigation'. It is quite natural that Vladimir Ilyitch should have insisted on having a clear statement as to this matter of the relationship between Bolshevism and what we then termed Trotskyism." (Preface by L. Kamenev to his pamphlet "Two Parties", May 1924.)

And what were the results of this attempt? Listen to the following passage:

"The attempt at collaboration with Comrade Trotsky — and I can assure you that it was honestly intended, as is proved by my letters and private interviews of which Trotsky is now making use — this attempt proves that pacifism inevitably leads to a defence of liquidatory tendencies, the cause of which it openly champions." (Kamenev, "Two Parties", Page 136.)

Or again:

"If 'Trotskyism' were to succeed as a tendency in the Party, what a wide scope would be opened up for liquidatory directives, for Otsovism and for all tendencies working contrary to the Party." (ibid., Page 143.)

There, comrades, you have the example of an attempt at co-operation with Trotsky. (Cries of "An instructive attempt".)

The results of this attempt were described at the time by Comrade Kamenev in a special pamphlet, which appeared in 1911 under the title of "Two Parties". I do not doubt that this pamphlet proved very useful in the case of all comrades who had any illusions on the subject of co-operation with Trotsky. And now I have still a question to raise. Would Comrade Kamenev not like to try writing another pamphlet, also called "Two Parties" and describing his present attempt at co-operation with Trotsky? (General laughter. Applause.) It would not be wholly useless. Naturally I cannot hold out any guarantee to Comrade Kamenev that Trotsky will not again make use of his letters and private interviews. (General laughter.) This need, however, hardly be feared. In any case he has the choice. Either the fear of being betrayed in the above way by Trotsky and thus incurring the danger of remaining outside the Party, or else to put all fears on one side and remain in the Party. Either the one thing or the other.

The Opposition is said to intend issuing a declaration to the effect that it is ready to submit to all party resolutions. (Cry of "just as in October 1926?") to dissolve the fraction (Cry of "We have heard that twice before!") and to defend their opinions, which they do not abandon ("Oh no, we prefer to dissolve it ourselves!") within the limits of the Party Statutes ("With reservation! Our statutes are not so elastic.") I believe, comrades, that nothing will come of all that. We have some experience of their declarations, especially of the two declarations of October 16th, 1926, and August 8th, 1927, respectively. What did this attempt lead to? I have no intention of writing a pamphlet entitled "Two Parties" but I beg to declare that this attempt has led to the most negative results, to a betrayal of the Party on two occasions, and to a weakening of party discipline. What right has the Opposition to demand of us now that we, the Congress of the Great Party of Lenin, should still believe in it after such an attempt. ("That would be foolish." "Any one that believes them is bound to be let down.")

They are said also to intend raising the question of the reacceptance into the party of the excluded members. ("Nothing doing. Let them go to the Menshevists.") I believe, comrades, that nothing will come of that either. (Prolonged applause.)

And why did the Party exclude Trotsky and Zinoviev? Because they are the organisers of the entire work of the Opposition ("Very true"); because they have made it their object to undermine the laws of the Party; because they imagine that no one will dare to touch them; because they wish to create for themselves a sort of privileged position of nobility within the Party. But can there be "squires" in the Party in the enjoyment of privileges and peasants devoid thereof? Should we Bolshevists, who have exterminated the nobility root and branch, set about re-establishing it now? You ask why we excluded Trotsky and Zinoviev from the Party. Well, because we want no caste of nobility in the Party, because our Party law is impartial and all members of the Party have the same rights. If the Opposition wishes to remain within the Party, it must submit to the will of the Party, to its laws, and to its instructions without reservation. If it is unwilling to do that, it may go where it will be accorded greater liberty. ("Hear, hear!" Applause.) New laws representing privileges for the Opposition, we shall not and will not create. (Applause.)

Then, as to conditions. We have only one condition. The Opposition must demobilise completely, both in an ideological and in an organisatory sense. ("Hear, hear!" Prolonged applause.) It must openly and honestly admit its faults, which have assumed the dimensions of a crime against the Party. It must surrender us its nuclei, so that the Party may be able to dissolve them completely. Either that, or the Opposition must remove from the Party. If it does not go willingly, then we shall soon show them the way. (Prolonged applause.)

That, comrades, is the case regarding the Opposition.

## IV. Total Balance.

I now come to the conclusion, comrades. What is the total outcome for the period under review? It is as follows.

1. We have preserved peace with the States around us in spite of the greatest difficulties and in spite of the provocative sallies of the bourgeoisie of the "Great Powers".

2. We have confirmed the alliance of the working class of the Soviet Union with the workers in the imperialist countries in spite of a series of obstacles and a sea of calumny on the part of the corruptible bourgeois press.

3. We have raised the authority of the proletarian dictatorship among millions of workers in all parts of the world.

4. We, as a party, have helped the Comintern and its sections to confirm their influence in all countries of the world.

5. All that a country can do for the development and acceleration of the revolutionary movement throughout the world has been done by us.

6. We have raised our Socialist industry by setting up a

second rate for its development and by securing its hegemony in the whole of national economy.

7. We have brought about the alliance of Socialist industry and peasant economy.

8. We have confirmed the alliance between the working class and the middle peasantry, based on the support of the poor peasants.

9. We have confirmed the proletarian dictatorship in our country in spite of hostile international surroundings by showing the workers of all countries that the proletariat can not only destroy capitalism but can also build up Socialism.

That is the total outcome.

And what conclusion can be drawn therefrom? There is only one possible conclusion, viz. that we are on the right path and that the policy of our Party is right.

It follows that, continuing along this path, we are bound to arrive at the victory of Socialism in our country and to the victory of Socialism in all countries. (Prolonged applause.)



That does not mean, however, that we shall meet with no difficulties in our way. There are bound to be difficulties, but we are not afraid of them, for we are Bolsheviks, steeled in the fire of the revolution. There will be difficulties, but we shall overcome them as we have overcome difficulties in the past, for we are not Bolsheviks, of the iron brigade of Lenin, fashioned to cope with and overcome difficulties without whimpering or despairing?

And because we are Bolsheviks we shall certainly be victorious.

Comrades, forwards to the victory of Communism in our country, to the victory of Communism in all the world. (Vociferous and continuous applause, all rising from their seats and giving Comrade Stalin an ovation. Singing of the "International".)

# Organisatory Report of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. at the XV. Party Congress.

## Full Report of Comrade Kossior's Speech.

Comrades! That economic growth of which Comrade Stalin has drawn so vivid a picture in his report, the fact that our country is advancing with gigantic strides, under the leadership of the Party, on the road of socialist construction, and finally that enormous and unexampled increase of working class activity which necessarily accompanies the advance of socialist construction — all this is bound to find definite expression in the work of all the mass organisations of the working class, the trade unions, the Soviets, the co-operatives, etc. And it is further bound to lead to those greater demands now being put on our Party leadership by these organisations, to a call for alterations in the methods of leadership, for their adaptation to the present and not inconsiderably changed situation.

The organisatory work of our Party and of the C. C. has been carried out during the last two years under difficult conditions. We have had no possibility of applying ourselves with the needful deliberation to questions of the utmost importance. The ceaseless discussion, the oppositional fever, the disorganising activities of the Opposition, often enough calculated to undermine all that had been already achieved by the Party —, all this, Comrades, has imparted a special stamp to our work, and has thrown many obstacles in its way. But despite all these difficulties, the Party has accomplished much of which it can be proud; in every field of work success may be recorded, and in every direction great progress has been made.

### THE WORKING CLASS BETTER ORGANISED AND MORE UNITED.

#### The Trade Unions.

I shall begin with the mass organisations of the working class. The activity of the working class is bound to give an impetus to the work of all mass organisations, above all of the trade unions. About 10 millions workers are organised in the trade unions at the present time. During the last two years the number of organised workers has increased by 30 per cent, the production trade unions by 28 per cent and the employees trade unions, etc. by 25 per cent. The trade unions of the agricultural and forest workers, and of the building workers, have grown most rapidly of all. This is easily comprehensible, as these categories contain considerable reserves as yet untouched by the trade union movement.

In all the trade unions, without exception, the workers are much better organised than formerly. To us the improved quality of trade union work is of greater importance than the purely numerical growth of the union; to us the really important point is the closer contact between trade union work and the broad non-Party masses, the establishment of close connections between the unions and these masses in the workshops and factories. Were we to deal in detail with the whole of the work being done by the trade unions, we should find an increased activity in every sphere of work — with regard to organisatory effort, to tariffs, and to the general work of cultural enlightenment. I shall not, however, go further into this, but shall confine myself to the following: The improvement in trade union work has begun at the very foundation, a point of special importance to us. The factory councils, the workshop bureaus, etc., and all basic trade union organs, have begun to work more efficiently, to establish better contact with the masses, whilst the working masses themselves have begun to adopt an attitude towards the unions showing that they re-

cognise these as organisations directly and immediately defending their interests.

In the works and factories the workers' meetings have shown an increasing attendance. Two years ago the workers' meetings of a number of trade unions were attended by only 20 to 30 per cent of the workers employed in the works or factory concerned, but now a much higher attendance may be recorded, especially when local questions are under discussion. It must also be recorded that the number of workers speaking at public meetings has increased. Another characteristic feature is the steady increase of the number of speakers taking part in the discussion at the trade union congresses, these speakers being chiefly recruited from workers engaged in the process of production.

I must further place on record an improvement of trade union work in the organisation of the less advanced categories of workers: seasonal workers, agricultural labourers, building workers, etc. Work among workers employed in factories and workshops, but still living in rural districts, has also advanced. Here only the first steps have been made, but these themselves are a sign of progress.

This enlivenment of the work of the trade union mass organisations has necessarily led to an increase of the staff of subordinate trade union functionaries. The A. U. C. T. U. points out that our staff of worker functionaries numbers about 1,400,000, of whom about one million are non-Party workers. It is not likely that this number is exaggerated. The growth of the staff of trade union functionaries is doubtless promoted by the circumstance that new strata and new cadres of workers from the process of production are being continually absorbed in the trade union organs. This means that the leading organs of the trade unions are actually becoming a school for the training of new cadres of trade unionists.

On every rung of the ladder of the union organs we find a renewal of the membership of these organs at the expense of the fresh forces streaming in from year to year; the number of non-Party workers in all trade union organs is increasing continually.

This renewal of the trade union organs has some disadvantages. It can be observed at times that the renewal of elected organs has become an aim in itself, so that the trade union organs do not set sufficient value on the persons elected, change them frequently, and give themselves little trouble to retain even capable persons in suitable positions, or to help them to advance further. The trade unions do not pay sufficient attention to their functionary staff, which is badly organised, inadequately instructed, and too seldom has the right man in the right place.

I should like to mention a few other defects of trade union work. Although the number of non-Party workers in the trade union organs is gradually increasing, still they are represented to a very inconsiderable degree in the higher leading organs of the trade union movement, in the Central Committees, in the A. U. C. T. U., etc. (The Plenum of the A. U. C. T. U. contains 3 per cent non-Party workers, the trade union C. C.'s 4 per cent). The same may be observed at the trade union congresses, where the percentage of non-Party workers varies between 19 and 25 per cent, and where even this is an achievement of the past year, as formerly the percentage of non-Party workers was much lower. Such a state of affairs is undoubtedly ab-

normal. The trade unions, as organisations for combining the broad masses, must be represented to a much greater extent at the Congresses and in the work of the leading trade union organs by non-Party workers.

Another defect is that the trade unions do not train sufficient fresh cadres out of their own ranks for filling positions in the upper trade union organs. The A. U. C. T. U. for instance has only 6 per cent of workers from the process of production who joined the union after 1922. Matters are somewhat better in the Plenum of the trade union C. C., but even this improvement is of recent date. It is an undeniable fact that too few fresh cadres of workers from the process of production are brought over into the trade unions, and it is extremely necessary that the trade unions devote some attention to this question.

There are very few women in the leading trade union organs: 4 per cent. in the A. U. C. T. U., 8 per cent. in the Plenum of the separate union committees, 2 per cent. in the presidiums of the union committees, etc. Even in such trade unions as those of the tailors and textile workers, the majority of whose members are women, the proportion of women in the leading trade union organs is almost twice as small as the percentage of women workers in the process of production. These defects are the more felt in that during the last two years there has unfortunately been an obvious increase — in the A. U. C. T. U. and in the trade union C. C. and its presidiums — in the number of one-time members of other parties. This is a further confirmation of the insufficient speed at which fresh cadres of trade unionists are recruited from the ranks of the working class.

In some places the trade unions have not quite done away with the old methods of command. I could cite a number of cases in which the active participation of the workers themselves has been so slight that election meetings could not be held, either for trade union or Soviet elections, because the workers from various factories and workshops did not appear in sufficient numbers at the election meetings. All this shows that our very considerable achievements in the work of the trade union organs are still accompanied by grave faults. The old methods and forms of work which must be completely superseded in the near future have not yet been laid aside.

#### The Production Conferences.

I pass on to the question of production conferences. There is no doubt whatever that these are making progress. The very fact that this institution has struck firm root in the workshops, and has extended its influence to the smallest unit of production, shows that here we have again passed a fundamental turning point. Besides this we may observe, in every branch of production without exception, a greater regularity in the holding of production consultations, the convocation of commissions, and the organisation of production conferences. The number of workers taking part in the production consultations is increasing nearly everywhere. In the Moscow metal industry, for instance, the number of participants in the production meetings has increased by 40 per cent. during the last two years; in 10 Moscow Trusts by 20 per cent.; in Leningrad by 35 per cent., and in Mishni-Novgorod by 64 per cent. The A. U. C. T. U. is of the opinion that about 15 per cent. of all workers take part in the work of the production consultations. I believe this estimate to be approximately correct.

This fact bears witness of the tangible progress in this sphere. It must be remembered at the same time that the quality of the work done through the production consultations has greatly improved. The production consultations have advanced, or are advancing, from dealing with casual questions to systematic work, and are focussing their main efforts on the improvement of production and of the organisation of labour. The Moscow Committee of the Party reports that the overwhelming majority of the proposals brought forward at production consultations deal with repairs to machinery and equipment. The second place is taken by questions of rationalisation and mechanisation. The proposals made by the workers at the production consultations may be counted by thousands. One sign of the better work being done with the aid of these consultations is the fact that only 10 to 15 per cent. of the proposals submitted are rejected, whilst 80 to 90 per cent. are as a rule accepted and put into execution. The proposals discussed at

the production consultations are usually questions which to the extent of 90 per cent are brought forward on the initiative of the workers themselves. This is a point of the utmost importance.

There is at the same time much improvement to be recorded in the putting into practice of the proposals accepted by the production consultations. I need only mention two out of the many figures showing this improvement. In Leningrad the percentage of proposals put into practice has increased from 40 to 60, in Moscow from 53 to 63. Similar data come from Nishni Novgorod, etc.

In the course of these two years the participation of the workers in the control of production has also taken new forms. After the production consultations had been instituted in the separate workshops, these were followed by regular production conferences for the whole works or factory. Control Commissions for the production consultations have been organised in accordance with the decisions of the 15th Party Conference, and these have taken up work in some places, although a general survey of the experience gained in this work has not yet been made. The so-called "production inspections" have also been introduced.

All this shows, comrades, that the work of the production consultations is being greatly activated. The trade unions and the Party must devote even more attention to this matter, and take it more firmly in hand. The same applies to the economists. Although the attitude adopted by our economists towards the production consultations has greatly improved, there are still many cases in which the attitude is still negligent, or at least displays a lack of interest in this work or of inclination to take part in it.

#### The Cultural Work of the Trade Unions.

During the last two or three years, the trade unions have placed this work on a sound basis, and have raised it to a position of the greatest importance in the life of the working class. During this period the clubs have not grown to a very great extent numerically — from 900,000 to 1,000,000 — but they have advanced to the system of voluntary membership, and have greatly improved their methods of work. It is a characteristic feature of this advance that the number of "Red Corners" in the shops and factories has increased during this time from 7,000 to 42,000. These "Red Corners" are however precisely those clubs in which real political and social work is done, both in the whole factory or works, and in the separate departments. In the majority of cases these are the clubs in which the workers gather together and where they spend every minute of their leisure.

In the future we must strive to make greater use of the cinema and the wireless in the factory and other clubs, and to employ these more in order to establish closer contact with the masses.

A further advance made in this period is the increased circulation of the newspapers mainly read by the workers. The figures adduced by Comrade Molotov at the 14th Party Congress showed that at that time there were 10 newspapers to 27 workers; at the present time there are this number of papers to 21 workers.

Mention must further be made of the tremendous urge after education shown by the working people. The number of evening schools, universities and circles in the clubs is increasing daily.

#### The Work in the Town Soviets.

In the work of the town Soviets we can report an activation and an increased active participation of the working class, fully equal to that shown in trade union work. In the course of the last three years the participation of trade union members in the elections to the Soviets increased from 52 to 70 per cent., that of the industrial trade unions to 73 per cent. 66 per cent. of the women organised in trade unions, and 40 per cent. of the unorganised women, took part in the elections. The increased interest of the workers in the Soviets may be seen, for instance, in the care bestowed by the workers on working out their instructions to their delegates, the wide discussion on and many proposed amendments to these instructions. All this bears witness to the growing activity of the working class and to

its increased participation in the work of the Soviets and of socialist construction.

Progress may also be recorded with respect to the composition of the town Soviets. In 1927, 47 per cent. of the Soviet delegates have been workers. This is the highest proportion attained since the introduction of the N.E.P. In 1924/25 a maximum was reached with 46 per cent. We see that this year we have passed beyond the highest standard hitherto reached.

In some of the industrial towns, the percentage of workers is naturally greater than this. An increased participation of women in the town Soviets may also be recorded for the last two years; the number of female delegates has risen from 18.9 per cent. to 21 per cent. Some small advance may be reported with regard to the party sympathies of the members of the town Soviets. There are however not so many communists in the Soviets as formerly. In 1922 70 per cent. of the Soviet delegates were Party members; but this however is no guarantee that they accomplished specially good work.

I should like to mention the steps taken by the C. C., during the period under report, in the sphere of Soviet Work. In the first place we must record those decisions aiming at providing a basis for the activation of work in the town Soviets. Besides a number of organisatory measures, various decisions have been passed with the object of furnishing a material basis for activation of the work of the town Soviets, of forming municipal budgets, developing communal economy, etc. The question has been raised as to the best methods of improving the work of the Soviets in the industrial settlements, where the economy is entirely in the hands of the local economic organs. As a final result of all this work we can record an activation of the town Soviets, better attended plenary sessions, regularly held sessions, and treatment of urgent local questions calculated to arouse the interest of the workers.

New forms of work are being taken up in the town Soviets: representatives constantly present in the factories, group meetings of the members of town Soviets, meetings of sections in the factories, etc. Section work is beginning to proceed on regular lines. The attendance at the section meetings is becoming more regular. The work in the sections is being carried on not only by the members of the Soviets, but by large numbers of workers from the factories and works who are not members of the Soviets. A few figures will show this: Out of 18,000 workers taking part in the work of the sections of the Moscow Soviets and municipal district Soviets in Moscow, 13,700 are not members of the Soviets, and of these, 5,500 are workers from the bench. Similar data come from Leningrad and other districts.

The Soviet sections have already found sharply demarcated spheres of activity. They control trading companies, schools, and hospitals; they work out proposals for our advance in various directions of constructive work, and accomplish much valuable work here. Special mention must be made of the campaign carried on by the Soviets for the reduction of prices.

Passing on to the faults of the town Soviets, I must first of all mention the still too prevalent lack of connection between the work done and the instructions given to the individual delegates by the workers meetings. The work done by the commission is too often on paper only. Very often the work is not suitably allotted among the members of the Soviets, and the Soviet apparatus works altogether without any actual contact with its sections. It is our task to ensure the steady widening of the circle of the members of the Soviets, and of the factory and other workers participating in the work of the Soviets, so that our Soviets may in this manner become real schools in which the workers learn how to guide the State.

### Mass Campaigns.

A characteristic peculiarity of the campaigns which we have carried out during the period under review has been that we have been able to pass, in actual practice, from general agitation to the immediate participation of broad masses of workers in the practical work of accomplishing our main tasks. This applies especially to three campaigns: the rationalisation campaign, the price reduction campaign, and the defence campaign.

I have already touched upon the rationalisation campaign. This work has lain chiefly in the factories and workshops, and has extended over a long period; our production consultations

have been much occupied with this subject. The price reduction campaign, thanks to the wide sympathy awakened in the masses, has had definite results. In the course of these campaigns the shop commissions have taken up their work with greater energy, and many thousands of factory and other workers have been drawn into the work of revising prices. The attention of the working class has been drawn to the work of the co-operatives, and the co-operatives themselves have received fresh impetus to mass activities.

A further campaign which must be mentioned here is the "Defence week" campaign. This too was so organised as to reach the broadest masses of the workers, and was entirely practical in character (formation of circles for the study of the science of war, erection of rifle ranges for rifle practice, etc.); it further resulted in the increased membership of the "Oso Aviachim" society.

### The Meetings of the Working Women Delegates.

Now to those organisations which play an extremely important part in all our work in the shops and factories — the organisations of working women delegates. We have to report an increase in both the number of these organisations, and in the number of women delegates (from 67,000 to 90,000), one half of whom are doing practical work in the Soviets and the trade unions. It must be admitted that the working women are doing but little. At the meetings of the working women delegates only 8 per cent. working women are present on an average, and working women take very little part in co-operative and Soviet work. There is still much to be done here.

I may sum up this part of my report by repeating that the steadily increasing activity of the working class has enabled us to improve our work in the trade unions, that we have brought this work into closer contact with the masses, have extended the sphere of the production conferences, improved the work of the town Soviets, and induced the working masses to take part to an ever increasing extent in the practical work of socialist construction. The following lines of guidance should be laid down for the work of the mass organisations in the immediate future; energetic extension of mass and cultural work in the trade unions and co-operatives; development of the work in the town Soviets and their sections, in order that the broad masses of the workers may be trained in the work of guiding the State and the Soviets may be made into actual schools for the practical instruction of fresh cadres of workers, whose main task it will be to establish closer contact between the State apparatus and the masses, and to combat bureaucracy. Our work must be so organised that workers engaged in the process of production must be enabled to rise more rapidly into leading positions in the trade unions, Soviets, and co-operatives, and that the non-Party workers and the subordinate staff of functionaries in the works and factories are made to participate to a greater extent in our leading organs. The work of organising working women, especially in the textile districts, must be taken up more energetically.

## WORK IN THE VILLAGE.

### The Soviets.

I pass on to the work in the village. In the course of the last two years the Party has accomplished a gigantic task in the village.

In the first place, the following must be observed with regard to the activation of the village Soviets: The figures of the last election campaign show that the activity of the peasantry as a whole grows comparatively slowly. But if we take the individual social groups separately, we find a certain increase of activity among the agricultural workers and poor peasants. At the same time we must remember our last election enactments, which increased the number of those not permitted to take part in the elections.

The influence of the Party in the village Soviets is becoming gradually stronger, both among the presidents of the village Soviets and in these Soviets themselves, and in the district Soviets. This applies equally to the influence of the Young Communist League. The social composition of our village Soviets is improving. Taking exemption from taxation as a basis, we find that the percentage of village Soviet members

exempt from taxation has doubled — from 8 to 16 per cent. At the same time it must be remembered that the figures for 1925/26 are on the same level as those for 1924/25, and the first really noticeable change has taken place since then, thanks to our increased work among the village poor last year. The proportion of agricultural labourers and other workers in the village Soviets has increased, and we can record a certain advance here, if no very great one.

It is worth noting that the percentage of persons exempt from taxation among the presidents of the village and district Soviets is greater than the percentage among the total membership of the village Soviets. This is of fundamental importance.

Work in the village Soviets has improved in every respect. The village Soviet is in many places beginning to become the actual public centre of the locality and is an organ of actual power possessing the confidence of the peasantry.

The village Soviets work entirely under the guidance of the Party, and are already beginning to repulse the kulaks energetically.

Besides the village Soviets, the village has a few other organisations, the "land societies", for instance, which play an important rôle in the public life of the village, and to which we have accorded too little attention up to the present. Whilst the village Soviets, for instance, have only dealt with local questions to the extent of 10 to 20 per cent, the "land societies" have taken up matters concerning local conditions to the extent of 60 to 70 per cent, and thus possessing the greatest possible interest for the poor peasantry and agricultural workers. It must be admitted that very little has been done as yet towards influencing these public organisations by means of the village Soviets. A number of C. C. decisions aim at strengthening the leading rôle of the village Soviets in the "land societies".

With respect to the sections of the village Soviets, an improvement may again be recorded. Two years ago the village Soviets possessed no sections whatever, or only on paper, but at the present time we have many actually functioning sections.

### Co-operation.

Co-operation in the village. The consumers' co-operative societies have grown rapidly as far as the number of members is concerned — by 83 per cent. The agricultural co-operatives have not grown so rapidly, and even now comprise no more than 32 per cent. of the farms, as compared with 24 per cent. two years ago. This more moderate growth of the agricultural co-operatives is fully explained by the special difficulties encountered here; it is only in very recent years that this description of co-operative has been able to make any progress at all. With regard to the social composition of the co-operatives, it must be stated openly — without referring here to exact figures — that all the data at our disposal go to show that at least nine-tenths of the members of the consumers' and agricultural co-operative societies are middle and poor peasants.

I should like to observe that the development of the co-operative is considerably slower than that of the Soviet. In 1926, for instance, 45 per cent. participation in the election campaign was recorded for the consumers' co-operative societies; today this figure is 50 to 54 per cent., in the agricultural co-operatives something over 35 per cent.

Our present work attaches much importance to the handicraft co-operatives; one reason for this is the intenser fight against the kulaks, and another the fact that private capital exercises its greatest influence among handicraft workers. Although the handicraft co-operative is growing, up to now it only comprises 13 per cent. of the handicraft workers. This is entirely inadequate, and shows the imperative necessity for more energetic effort in this direction.

### The Peasants' Aid Committees.

It must be openly admitted that during these two years the peasants' aid committees have made but little progress. There has been however, a certain numerical growth, the work has been placed on a sound basis, and the committees have come in closer touch with the population. But there are still a number of objective difficulties hampering this work in the village. Of these the chief difficulty is the disputes arising out of the uncertainty as to the competency of the peasants' aid committees on the one hand and the "land societies" on the other. Besides this, it appears to me that the village nuclei devote very little attention to this field of work.

### The Organisation of the Village Poor and the Agricultural Workers.

The organisation of the village poor has been the centre point of attention of the C. C. and the local Party organisations during the period under review. When we first took up this work, at the time of the XIV. Party Congress, the organisation of the village poor was really set going, and has since then progressed more or less. There is no doubt that this department of our work has exercised enormous influence in the campaigns for the Soviet and co-operative elections, and upon the whole public life of the village. In 1925/26, for instance, we convened 1500 meetings of the village poor in 10 governments and districts, whilst last year, 18,000 such meetings were counted in these same 10 governments. This last year has also witnessed for the first time meetings of the village poor as part of the campaign for the co-operative elections; such meetings have, however, not yet been held to any great extent. It is characteristic of our work for the organisation of the village poor that we have succeeded not only in preventing relations worsening between the poor and middle peasantry, but have been able to strengthen the alliance between these two groups. As a rule 10 to 30 per cent. middle peasantry have been present at the meetings of the village poor. It must, however, be observed that only a very small number of agricultural workers have attended these meetings.

We must make it possible for the organised village poor to exercise influence on the practical daily work of the Soviets and co-operatives. With this purpose in view, we passed a decision calling for the formation of groups of the village poor. Has this been carried out? At the time of the XIV. Party Congress there were no groups of village poor at all; last year a few hundred had been formed, and now we have some thousands of such groups. But we must not deceive ourselves here; we must openly admit that the inquiry instituted among the groups of village poor shows these to be accomplishing very little. They are not working on any systematic lines, nor do they grasp the essential points to be attacked. They have not yet learnt how to work in order to defend the daily interests of the village poor, on the methods already in use in the Soviets, co-operatives, etc. The village poor groups work as a rule through the village Soviets, and here only from case to case. Energetic steps will have to be taken to put this work on a sound basis.

And now a few words on the trade union of the agricultural and forest workers. This trade union numbers 1,200,000 members. Of these 350,000 are working on independent peasant farms. A certain improvement in the mass work of this trade union may be recorded. But although the specific weight of the agricultural labourer has increased in the Soviets, the staff of functionaries is still being insufficiently recruited from the ranks of agricultural labour itself. Measures must be taken ensuring that the work done among the village poor, the general meetings of the village poor, and the work carried on in the village poor groups, are all brought into closest contact with the Soviets and the co-operatives, so that the organisations of the village poor find expression in the daily work of the Soviets and co-operatives, so that the village poor may utilise their organisations and meetings for learning how to defend their interests in the Soviets, and to carry out those Soviet decisions which safeguard these interests, and so that our Party may be thereby enabled to secure its influence in the Soviets and to carry out its proletarian policy in them.

### Work among the Peasant Women.

The work of the Soviets cannot be activated, nor can a successful co-operative system be built up, unless we draw into this work the peasant women, forming one half of the village population. It must be placed on record that during these last two years the peasant women have taken much more energetic part in the elections (from 20 to 30 per cent.), a percentage increase much greater than that of the total participation of the peasantry in the elections. But these successes are obviously still insufficient in view of the actual tasks still before us in this field of work. The available data show the number of women delegates from the villages to have risen from 246,000 to 386,000, of whom 112,000, or 35 per cent., are taking part in practical work. In 1925 there were 58,000 women in the village Soviets, as compared with 109,000 this year; in the district Soviets the corresponding figures are 1,500 and 3,800.



Mention must be made here of the recent Congress of the women members of Soviets all over the Union; this Congress made it possible to form an idea of the enormous political progress and of the experience gained and steady advancement made by the working and peasant women working in the village and town Soviets. The work of this Congress made a most profound impression on all who had the opportunity of attending it.

Peasant women are, however, but little represented in the leading organs of the co-operatives. About 11 per cent. of the members of co-operatives are women, but the proportion of women in the co-operative managements is only 2 per cent.

#### Red Army Soldiers on Leave.

I should like to say a few words on the influence exercised by the Red Army on our village work. During the last few years the political organs of the Red Army have accomplished wonders towards preparing the soldiers for their return on furlough to the villages, so that they may become valuable public functionaries in their native places. Facts and figures show us that the returned Red Army soldiers play an extremely important part in the village. In the village Soviets we find 34 per cent. former Red Army soldiers, among the presidents of these Soviets 49 per cent.; in the district Soviets 50.5 per cent., among the presidents of these 67 per cent., etc. This demonstrates plainly the immense importance of this work of the Red Army.

#### Cultural Work.

It must refer once more to our cultural work, for it is evident that this work will demand our special attention during the coming period. We cannot yet boast of any great success in this direction. The number of reading rooms has increased somewhat; their work is improving; the reading rooms have begun to organise "Red Corners", they have become the centre of various circles, and the number of libraries has increased. But all this is comparatively little in view of the tremendous tasks still before us. I must raise two questions with respect to cultural work in the village: Wireless and cinema. We possess a total of 1593 travelling cinemas. This is very few indeed; it is absolutely insufficient. Here we must effect fundamental changes. We must admit that our cinema organisations have done but little towards supplying the village with good and more or less suitable films. The same applies to the wireless. At the present time there are only 157,000 wireless sets in the whole Soviet Union, and of these only 14,000, or less than 10 per cent, fall to the village. This is again an entirely insignificant number, and we can by no means remain satisfied with it.

#### Guidance of the Work by the Party.

I should like to refer to the guidance given by the Party to the work in the village. It need not be said that the whole of the work briefly detailed above could not have been done if the work of our village nuclei had not greatly improved. All that lack of cohesion and unity observable in 1924/25 has vanished since the slogan of activation of the Soviets was issued. The work of the subordinate nuclei has much improved, and the village organisations have already learnt how to tackle the work properly, and how to apply the new methods. They still, however, devote too little attention to local questions and do not understand how to arouse interest by means of these questions or to organise the peasantry; they have not yet quite rid themselves of the habit of working with campaigns. There is still much to be done here, but we can already report that whilst up to the time of the XIV. Party Congress great masses of Party members were sent to the villages to improve the village work, during the last two years this method has been more and more replaced by a systematic reinforcement of the peasant districts, and by the training of fresh cadres out of the villages themselves. We must continue to work with all energy for the activation of the Soviets, and must surround them with a staff of peasant functionaries. Work among the village poor must be intensified; above all, the village group work must be given more definite forms. The activities of the small owning peasant masses must be directed into the channels of the Soviets, the co-operatives, the "land societies", etc. Our cultural work must be extended, and im-

provements must be made in the methods by which the subordinate nuclei guide the work of all public organisations in the village.

#### Party and State Apparatus.

I pass on to the question of the guidance of the state apparatus by the Party. I need not dwell on the question of retrenchment in the State apparatus and the suppression of bureaucracy, since this has already been dealt with in the report of the Central Control Commission and the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection. I should like, however, to touch upon a part of this question which is of paramount importance. I refer to the decision passed on 15th November 1926, calling upon the communists in our organs to take a really active part in the struggle against bureaucratism, and in the work of retrenchment in the State apparatus. In this respect perfectly untenable conditions have obtained up to the present. It must be said that the decision of the C. C. on this question has put new life into the work of the Soviet nuclei. This is confirmed by the investigation made by the Central Control Commission of 500 Soviet nuclei. This inquiry has, however, shown that the Soviet nuclei, whilst certainly more active than before, still fail to work independently enough, and wait for commands from the centre. Work is often hindered by the diverse composition of the nuclei.

The Party core in the State apparatus itself has grown during the last two years. We have instituted a number of inquiries into the apparatus of the Supreme Economic Council, of the trusts, the syndicates, the co-operatives, the trade and credit services, etc. The management of the trusts, for instance, are composed to 75 per cent. of Party members, of whom one third were already members of the Party whilst it was still illegal, and more than one half are workers, of whom one half again have already been working in the economic field for five years and longer. The managing directors, their representatives and assistants are four fifths communist and to the same extent (that is, four fifths) workers. Hence the middle strata of the apparatus of the People's Supreme Economic Council and of a number of trusts contain, out of the total of responsible workers (3000), a proportion of 22 per cent. communists and 6 per cent. workers.

The investigation shows us that the operative section of our apparatus (apart from the actual heads), that section upon which the whole work of the apparatus devolves, is built up for the most part of non-Party elements, so that the communist leadership frequently becomes a mere fiction. This can also be seen from the fact that among us there is considerable fluctuation, a shifting of the communists in the State apparatus. In the leading undertakings the communists do not remain in one place; they carry on one kind of work for 10 to 14 months at most, whilst the non-Party workers carry on for 2 to 3 years. It will be easily understood that a communist working in one place for only a few months, and then leaving, can exercise no influence. He cannot be the leader of non-Party specialists who have been in the apparatus for several years, nor expect to be the first authority for the workers in the apparatus concerned. The question of fluctuation, of frequent shiftings of place among the Party workers, is one which must be inquired into. We must make it our care that the communists learn the actual work, and do not fear the petty drudgery. Every kind of work, even petty drudgery, needs experience, and this cannot be gained by rushing from one work to another.

#### The System of Promotion.

Now to the question of promotion. I shall not state the figures given by our enactments, neither those compiled on the promotions incidental to the current work of the C. C., for instance, the figures resultant on the inquiries instituted by the C. E. C. in 24 governments and comprising over 1000 persons, nor those compiled from other inquiries. I need only draw attention to the fact that our system of promotion is no longer based on campaigns, but on practical everyday work. But although some progress and success may be recorded with regard to the promotion system, it must be admitted that our Party and Soviet organisations are still devoting too little attention to this question. I append only a few figures, showing what happens to persons promoted in the work of the governments.



During the period under report it might frequently be observed that promotions were made simply for the sake of promotion. Some one is promoted, and afterwards the question is raised: "Was a promotion necessary this year? Last year there were promotions, and now others are being promoted again". Promotion should be carried forward systematically, as a means of attaining competent collaborators, and not fumbled with in this uncertain way. The data received from various gouvernements give the following information: Out of 24 persons promoted in the gouvernment organs of the Voronesch organisation, 20 are working satisfactorily. In the Volodga gouvernment 41 out of 44 are working satisfactorily, in the Vladimir gouvernment 36 out of 39. We are in receipt of similar reports from a number of other towns, Tver, Nishni Novgorod, etc.

Promotion is very slow in our central Soviet organs. In the course of the last two years promotion in our central organs has been confined to a few dozen workers and peasants. This is obviously insufficient.

I should like to deal especially with the question of promotion in our industrial undertakings. We have made inquiries in 26 large factories employing 126,000 workers, and find that within the last two years 1300 workers have been promoted, about 1000 to positions in the undertakings themselves, and the others outside. 25 per cent. of these persons do not belong to the Party. Who is responsible for the promotions in all these undertakings? The nuclei recommended 46 per cent. of these promotions, the factory councils and other trade union organs 26 per cent., and the management 21 per cent. The trade union organs have shown very little initiative here. The rôle played by the production consultations in the promotion question is very considerable.

### The Trade Unions and Promotion.

The rôle and influence of the trade unions in training the leaders of our industries is a question of extraordinary importance. There are no accurate and definite data obtainable on this question. Some few trade unions can furnish a few incomplete and generally out of date figures. All this shows that up to the present no systematic work has been done by the trade unions towards the training and promotion of the leading cadres of our industry. The existing system of appointing the co-workers ensures however the influence of the trade unions in the selected leading cadres. We, in the C. C., have special commissions which regulate this question as a rule, and it is characteristic that the trade unions show very little initiative in securing the promotion of candidates to definite economic positions. Out of 794 persons appointed to different economic positions during these two years, 300 of whom were selected from non-economic organs, the trade unions proposed only 22 persons from their own ranks. Even among the economists we find few who have been promoted to higher positions on the initiative of the trade unions, although the trade unions have a first hand knowledge of economic work. They must make it their duty to form exact judgments on the economists, and to provide for the promotion of those deserving it.

There are two trade unions which have come especially to the fore in the promotion question: the C. C. of the metal workers and the C. C. of the miners. These play a really important part in this work, and have been successful in having many of their candidates promoted to economic positions. All the other trade unions are taking very little part in this work.

I shall not repeat what Comrade Stalin has already stated with regard to the promotion question. I have at my disposal an enormous amount of material showing the most abnormal conditions obtaining in the majority of our organisations with respect to promotion in all cases where our Communists leave the persons promoted to the chance of fate or to themselves. The apparatus, especially the specialist apparatus, adopts every possible measure to oust the promoted persons, or to exalt them somewhere. Here there is still need of much serious effort. At the present time the Opposition is a great clog on our endeavours, but we may hope for more favourable conditions in the future, and the possibility of filling up the gaps again.

I must accord a few words to the leading Soviet apparatus. Here we may record an increase of the number of workers and peasants, and a decline of the number of employees, and this on every rung of the ladder, in the executives of the departments, gouvernements, and districts. This is incontestably a positive fact. The directions providing that at least one third

of the Soviet members must be non-Party have not yet been fully carried out, except in our central organs, the Central Executive Committee and the C. E. C. of the R. S. F. S. R.

In concluding my remarks on the leadership of the Soviet apparatus, I must once more emphasise that the Communists are not accomplishing much work in our organs for the struggle against bureaucracy. More attention must be paid to this question. In the State apparatus, especially in the organs of the leading staff, the influence of the Communists is assured; in the middle sections of the apparatus the communist influence and the Party leadership are less secure. The frequent changes and insufficient training among the Party workers are the chief obstacle in the way of the increased influence of the Party in the State apparatus.

The promotion of workers and peasants to leading positions in the State apparatus is proceeding more satisfactorily than before the 14th Party Congress, but on the whole there is but little progress in this direction, especially with respect to promotion into the central organs. The rôle of the trade unions in the work of training and promoting workers for industrial positions is undoubtedly insufficient, and they must devote considerably more thought and effort to this subject.

### The Work of the Young Communist League.

The Young Communist League can undoubtedly boast of many achievements and positive results; the growth of mass work, the progress of political enlightenment, the increased participation of the Young Communist League in public life, in the Soviets, co-operatives, etc.

There is however one point to which due attention must be paid, and that is the slowing down in the growth of the Young Communist League. It is easily comprehensible that this speed slows down with regard to the influx from the village. This is normal, so to speak. But that the rate of growth should have slowed down with respect to the workers is not quite normal. The period under report has witnessed certain changes in the social composition of the Young Communist League; these are not very considerable, entailing only a falling off in the number of workers and an increase in the number of peasants and day labourers to the extent of 1 to 1½ per cent. These changes are as a rule of no essential importance, and involve no danger.

I must further raise a few critical questions in the work of the Young Communist League, a few problems which the Young Communist League will not be able to solve for itself, without the aid of the Party.

One very conspicuous point is the great fluctuation in the Young Communist League. In 1925, for instance, 11 per cent. of the members left the League, and now again 14 per cent. This fluctuation is greatest among the agricultural labourers, and least among the workers in the towns. It is of importance to investigate the causes of this; the Young Communist League must strive to abolish this fluctuation, and the Party must aid it in the task.

The youth of the working class is comprised to the extent of 45 per cent. in the Young Communist League. In the large towns this percentage rises to 70 per cent. But the fact that the larger half of working youth is still outside of the Young Communist League, and that the League is growing but slowly, must induce us to devote more attention to this question. The Young Communist League needs here the help of the Party, help enabling it to improve its working methods, and especially its methods of economic mass work.

I need not dwell on the subject of the Party core existing in the Young Communist League. I need only observe in passing that this core is growing steadily. The percentage of Young Communist League members accepted as members of the Party has now reached 40, of those joining the army even 75. The number of workers in the leading organs of the Young Communist League is also increasing.

In the country the Young Communist League is developing a great work. It plays an important part in the public and political life of the village, especially in questions concerning the raising of agriculture and its adoption of co-operative methods. All that is required is that the Party again lends its aid to the Young Communist League in this work, and gives it the support of its guidance.

The most important task of the Young Communist League is the work of political enlightenment. But it is just here that the greatest shortcomings of the Young Communist League are observable. This work does not by any means keep pace with the general growth of the activity of the working masses in the Young Communist League, as expressed by the increased number of practical proposals emanating from the workers. Here again the Young Communist League cannot cope with its task without the aid of the Party, and the Party must give its help.

A critical question for the Young Communist League is its adult members. On 1st January there were 74,000 adult members, that is, members reaching the age limit obliging them to leave the Young Communist League, but not becoming members of the Party. By 1st January 1927 there were 350,000 such adults. This state of affairs leads to many unsound conditions, and to great dissatisfaction. Classified socially, 36 per cent. of these adults will be found to belong to the working class, 39 to the peasantry, and 25 to the employees. The question of these members concerns every social stratum represented in the Young Communist League, but most especially the peasant class. These are cadres of young people who have grown up in the Young Communist League, who have become accustomed to public activities, and are desirous of continuing this work, but who cannot become members of the Party for some reason or other. We must consider how these active cadres are best to be utilised for public work.

Finally, the question of the Young Pioneers. I must touch upon this question, for during the period just past the Pioneer organisation has just passed through very considerable difficulties.

The Pioneers have passed through a period of withdrawals from membership, disbanding of various organisations and divisions, etc. This may be explained by the fact that the methods of work did not correspond to the new conditions under which the Pioneer organisations have to work at the present time. They did not satisfy the children, nor did they correspond to the level of the Pioneer group leaders in the Young Communist League. The result was a period of redoubled difficulties. Now, however, a turn for the better may be observed. Many of the organisations show signs of great improvement. The Young Communist League is striving at the present time to train the children to greater self-activity, to independent and practical work, to leisure time occupations, etc. We have every reason to hope that all these measures will yield a positive result. The number of members in the Pioneer organisations now counts 1,700,000, or 150,000 more than in January 1926 and 100,000 less than in July 1926, at which time the number of Young Pioneers reached its maximum.

#### The Changes in the Social Composition of the Party.

I pass on to our inner Party work.

During the period just passed the C. C. devoted much attention to organisational questions, especially to questions dealing with the regulation and ascertainment of the social composition of the Party.

What processes have been going on in the Party during this time? In the course of six months the Party membership rose by 195,000, whilst the number of candidates fell by 73,000. In this manner the sum total of the members and candidates of the Party rose by 121,000 and now counts 1,200,000.

The social composition of the Party has changed as follows: The percentage of workers has sunk from 58.1 to 56.3 per cent, the number of peasants from 24 to 22 per cent, whilst the number of employees has risen from 17.3 to 21.4 per cent. We need not be alarmed at this decline of the peasantry and advance of the employees, for it is only the result of the recount which has been made of the whole Party membership, and merely signifies certain regroupings, reclassifications of members of one category in another. But the decline in the number of workers requires explanation. Among the real members of our Party the number of workers has increased steadily the whole time, and there has been no falling off. Whilst two years ago 62 per cent. of our real Party members were workers, the recount shows a rise to 64 per cent.

A fair survey of the actual proportion of Party members who are actually workers from the bench can only be gained by a consideration of the following figures. In the course of

a year and a half the percentage of workshop and factory workers in the Party has sunk from 40.8 to 37 $\frac{1}{2}$ . But here we must remember our new instructions, according to which many Party members really working in workshops and factories, and hitherto classified in this category, are no longer to be regarded as workers, but are taken over into the group of the employees. An examination of our recount shows that whilst this records a 6 to 7 per cent decline in the number of workers, there has in reality been no decline, but merely a reclassification.

Again it is difficult to operate with the data of July 1st, for on this date our organisations drew up no fresh lists of names which might be used as basis for a recount of the Party membership, and the count was made for the most part with the aid of the old lists. Various organisations counted from the new lists, others from the old, so that the figures of 1st July may easily be inaccurate.

The proportion of peasants employed on peasant farms has declined, the number of communists working in the State apparatus and in public organs rose from 36 to 41 per cent. This is explained by the fact that there is a permanent fluctuation going on among the different social categories of our Party. Workers from the shops and factories are appointed to Soviet work, a large number are sent to the colleges, etc. Every year, for instance, a total of 20,000 such workers, or about 2.5 of the whole of the Party members, are sent into the army or to the colleges. If we take the figures for 1924, we find that in this year about 90,000 workers passed into other categories. The number of women has increased by 14,000, but the percentage has remained practically unchanged (12.8 per cent. to 12.9 per cent.), which is not very gratifying.

In what direction is our Party growing, and why had we to record a certain decline in the percentage of worker members on 1st July? This is explained by the increased number of peasants joining the Party during these two years. This could not be otherwise, for the intense activity of our Party in the village has naturally resulted in many of the non-Party functionaries from the poor and middle peasantry joining the Party. And it must be remembered that this staff of functionaries was learning to work during the period immediately following war communism. Without this cadre of functionaries it would have been exceedingly difficult to meet the demands of our work in the village.

A few absolute figures will give a clear idea of the position. Since the middle of 1925 175,000 workers, 137,000 peasants, and 48,000 employees, have been admitted to the Party. It will be seen that the workers represent the strongest contingent. In spite of this, however, a certain shifting took place in the Party; that is, the specific weight of the peasants increased more rapidly than that of the workers. At the present time this is no longer the case, although the percentage of peasants among the newly admitted members is still extremely high. The percentage of peasants admitted to the Party in the successive half years has been: 39.6 per cent., 39.1 per cent., 38.5 per cent., and 33 per cent., as compared with the 25 per cent hitherto forming the peasant percentage of the Party.

Up to the first half of 1927 the percentage of workers among the newly admitted members was less than the total percentage of workers in the Party. Hence it is only since 1927 that the percentage of workers has commenced to increase. It was not until the second half of 1927 that we could record an increase in the percentage of workers among newly admitted members have been 40, 41, 43, and 51 per cent (first thus higher than the percentage of workers in the Party (58 per cent.)). This means that the Party is being replenished from the ranks of the workers and the specific weight of the workers in the Party grows accordingly. The new admissions of employees have declined from 16 to 8 per cent in proportion to the total number of new admissions. The Party has had a percentage of 40.8 of factory workers. Since the second half of 1925 the percentages of such workers among newly admitted members have been 40.41, 43, and 51 per cent (first half of 1927). Here again an advance will be observed since the first half of 1926, that is, the proportion of workers from the bench has increased. At the same time we must take into account the constant shifting of this category of workers into other categories; workers promoted to attend the colleges and workers' faculties no longer count their original category.

The re-registration of the Party membership has been seized upon by the Opposition as an opportunity for loud outcries about alleged mass withdrawals from the Party.

What is the truth of the matter? The fresh registration showed in the first place that our lists contained about 10,000 "deadheads", still figuring in the statements of the government committees, but no longer existing in the nuclei. We then formally ascertained the withdrawal of those who had in reality left the Party long ago, in the course of the years which have elapsed since 1924. The number of such withdrawals was ascertained at 35,000, of whom 20,000 were workers from the bench.

We have made an inquiry into what really happened with the worker members of the Party, and how many of them had left the Party since 1924, with the following result: Between the Lenin enrolment in 1924 and the 1st January 1927 we admitted 488,000 workers from the bench into the Party. Of these 8000, or about 2 per cent, were expelled. 27,000 left the Party voluntarily, or lost their membership automatically, by the 1st January. To these must be added further 20,000 dropping out at the recount, making a total of 47,000 or about 10 per cent. If we take into account the mass admissions to the Party in 1924 and 1925, it is obvious that there is bound to be a certain percentage of those whom we have not been able to retain in the Party, whom we have not understood how to handle, and whom we have failed to win over permanently. This is of course a minus for which we are to blame. These 9½ to 10 per cent., these 47,000 persons who have left the Party in the course of three years, are however only a very inconsiderable number. These figures show that the Party has been able to retain 90 per cent. of the workers admitted as members during the two Lenin enrolments, and that it has been possible for us to utilise this new material for the formation of fresh cadres taking an active part in Party work.

There are doubtless still many defects in the regulation of the composition of the Party. These came very distinctly to the fore during the process of re-registration. We have passed various decisions for removing these defects.

The latest decision passed by the C. C. in October on the question of the regulation of the composition of the Party contains the following main points:

1. Special attention to be devoted to the large industrial undertakings, a number of objective causes having hitherto prevented the workers in large works and factories from being reached to a sufficient extent.

2. The greater utilisation of non-Party worker functionaries, and in the village of functionaries from the poor peasantry; the training of thoroughly tried and tested functionaries from the middle peasantry.

The C. C. passed another decision according to which within 2 years the Party membership is to consist to 50 per cent. of workers from the factories and workshops, that is, that the decision passed on this question at the XIII. Party Congress is to be put into practice. Finally a decision was adopted on the mass admission of workers to the Party. This decision was passed by the C. C. on the eve of the tenth anniversary of October.

The mass inflow of workers into the Party is the best reply of the working class to the unheard of calumnies circulated against it by the Opposition. The admission of a large number of workers — about 70,000 — into the Party will raise the percentage of workers in the Party to a maximum not before attained.

### Inner Party Democracy.

Comrade Stalin has here described very correctly the conception of inner Party democracy as held by the X. and other Party Congresses, and the directions issued in the question by these Party Congresses. These directions have no resemblance whatever to those dished up by our "esteemed" Opposition as its interpretation of inner Party democracy.

What results have we to report? There has been undoubtedly an enormous advance towards inner Party democracy. Nobody will deny that during the period under report the work in our subordinate factory nuclei has been greatly activated. The contact between the Party and the masses has become closer. The activity of the general membership of the Party has increased. The nucleus meetings have been better

attended, the number of the simple members who have taken part in the discussions, and in the active life of the Party has increased. All this shows us the enormously increased activity and higher political level of the broad masses of the Party members. These are the immediate results of actual inner Party democracy.

Comrade Stalin also referred to the fact that during these two years almost every question raised in the C. C. has been simultaneously dealt with by the whole Party and in all the nuclei. This has hitherto never been the case. The widest possible distribution of the stenographic reports of the Plenary Sessions of the C. C., especially of late, has contributed greatly to inducing the whole of the fundamental masses of the Party members to take part in the solution of inner Party problems, and in the task of working out our unshakable Leninist principles. It is solely due to the development of inner Party democracy that we have been able to achieve so much towards the political development of the Party, towards increased activity, and towards that unity of which the latest discussions have borne witness.

The extended application of the methods of inner Party democracy has led to an enormous growth of the cadres of subordinate functionaries in the nuclei. The figures referring to a number of organisations — Moscow, Leningrad, Bryansk, Tula, etc. — show that the cadres of subordinate functionaries (members of the bureaux of the groups, nucleus secretaries, etc.) have become one and a half times to twice as large as before. This growth of the nucleus functionary cadres is due in the main to the transference of Party organisatory work into the workshops, the formation of workshop nuclei, the formation of cadres of workshop organisers, group and sub-group organisers. We may add two comparative figures from a number of towns (Moscow, Leningrad, Artemovsk, Stalino, Ivanovo Vosnessensk, Vladimir, Tver, Tula) counting among our greatest centres. Towards the end of 1925 there were 4900 group and workshop organisers as compared with 15,000 today, that is, the number has been tripled.

But not only the number has increased. The quality of the work of the group organisers has improved at the same time. At the present time it is these organisers who are doing the real Party organisatory work in the factories. They form the most important Party apparatus establishing our contact with the masses. The regular meetings, both of the subordinate and the whole of the functionaries of our organisations, have become a permanent feature. The whole cadre of functionaries is called together when important questions are to be decided upon, and these same functionaries take part in the work of the Plenum of the Party Committees. The local organisations are adopting a number of measures calculated to raise the political level of their functionaries, and a large number of courses of instruction and schools have been opened for the functionaries.

These measures show that the Party is exerting every effort for the training of fresh cadres. It need not be said that these efforts are not equally successful everywhere; there are still enough stumbling blocks in the way, and only too often the work done is only on paper. Capable leadership too is wanting in many places, but even here considerable success is being gained.

If we cast a glance at the composition of the bureaux of our factory nuclei, or the composition of nuclei secretaries, we again find a considerable increase in the number of workers acting as nucleus secretaries or in the nucleus bureaux. This does not apply equally to the factory nuclei. If we take all the nuclei together, there is an increase of the worker element from 38 to 41 per cent. The factory nuclei contain 80 to 85 per cent. workers.

An especially characteristic fact must be mentioned here. At the time of the XIV. Party Congress the majority of the members of the bureaux (more than one half), in the factory nuclei, had been in the Party since 1917 to 1920. At the present time we find a regrouping inclining to the side of the younger Party members. The majority of the nuclei secretaries and members of the bureaux are comrades who joined the Party after 1924, that is, after the Lenin enrolment. All these tens of thousands of subordinate functionaries are to the extent of nine tenths actually fresh cadres, and are not only working in the nuclei and carrying on mass work, but are also taking part in the work of leadership falling to our Party Committees, and

in the work of the government and district committees. In this manner the Party has trained fresh cadres during the last two years. It need scarcely be emphasised that only the widest application of the methods of an actually existing inner Party democracy, and not of a merely pseudo democracy, have enabled such new cadres to be formed.

The composition of our Party committees. Here again we can record an increased percentage of workers in our leading organs, accompanied by a certain stability of this percentage in the district committees, in which the number of employees has declined and that of the peasants increased. The number of workers among the secretaries of the Party committees, and among the chairmen of the government executive committees, has also increased. Among the secretaries of the government committees we find on the one hand an increase in the specific weight of comrades who already belonged to the Party in its illegal days — from 71 to 78 per cent. — and on the other hand a decline of the number of those who have come over to us from other parties (from 17 to 9 per cent.).

### Organisatory Work.

We have seen that during these last two years the organisatory work of the Party has been greatly extended, both in the lower nuclei and in the C. C. of our Party. There is no doubt whatever that the leadership of the work of the lower organisations by the C. C. and the local Party committees has greatly improved.

Comrade Stalin has already referred to the difficulties of the task of leadership. I need only touch upon the fact that the last relics of the method of issuing commands from above, a method existing once and even now doubtless still sometimes applied, gave rise to a number of those conflicts which we witnessed in 1926 and at the beginning of this year. Many quarrels have arisen, between the secretaries of the Party committees and the secretaries of the executive committees for instance, most of them have been due to the unskilful or incorrect behaviour of the secretaries, and of many other Party workers, in their work of leadership in the Soviets and trade unions.

Various other signs go to show that many other defects still exist, and that everything does not work perfectly smoothly. We have for instance not yet been successful in doing away with the group conflicts in the national republics. Although fresh cadres of national functionaries are being formed in these republics, holding aloof from these groups, regarded with hostility by these groups, and fighting against them in every possible way, still there have been many relapses into this splitting up into groups in the different nationalities and territories. If this is to be overcome, we must continue to proceed both energetically and cautiously in fighting this evil.

I must also point out that our methods of leadership still incline too much to measures on paper. First we draw up a resolution in the C. C., this is copied in the governments re-copied in the districts in a slightly altered form, and then copied once more in the municipalities. Each organ pursues its own methods, and the end result is a ladder with many rungs. The lower organisations, having received the directions of the C. C. in this manner, again sit and wait until further regulations have percolated through to them. Our directions must be carried out on a regular system, if this waste of paper is to be avoided and our Party members saved from confusion.

Various other evils have been observable in our organisations during the period of this report. I must refer for instance to the regrettable cases of ideological degeneration among members of the Party, in Irkutsk, Ulyanovsk, Ryashsk, and other places.

Two words on our Party apparatus, now showing decided tendencies towards retrenchment. It must however be stated openly that we must attack the work of retrenchment in our Party apparatus with considerably greater determination and seriousness, and must devote much more attention to the rationalisation of the apparatus. During a recent common discussion with the C. C. C. on the question of the C. C. apparatus and the apparatus of our large organisations, as for instance the Moscow organisation, we came to the conclusion that much superfluous work is carried on, and that the apparatus has become unwieldy, causing both money and effort to be expended

without urgent necessity; for this reason radical measures must be adopted for the retrenchment and simplification of the Party apparatus, the more that this must be made to form the model upon which all the other apparatus of our State are to be built up.

### Press and Education.

A few words on our press and our educational work. The number of our newspapers has fallen off somewhat, whilst the editions of the other have increased, the total circulation being larger than before. The wall newspapers have risen to a place of leading importance. Our press has improved qualitatively. The number of worker and peasant correspondents has increased, especially the latter. There is a sad lack of competent press workers. The number of comrades suitable for this work has not only not increased, but even shows a tendency to decrease. On the other hand, the number of former members of other parties, now working for our press, has grown. We place some hope on the State Institute for Journalism, in which the students are 50 per cent. workers. This can however only help us in the distant future, and for the needs of the moment urgent steps must be taken.

The importance of political education for the Party has been strikingly evidenced during the last two years, during which the Party has been able to press back relentlessly and with iron determination, step for step, the attacks of the Opposition.

Our educational work must be subjected to a number of changes in the coming year, if it is to meet the higher demands of the Party members; some of these changes are the more imperative in view of the not entirely satisfactory work of political education in our schools.

We have adopted the principle of free selection of the form of political education on the part of the comrades themselves, and this has led to an increase of the voluntary educational circles from 2600 to 8000, and an almost threefold increase in the number of students attending these circles. The network of our schools for elementary political instruction has somewhat decreased this year, whilst on the other hand there has been a striking increase in the number of evening schools. This is one of the new forms of Party educational work which has earned much popularity of late.

Time does not permit me to go into the question of propagandists. I can only mention that the number of propagandists out of the working class increases from year to year. The percentage of workers among the leaders of our Agitprop commissions has risen from 19 to 25 per cent. The percentage of workers among the propagandists in the local organisations has also increased, and we are beginning more and more to seek our propagandists among the simple functionaries of the nuclei, and especially among the comrades working in the Agitprop commissions of these nuclei.

### Work in the Red Army.

The Party organisation in the Red Army too has made considerable progress during the last eighteen months. Here the increase amounts to 16,000 comrades, or 21 per cent., as compared with the 11 per cent. increase of the Party as such. The social composition of the Party organisations in the Red Army has also improved. The number of workers has increased, both in the organisation as a whole, and among the newly admitted Party members. The percentage of worker Red Army soldiers in the organisation has increased from 16 to 23 per cent. The percentage of Party members among the commanders of the Red Army has increased from 43 to 54 per cent. This improvement in the work being done in the army extends to the winning over of new Party members within the army itself. At the present time 56 per cent of the members newly admitted to the Party are worker Red Army soldiers, and 77 per cent. members of the Young Communist League.

In order to characterise the unanimity and ideological steadfastness of the Party organisation of the Red Army, it is only necessary to point out the results of the discussion which has been carried on in both the military and civilian nuclei. Where the Opposition succeeded in obtaining 0.5 of the total votes in the civilian nuclei, in the military nuclei it obtained 2½ times less. Here its rejection has been more crushing than anywhere else. This bears witness to the great improvement of the Party organisation of the Red Army.



### Summary.

To sum up the part of my report referring to inner Party matters, I may again state that we have to record a higher political level and increased activity of the whole mass of Party members, and an increased participation of the Party members in political life, the training and promotion — both in the subordinate nuclei and in the leading organs — of fresh cadres of workers from the bench. In the future we must lend every aid to this work, at the same time utilising to the utmost the old cadres of the Party.

In my opinion the Party Congress should confirm all the decisions of the C. C. on the regulation of the growth of the Party. In the future we shall have to devote increased attention to mass work in the factories, especially in the large undertakings, as also to work in the workshop nuclei, and to the

extremely important task of schooling the cadres of subordinate functionaries in the nuclei. The results of which I have attempted to give a synopsis in my report on the various departments of our organisatory work are conclusive evidence of the success won by the Party during the last two years.

We must not exaggerate our successes, but neither should we underrate it. We can boast of very considerable successes. Of course our work still possesses many defects, much is only half finished, and fresh tasks are always rising up before us, ever more difficult, tasks at the solution of which we have to work with the greatest energy. The work accomplished by our Party during the last two years shows us that we shall perform all these tasks, that we shall overcome all these difficulties and that our glorious Leninist Bolshevik Party has brought its work for the building up of socialism to a height never before attained. (Enthusiastic applause.)

## Resolution of the XV. Party Congress of C. P. S. U. on the Report on the Activity of the C. C.

**Unanimously adopted at the Session of December 7th, 1927.**

(Full Text.)

The XV. Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) fully and entirely approves of the political and organisatory line of the Central Committee.

The Party Congress records that the correct policy of the C. C. under the difficult conditions of the period under report, secured the consolidation of the international power of the Soviet Union, the increased importance of our country as a factor of international peace, and the increased authority of the Soviet Union as a citadel of the international revolutionary movement.

Thanks to the policy of the C. C., serious successes have been achieved within the country in the sphere of socialist construction; the productive forces of town and country have uninterruptedly developed, accompanied by a growing preponderance of the socialist elements of the whole of economics; the material and cultural level of the working and peasant masses has been raised; the union of the Soviet Republics on the basis of the correct carrying through of the Leninist policy in the national question has been strengthened; the alliance of the working class with the peasantry has been consolidated; the leading influence of the proletariat and its Party increased and the positions of the proletarian dictatorship systematically strengthened.

At the present time the proletarian State, the working class and the Party conduct their activity in an international and inner situation which has changed in many respects.

In the international sphere the period under report brought with it a series of new characteristic features which made their appearance both in the camp of imperialism as well as in the relations between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union. The partial stabilisation of capitalism, already mentioned by the XIV. Party Congress, has in the meantime revealed its character pretty clearly and brought to the fore the contradictions concealed by it.

In spite of a certain progress of the capitalist States, in spite of the growth of world production beyond the pre-war limits, in spite of the reconstruction of international trade and the stabilisation of currencies, in spite of a certain "normalisation" of the international relations, in spite of a partial progress of technique and of capitalist rationalisation — in spite of all these, and to a certain extent as a result of all these, the irreconcilable contradictions of the capitalist world system have increased. There has been an increase in the inequality of development of the capitalist countries, and on this basis the fight for the economic-political spheres of influence and for the redistribution of the world has become more acute. There has been an intensification of the international fight for markets and for raw material, for the spheres of capital export, owing to the disparity between the possibilities of production of the

imperialist States and of the effective demand of the great masses of the population who are plunged into misery by capitalism as a result of the chronic incomplete utilisation of the capitalist production apparatus, as a result of the loss of such an enormous market as the Soviet Union for the world system of capitalist economy.

There has been an intensification of the contradictions between the European and American mother countries on the one hand and the dependent countries and colonies on the other hand, whereby the fight of the dependent countries against imperialist subjugation has assumed the form of armed revolts, national wars, colonial revolutions (China, Indonesia).

There has been an aggravation of the class struggle in the imperialist countries, in which the working class — in reply to the campaign of capital against its standard of living, in reply to the abolition of the eight-hour day and to the exploitative rationalisation, in reply to the reactionary, militarist policy of the ruling bourgeoisie — is going over to the counter-attack.

There has been an aggravation of the contradictions between the Soviet Union and the countries of its capitalist neighbours, as the Soviet Union, by its victorious development, is undermining the basic pillars of capitalist world hegemony. The growth of the socialist elements in the Soviet Union, the collapse of the bourgeois hopes upon the degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship are, along with the growth of the international revolutionary influence of the Soviet Union, the most important factors of this aggravation.

The capitalist development as a whole reveals the tendency to shorten the historical period of peaceful "pause for breath", to accelerate the new phase of great imperialist wars and to hasten the revolutionary solution of the world conflicts. This means before all for the Soviet Union a growing tension in the relations to the bourgeois States, the policy of which, in spite of the existence of a number of inner antagonisms between the various States and the various groups of the bourgeoisie which at present render more difficult the setting up of a capitalist united front, is becoming more and more hostile to the Soviet Union and creates the direct danger of an imperialist attack from outside.

The international development of the last two years has clearly shown how futile have been the attempts of bourgeois and pacifist politicians to "unite" and to "reconcile" the Powers on a capitalist basis. The endless Unity Conferences and commission meetings of the League of Nations, the so-called "Manifesto of the Bankers" (a declaration against the customs orgies since the Versailles Treaty), the World Economic Conference, the pacifist "Pan-Europe-Plan", the Geneva Three Power "Disarmament" Conference reveal themselves to be a new deception of the working class.

The "unity" attempts have only cloaked the insane competition of the imperialists behind the scenes, the fight for the distribution of the colonial booty, the unceasing armaments, the conclusion of open and secret military alliances which immediately prepare for new imperialist wars.

In reality there is proceeding a growth of the fascist, chauvinist, militarist tendencies. Under the leadership of the British Conservative government, the reactionary elements of the international bourgeoisie began to prepare the ground for the armed attack on the Soviet Union, by encircling the Soviet Union with a whole coil of provocations (raids upon Soviet representations abroad, murder of functionaries of Soviet diplomacy).

The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. records that simultaneously with the strengthening and aggravation of the fascist and aggressively militarist tendencies in the policy of the capitalist States, there are arising the preconditions for a revolutionary solution of the present international and inner contradictions. The General Strike and the struggle of the miners in Great Britain in 1926, the revolt in Indonesia, the great Chinese Revolution, the revolutionary action of the workers in "stabilised" Austria (July 1927), as well as the consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union clearly show the contradictions and the rottenness of the capitalist world regime. The temporary ebbing of the revolutionary wave in Europe (after the defeat of the German Revolution in 1923) is now being followed by a flood, by an increase of the activity of the proletariat, the differentiation and swing to the Left of the labour movement, the consolidation of the ranks of the Comintern and its sections, the growth of the revolutionary mass movement (demonstrations in connection with the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti, election successes of a number of Communist Parties, the October Delegations of foreign workers to the Soviet Union etc.).

In view of the above enumerated facts which characterise the present international situation, the XV. Party Congress instructs the C. C. to conduct the further work:

a) on the basis of the unshakable continuation of the policy of peace, which is nothing else but the policy of struggle against the danger of imperialist wars and at the same time the main condition for the further growth of socialism in the Soviet Union;

b) on the basis of an all-round consolidation of the brotherly alliance between the workers of the Soviet Union and the workers of the West European States, as well as with the toiling masses of the oppressed countries;

c) on the basis of a further, systematic development of the economic connections with the capitalist countries, securing at the same time the growth of the economic independence of the Soviet Union;

d) on the basis of an uninterrupted development of the defensive capacity of the country, of the Red workers' and peasants' army, of the air fleet and the navy;

e) on the basis of an accumulation of the necessary economic reserves (grain, goods, currency reserves, especially defence reserves).

The XV. Party Congress regards the line and the work of the Central Committee in the sphere of home policy and economic construction as being perfectly correct.

On the basis of the Leninist policy of the C. C. the development of State industry beyond the pre-war level has been secured; the number of employed workers has increased; labour productivity and wages have grown. The development of the State big industry has been accompanied by an uninterrupted growth of the share in the production of the means of production. The surpassing of the pre-war level of industrial production, the renewal of fixed capital of socialist industry, the commencement of radical technical changes in production, the considerable results in electrification, the setting up and development of quite new industrial branches (machine-industry, lathe construction, automobile industry, turbine construction, aeroplane industry, chemical industry) the erection of new factories, great factory equipments and the thoroughly new equipment of old factories — these are the essential achievements of the Party and of the working class on the path of the industrialisation of our country proclaimed by the XIV. Party Congress.

Alongside of socialist State industry there has grown the importance of all the other sectors of the system of economic commanding positions of the proletarian State: transport service, the State budget, the bank and credit system, the trade apparatus. The State and co-operative sector captured decisive positions on the market and is systematically ousting from it private trade capital. In spite of boycott-like manoeuvres of the capitalist surroundings, our foreign trade relations have been extended on the basis of our foreign trade monopoly; at the same time a favourable trade balance has been achieved.

During the period under review the economic policy of the Party has contributed to the further development of agriculture on the basis of a gradual consolidation of the leading role of the socialist town; to the extension of the area under cultivation, to the growth of the goods share, to the penetration of the elements of a higher technic and of agriculture: multiple field system, technical cultures, introduction of machinery into agricultural production. The economic alliance between town and country has greatly increased. Along with the growth of agriculture there has also increased the supplying of the village with town industrial goods and the importance of the agricultural co-operatives.

The XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U. considers it necessary, however, to state that the above-mentioned achievements are insufficient and that the level of agriculture is still extremely low. The Party Congress therefore instructs the C. C. to adopt practical measures for the increased development of agriculture, in which connection the work of the regulation of the soil is considered to be the chief measure. It is necessary in the first place to take in hand the transition of the scattered peasant undertakings to the basis of an extended co-operative combination of the peasantry on the lines of wholesale production (collective cultivation of the soil, on the basis of intensification of and application of machinery to agriculture) with an all-round support and promotion of the beginnings of socialised, agricultural work. Such an increased raising of agriculture is also necessary in the interest of the peasantry, in the interest of the extension of the market (for sale and for raw material) for big industry and in the interest of the technical transformation and socialist collectivisation of the village by overcoming at the same time its capitalist elements.

The past period of economic development undoubtedly constitutes a step forwards in the direction of Socialism. This achievement, however, does not include the removal of the difficulties, of the dangers and contradictions connected with the peculiarities of our growth, with the anti-labour social class forces. Only by a systematic fight against these forces can these difficulties be overcome and further progress towards Socialism be made. The chief difficulties are: the problem of export and import; the extremely complicated sharpening of the international situation; the problem of fixed capital, of the cost of production and of the reduction of industrial prices; the problem of unemployment and of the agrarian surplus population; the problem of goods shortage on the one hand and the improvement of the supply of the towns with agricultural products on the other hand; finally, the problem of the accumulation of reserves (goods and currency reserves).

The Party Congress calls the attention of the whole Party to the fact that the successful solution of these problems requires the special exertion of all the forces in the Party, the unity of their will and firmness in carrying out the Party instructions.

The XV. Party Congress is of the opinion that the policy of a still more decisive economic ousting can and must be applied towards the private economic elements which have grown numerically, even if less than the socialist economic sector. The preconditions for the further economic offensive against the capitalist elements have been created by the previous successes of economic development on the basis of the growing goods traffic and on the basis of the liquidation of the remnants of war communism (decisions of the XIV. Party Conference). As a result of these successes the proletarian State concentrated in its hands those material and economic resources which are necessary both for the successful overcoming of the capitalist elements in the village (attack together with the middle peasant upon the kulak, greater support of the village poor, development of the co-operatives of the poor and middle peasants, co-operation of production) and the further ousting of private capital from the town.

The XV. Party Congress instructs the C. C. to continue with unabated energy the policy of socialist industrialisation, which has already shown the first positive results. The Party must, along with an all-round strengthening of the industrial power of the Soviet Union, still further make use of the existing financial and economic means for the extension of the production of the means of production, especially of metallurgy and machine construction, for the development of the home raw material production (cotton, wool, leather etc.) and uninterruptedly continue the policy of a reduction of the cost of production and of a reduction of prices of industrial goods.

The general tendency towards the industrialisation of our country must be accompanied by a determined policy of rationalisation of production and administration. Rationalisation of production, along with the improvement and simplification of the State and co-operative apparatus, is the main task of the approaching period. In the interest of raising the material and cultural level of the proletariat, and also in the interest of the rationalisation of production, the Party has proclaimed the gradual transition to the Seven-Hour Day, along with a further raising of the working class. Therein is expressed the fundamental difference between our rationalisation methods and the methods of capitalism; under capitalism rationalisation is accompanied by a deterioration of the standard of life of the masses and by a lengthening of the working day.

The XV. Party Congress calls upon all Party, economic, trade union and Soviet organisations to carry through with all energy this most important task of socialist rationalisation, as the Congress is of the opinion that only on the basis of socialist rationalisation will it be possible to achieve the industrialisation of the country (including the industrialisation of agriculture), the abolition of unemployment, to overcome the bureaucratic excrescences of the Soviet State, to satisfy to an increasing extent the requirements of the working and peasant masses, to secure their further cultural growth and to overcome the chief difficulties of socialist construction.

In spite of the leading and still growing role of the socialist economic positions, the development of the productive forces in the economy of the Soviet Union is inevitably accompanied by a partial growth of the class antagonisms. The private capitalist sections in town and country, which are allying themselves with some bureaucratic elements of the Soviet and economic apparatus, are attempting to increase their resistance against the attack of the working class; they attempt to influence in a manner hostile to the proletarian dictatorship certain sections of employees and intellectuals, the backward sections of home workers and small trades people, peasants and workers. This influence becomes also apparent in the cultural-political and ideological sphere (preaching of an ideology of a "change of front", the slogan of a big peasant "peasant union", chauvinism, antisemitism, the demand for bourgeois democratic "liberties" and in connection with this demand the petty-bourgeois oppositional slogan of two parties etc.).

The working class with the C. P. S. U. at the head, is opposing to this hostile influence and to the increased activity of the capitalist elements the strengthening of the regime of the proletarian dictatorship, a still further increase of activity, of self-activity and of the cultural development of the proletarian masses (activation of the Soviets, development of trade union democracy and of mass activity in the co-operatives, increase of the ideological influence of the proletariat upon the village, cultural and educational work among the masses etc.), as well as an increased ideological influence of the proletariat upon the broad sections of the Soviet intelligentsia. The Party Congress records a number of indubitable successes on this fighting front and considers a further all-round mobilisation of the proletarian masses and especially an intensified struggle on the ideological and cultural front to be necessary.

The Party Congress records the qualitative and quantitative growth of our Party since the XIV. Party Congress, approves fully and entirely of the policy of the C. C. with regard to the regulation of the social composition of the Party, records the success of the "October enrolment" of the workers for the Party on the occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution, and declares that the leading rôle of the C. P. S. U. as the chief lever of the dictatorship can only be maintained,

confirmed and strengthened on the basis of the Leninist unity and proletarian discipline of the Party ranks, on the basis of an uninterrupted raising of the ideological, theoretical and cultural level of the Party members, of a consistent carrying out of inner Party democracy and a systematic improvement of the social composition of the Party by means of permanent recruiting among working men and women from the factories for the Party.

The Party Congress considers the development of inner-Party democracy, the concrete criticism of the shortcomings, both of the Soviet apparatus and of the Party, the intensification of the struggle against careerism etc. to be particularly necessary in view of the complicated tasks with which the Party is confronted and in the interest of raising the activity of the Party members. At the same time the Party Congress calls the attention of the Party to the necessity of increasing the work in the Young Communist League, among the working youth in general and among the women.

The XV. Party Congress records that in spite of the warning of the XIII. Party Congress, which ascertained the petty-bourgeois deviation of the Trotsky group, and in spite of the warning of the XV. Party Conference with regard to the social-democratic deviation of the Opposition united under the lead of Trotsky, the Opposition continued to increase their revisionist errors from month to month, to conduct the fight against the C. P. S. U. and the teachings of Lenin by building up their own party, by carrying the fight beyond the boundaries of the Party, by appealing to non-proletarian elements in the country against the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The ideology of the Opposition, which openly concluded a bloc with the renegades of international communism (Maslov, Souvarine etc.) has now assumed the form of Menshevism in a peculiar Trotskyist formulation. The denial of the character of the State Soviet undertakings, the denial of the possibility of victorious socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the denial of the policy of alliance of the working class with the chief masses of the peasantry, and the denial of the organisatory principles of Bolshevism (policy of splitting the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern) logically led the Trotskyist-Menshevist Opposition to slander the Soviet Union as a degenerated, Thermidorian State, to deny the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and to conduct a counter-revolutionary fight against it.

Finally the Opposition has ideologically broken with Leninism; it has degenerated into a Menshevist group, it has gone the way of capitulation to the forces of the international and native bourgeoisie and has converted itself objectively into a tool of the third force against the regime of the proletarian dictatorship. It was precisely for this reason that the Opposition encountered an annihilating rejection on the part of the whole mass of the Party members as well as of the working class as a whole.

The Party Congress considers all the decisions of the C. C. and C. C. C. which are directed against the disorganising activity of the Trotskyists to be absolutely necessary and to constitute the minimum of necessity. It instructs the C. C. also in the future to secure the Leninist unity at all costs.

The XV. Party Congress declares that in view of the fact that the differences between the Party and the Opposition have changed from tactical differences to programmatical ones, and that the Trotskyist Opposition has become objectively a factor of the anti-Soviet fight, that membership of the Trotskyist Opposition and the propaganda of its views is incompatible with membership of the Bolshevist Party.

In the name of the C. P. S. U., in the name of the working class of the Soviet Union, the XV. Party Congress expresses its firm proletarian belief in the victory of Socialism in our country, in spite of all the difficulties. The world-historical lesson of the ten years existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the most brilliant proof of the correctness of the Leninist way which the C. P. S. U. is following. The XV. Party Congress instructs the C. C. to proceed undeterred on this path, to rally ever greater masses of the toilers of our country under the banner of socialist construction, to strengthen the ties of brotherly solidarity with the proletariat of all countries and to make the Soviet Union every year a more powerful outpost of socialist world revolution.

# The Discussion before the XV. Party Congress of the C. P. S. U.

## Discussion Supplement No. 8-10 of the "Pravda"

By L. B.

The following article, owing to an oversight, was omitted from our last week's number.

In addition to Comrade Tomsky's article "Trotskyism and the Labour-Question" published verbatim in the number of the "Inprecorr" No. 71 and the conclusion of Comrade Kuusinen's series of articles: "Comrade Zinoviev's Historical Untruth of the present Day", this number contains a contribution by Comrade I. Bagiev: "The powerful Phrases of the Opposition and actual Facts in the Question of the Organisation and Defence of the agricultural Workers".

Comrade Bagiev deals with the assertion of the Opposition maintaining that the Party failed to organise the agricultural labourers and that their wages were lower than the minimum wages fixed by the State. The steady and rapid increase of the membership of the Union of Agricultural and Forest Workers proves best of all how incorrect the statement is. In January 1924 the membership of the said trade union amounted to 280,600, in January 1925 to 415,000, in January 1926 to 856,900, in January 1927 to 1,109,400, in July 1927 to 1,189,600 members. The number of agricultural workers concluding labour contracts shows an equally rapid increase: in 1924, 376,100; in 1925, 819,400; in 1926, 1,187,300. With regard to the wages paid to agricultural labourers, the figures collected by the C. C. of the Union of Agricultural and Forest Workers gives evidence that not only the wages of agricultural labourers are not lower than the wages minimum fixed by the State, but that they amount to almost three times that minimum.

The discussion supplement No. 9 ("Pravda" of November 30th, 1927) consists of the following articles: "Our economic Prospects and the Opposition" by S. Strumilin; "The Opposition and the Five Years' Plan" by R. Weisberg; "New Tasks concerning the Introduction of the Collective System in the Village" by A. Smirnov; "Actual Co-operation of actual Masses" by M. Belenky; "On the 'Difficulties of the Food Question' in the Trotskyist Counter-Theses" by B. Monastirsky; and of some smaller additional suggestions referring to the theses of the C. C. on activity in the village.

Comrade Strumilin demonstrates that the Opposition is using — in a non-Marxist manner — as a standard of our progress as compared with Tsarism, not production but personal consumption and even the total average consumption, not proletarian consumption alone. In doing so it disregards the fact that the enormous consumption of the large landowners and of the large bourgeoisie is included in the total average consumption of pre-war times. The picture of the increasing well-being of the working class which we get by comparing the proletarian consumption of pre-war times with that of the present day, is very different from the picture drawn by the Opposition. An adult proletarian person consumed 24 per cent more of flour products, 19 per cent more of meat and fish, 28 per cent more of sugar and 15 per cent more of clothing (calculated in pre-war prices) in the economic year 1925/26 than he did in the years before the war. An examination of the nature of the products consumed gives an even clearer picture; the proletariat of the Soviet Union consumed by 5 per cent less rye flour and by 64 per cent more wheaten flour, further by 36 per cent less of fish and by 57 per cent more of meat in the economic year in question than it did in pre-war times. The Opposition is shedding tears over the fact that for instance the personal consumption of cast-iron in the United States exceeds that in our country so and so many times. It is indeed true, but our present level of the production of cast-iron (calculated in proportion to the population) has been reached in the United States as early as in 1850, and the Opposition omitted to teach us the magic art by means of which we might cover in five years the distance which it took American capitalism 77 years to go.

Comrade Strumilin quotes a few further examples proving that there is no need for us to cherish pessimistic views with regard to the rate of development of production in our country.

The Opposition is less entitled to make reproaches to the C. C. in reference to this question than anyone else. Two years ago, a plan was worked out under the direction of Piatakov, the leader of the Opposition, providing an increase of production amounting to 61 per cent in the past two years with an investment of capital to the amount of 2484 million roubles, whilst we achieved an increase of production by 70 per cent with much less capital invested (1774 million roubles).

Comrade Weisberg opposes the assertion of the Opposition alleging that the theses of the C. C. failed to take the class war into consideration. He makes use of a rich material of figures in order to prove to what degree the measures resorted to by the Party are accelerating the process of socialisation in production. We only quote the following figures from among those mentioned by Comrade Weisberg: in the next five years, the share of socialised industry in industrial production as a whole will rise from 86 per cent to 90.1, whereas private industrial production will decrease from 14 to 9.9 per cent, capitalist production from 5.2 to 3.4 per cent. In individual Republics, for instance in the Ukraine, not only a reduction of capitalist industry in industry as a whole, but also a restriction of the absolute amount of capitalist industrial production has been provided for. The turnover of co-operative commerce will grow by 62.9 per cent in the next five years whereas private trading (in its absolute amount) will fall by 14.6 per cent. In agriculture also, a considerable increase of the share of collective and Soviet farms in the total area under cultivation (from 2.4 to 4.7 per cent) and in the inventory (from 10.8 to 14.2 per cent) has been provided for.

Comrades Smirnov and Belenky make a number of suggestions with regard to organisatory measures aiming at a wider and more effective development of the collective forms of agriculture.

Comrade Monastirsky, with the use of a number of diagrams and of statistical data, demonstrates that the alleged difficulties of the food question in the towns (apart from seasonal disturbances which were of an obviously transient nature) are without any foundation. An example: the supply of Moscow with flour has augmented by 78 per cent in the time from 1912 up to the present, whereas the population of that town only increased by 25.4 per cent in the same period. The supply of meat, butter and eggs etc. offers a similar example.

In the discussion supplement No. 10 (published in the "Pravda" of December 1st, 1927), Comrade Anzelovitch, in his article "The Party, the agricultural Proletariat and the Opposition", also combats the assertion of the Trotskyites that the Party neglected the agricultural labourers.

In an "Amendment to the Theses of the C. C. on Activity in the Village" signed by Comrade Krupskaya and by Comrades Meshtcheriakov, Kravtchenko and Shiriamov, measures concerning organisation, finance and training, with the object of developing the activity of the functionaries for political enlightenment in the village, are suggested.

Comrade Lifshitz repeats the assertion maintained in the theses of the Opposition, that the average income of the proletariat is growing more slowly than the average income per head of the bourgeoisie. Comrade A. Kohn opposes this assertion by demonstrating that the figures quoted by Comrade Lifshitz are wrong and likely to misrepresent the actual situation entirely. Apart from this, the important thing is not whether or not the income per head of a very thin bourgeois stratum is growing at a more rapid pace than does the average income of the proletariat, but in what way the share of those two classes in the national revenue is developing. Looked at from this point of view, it may be said that the share of the proletariat and of the socialised economic bodies in the national revenue shows a rise of from 31.9 to 39 per cent in the last two years, whereas the share of the bourgeoisie has fallen from 5.5 to 4.8 per cent.