

V. b. b.

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 6. No. 7

22nd January 1926

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

The XIV. Party Congress of the Communist Party of Russia.

Discussion on the Political and Organisatory Reports and Concluding Speeches of Comrades Zinoviev (Co-Reporter), Stalin and Molotov (Reporters) of the Central Committee of the C. P. of Russia.

Continuation of the Discussion on the Political and Organisatory Report of the Central Committee.

After Bucharin, the next speaker was Rutin. In his opinion Zinoviev makes no concrete proposals. There is not a single member who overlooks the kulak danger, but we see it as it really is, and not in an exaggerated light.

Comrade Postischov pointed out the impermissibility of allowing a co-report to be given in the present situation.

The next speaker, comrade Krupskaja, declared: Kamenev was right in saying that the course of the Party is directed towards the rich peasantry. The poverty among the peasantry is the result of our backwardness, and therefore the whole of the Party forces must be concentrated on overcoming this backwardness. This policy was rightly determined. Bucharin's slogan of: "enrich yourselves" is faulty, for it can be applied to the middle and rich peasantry as well as to the poor. The speaker declared herself not in agreement with the policy of extending the NEP in the village. The successes of industry have led to an over-estimation of the economic situation. The same over-estimation may be observed with respect to the state apparatus. The present growing activity of the proletariat must be directed towards rendering state industry completely socialist.

Comrade Krupskaja concluded her speech with the declaration that there is no thought of a split, or of lack of confidence

in the Central. It is solely a question of determining the confines of a collective consultation of constantly recurring questions.

The next speaker, Petrovsky (Ukraine) declared that the speakers from Leningrad had proposed no political programme. Zinoviev's co-report was delivered with the intention of showing that there existed some sort of vacillation in the Party. Comrade Krupskaja had been at fault in publishing an article directly asserting that the Central is pursuing a false policy, and demanding that our policy be altered into one of crushing the kulaks. There is no single organisation which sees a kulak deviation in the policy pursued by the C. C. The attitude taken by the Leningrad comrades is an insult to the Party.

The next speaker, Polonsky, declared that at the time of the Trotzky discussion the Party landed with the right foot in the petty bourgeois bog. The Central dragged it out of the bog again. And now Zinoviev thrusts the left foot of the Party into the bog. Doubtless the Central will again prove powerful enough to prevent this. The Leningrad delegation must not be confused with the Leningrad organisation or the Leningrad working class.

Comrade Laschevitsch maintained that no collective leadership exists in the Party. Uglanov was wrong in declaring at the Moscow Conference that our task consists in continuing the

centralisation of the organisation and in centralising the leadership. This is not so.

Comrade Mikojsn declared that nobody wants the Central to be set aside. What we want is that everyone should submit to the iron will of the majority. (Applause.) So long as Zinoviev has the majority on his side, he is in favour of iron discipline and submission, but when he has not the majority, then he is against submission, (hear hear!) Zinoviev should not have given a co-report. He would have had the opportunity of speaking for five hours in the discussion. But the fact of his delivering a co-report means the opposing of his standpoint to that of the Central. (hear hear!) Bucharin has corrected his former errors, and therefore he should not be attacked again. (hear hear! and applause.) In some districts the middle peasant has not yet been won over, but he is already wavering. Stalin is right in his assertion that the under-estimation of the kulaks means the disarming of the Party. There is however no need to exaggerate the danger. The peasant question has not raised any indissoluble differences of opinion. The Party invariably seeks the right line, and cannot always find it at once. Zinoviev's speech is not clear. Nobody knows exactly how the peasant country is going to arrive at socialism. Not only must international perspectives be correctly judged, but above all the concrete connections between the questions must be found. In this respect we find no reply from Zinoviev. There is a great difference between the tone of the Leningrad articles and that of the resolutions passed by the Leningrad workers. (Applaus.) After the Party Conference the discussion should be definitely terminated. If it a luxury which the Party cannot afford. (Applaus.)

The next speaker, Uglanov, declared that Zinoviev's co-report contained no programme whatever. The Party has no difficulty in solving the questions set by Zinoviev. The speaker criticised some of the declarations contained in Zinoviev's article: "Philosophy of the Epoch". In conclusion the speaker demanded that Zinoviev should abandon his errors.

The next speaker, Jaroslavsky, began his speech by asking how it was possible that a member of the Political Bureau, who voted for all the fundamental theses at the plenary session of the Central three days before the Party Conference, without saying a word about differences of opinion, should now appear with this co-report. The history of the Leningrad workers is one of heroism; but this present episode in their history is better forgotten. (Applause.)

Zinoviev is mostly to blame for this. He, with his colossal authority as chairman of the Comintern, declared at the Leningrad conference that Moscow has coined the slogan: "Against Leningrad". No such slogan has been issued, and Zinoviev has no right to make such irresponsible declarations.

In Leningrad it has been said that the nearest disciples of Lenin — Zinoviev and Kamenev — are being suppressed. It is however the whole Party which is Lenin's nearest disciple. (Applause.)

Comrade Jaroslavsky then read a number of resolutions passed by large nuclei in Leningrad, differing from the head of the Leningrad organisation. Protest must be raised against the assertion of Wardin, that the C. C. purposely depreciates the dangers, in order to capitulate to them on the morrow. If there has been any weakness in the C. C., it has consisted of the weak leadership of the Leningrad organisation. Everyone must submit to the decision of the Party conference, and the Leningrad delegation must agree to this decision. (Applause.)

The next speaker, Medvedjev, reproached Zinoviev for declaring the political line of the C. C. to be wrong, and its organisatory line right. This is inconsistent, since the organisatory questions arise from the political.

Comrade Evdokimov (Leningrad) protested against the assertion that the Leningrad delegation does not represent the Leningrad organisation. We demand the objective treatment of the fundamental questions submitted to the Party conference. Bucharin is wrong in accusing Zinoviev of declaring the NEP to be a retreat only. Zinoviev himself speaks expressly of the NEP. The most important thing is to create greater clarity in regard to fundamental questions. The C. C. of the Communist Youth is wrong in asserting that the Leningrad Youth organisation is afraid of the middle peasantry. The tasks of our Communist Youth in the villages are extremely complicated. New

forms must be sought. The Leningrad organisation has accomplished a great work in creating the "Societies of the Smyschka", the alliance between town and country. In Leningrad these organisations have 400,000 workers. The Leningrad organisation will submit to every decision come to by the Party.

The next speaker, Komarov (Leningrad) first raised the question of why the Leningrad Party bureau has split into a majority and a minority. He then touched upon organisatory questions in connection with the superseding and nomination of responsible functionaries, including the superseding of the secretary of the bureau of the Gouvernement, Salutsky. In spite of the demand sent by the C. C. that Salutsky should be superseded on account of a serious offence, the Leningrad committee had vacillated greatly. Zinoviev himself supported this opposition. Comrade Komarov declared that at this time he had expressed the opinion, during a personal interview with Zinoviev, that we should exert every effort to place the leadership of all organisations in the hands of the C. C., and not of individual persons.

The next speaker, Ordschonikidze, emphasised that Zinoviev's co-report signified the opposition of a special programme against that of the C. C. It is entirely wrong to represent this co-report merely as an exchange of opinions, although Zinoviev himself declares the line taken by the C. C. in the question of the poor peasantry to be correct. The Party accepts Bucharin's line where it agrees with Lenin. The unfounded attacks upon Bucharin should not be tolerated, for Bucharin is one of our best Party theoreticians; we all love and support him. The Leningrad comrades have subjected the Party to a severe crisis. But it is none the less certain that the Leningrad comrades will tolerate no opposition against the Party majority, and will declare the decisions of the Party to be theirs.

The next speaker, Salutzky (Leningrad), declared that he had never attempted to discredit the C. C., and that he had recognised his former errors. All the members of the Leningrad delegation will carry out the Party decisions with the utmost energy.

The speaker Kaganovitch (general secretary of the Ukrainian C. P.) criticised Zinoviev's co-report severely. In his opinion Zinoviev has offered neither a practical programme nor concrete proposals. Zinoviev's co-report does not devote one word to the great progress made by the C. C. during the past year. He has only spoken of difficulties. To be sure there is a class differentiation taking place among the peasantry, but this has already been expressly stated by the C. C. and by the XIV. National Party Conference.

We in Ukraine raised the question of the poor peasantry as early as July, and properly dealt with the question of the committees of poor peasants executing the decisions of the Party conference on the defence of the interests of the poor peasantry and the efforts to be made to gain the middle peasantry. We have exempted 22% of the poor peasantry, or 1,200,000 poor peasants, from taxation. In the Ukraine 400,000 peasant undertakings are cooperating in the organisation of beet sugar cultivation.

Our concrete work aims at separating the middle peasantry from the village usurer. It is no easy matter to include 10 million peasants in Soviet constructive work. We say to the poor peasantry: Organise the cooperatives, organise the committees, organise the mutual aid between the Party and the Soviet power, seek to help yourselves in organisatory and material ways. The poor peasantry cannot be helped by means of such empty slogans as: "A horse for every farmer"! This is mere demagogy, and only makes real work more difficult.

Comrades Sokolnov and Kamenev come forward as eager defenders of the interests of the poor peasantry. But why have these representatives of finance and economics not made concrete suggestions for the aid to be given to the poor peasantry?

Many comrades demand the monopoly of a hundred per cent interpretation of Leninism. It is only the whole Party and the Party conference which can apply Leninism properly, not individual persons. (Applause.) Zinoviev's book "Philosophy of the Epoch" contains great pessimist deviations. The Leningrad organisation is attempting to terrorise us by its authority. We must overcome all differences of opinion by an unequivocal formulation. The decisions of the Party conference must guarantee the efficient carrying out of the tasks confronting us.

The next speaker, **Antipov (Ural)**, declared it to be the task of the theoretician to provide the **theoretical basis for our practical constructive socialist work**, and not to spread want of faith in the possibility of realising socialism in one country. The Leningrad organisation has isolated itself from the Party. But it will surely correct its errors. (Applause.)

* * *

Antipov was followed by the People's Commissar for Finance **Sokolnikov**.

Three fundamental questions arise:

1. The question of the socialist elements in economics;
2. The question of what changes in the relations between town and country will result from the growing differentiation;
3. The question of the relations between Soviet economics and the foreign market.

The first question is that of **State Capitalism and Socialism**. The speaker combatted Bucharin's standpoint, and asserted that the railways, for instance, did not become a socialist organisation on passing into the hands of the workers' state. **Foreign trade**, again, is carried on as a **state capitalist undertaking**. The monetary system is permeated by the principles of capitalist economics, and serves the sole purpose of organising economics under the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order that the socialist elements may grow.

Conditions in the factories are doubtless socialistic, but it is another question as to what degree actual Socialism has been realised. In the process of reproduction private capital also takes its share.

The errors committed in the grain transactions were caused by an over-estimation of the present possibilities of carrying out a systematic plan.

With respect to the second question, the speaker declared that in the future the rich peasant will acquire more and more economic spheres, the capitalist elements in the village are increasing, and it is thus most necessary to concentrate our fire against these. It is necessary that the agricultural taxes should be employed as weapons restricting the growth of the kulak elements.

With regard to the third question, the speaker declared that he was not in agreement with Stalin's formulation. It is true that industry must be developed to the utmost, but our progress depends solely upon the export of agricultural products.

Comrade Kamenev.

Sokolnikov was followed by Kamenev. He first protested against the demands that the minority should observe discipline, for since the disagreement is not yet ended, and the Party has not yet issued its decision, such demands are practically an attempt to throttle the discussion. The minority brings forwards resolutions, and has supported the co-report for the reason that it is convinced that a **new theoretical school is arising in the Party**, whose wrong principles the Party cannot too energetically repress. The minority is anxious to warn the Party against this current. The second cause of the co-report has been the fact that during the course of the Party Conference serious **accusations of liquidation and defeatism** have been brought up, and the Party knew nothing of these until the Conference. What ought to have been done was to permit a great open discussion before the Party conference, in order to clear up all the differences of opinion. (Interjection: "Then you would have lost even the present minority!")

Stalin declared in his Report that our efforts must be concentrated against the deviation of an under estimate of the rich peasantry danger. **Bucharin** accuses the minority of striving to revoke the new economic policy and to return to War Communism.

The October plenary session of the C. C. pointed out in its resolution the existence of two deviations: 1. The over-estimation of the negative aspect of the new economic policy; 2. The lack of comprehension of the necessity for the NEP.

Kamenev energetically denied the accusation of lack of comprehension of the necessity of the NEP, and declared that after five years of experience with the NEP there was no member who failed to recognise the importance and inevitableness of the NEP. (Interjection: "Is the under-estimation of the middle peasantry then not a lack of comprehension for the NEP?") There is one artificial current in the Party, contradictory to the actual policy of the Party, and this consists of the **attempt to beautify the negative aspect of the NEP**, to hide the difficulties brought about by the growth of capitalist elements; it is the **confusion of the NEP as means to Socialism with Socialism itself**. It is against this tendency that our forces must be concentrated. The whole international situation, especially the retardation of the world revolution, and further the whole social situation within the Soviet Republics, form a fruitful soil for the growth of this tendency to embellish the NEP. Sooner or later the Party will have to concentrate its whole efforts **against these stabilisation moods**. In the Party, and in practical economic work, we already have to combat precisely these tendencies, not the alleged attempts at breaking up the NEP.

Stalin's error consists in the fact that though he does not identify himself with this tendency towards the embellishment of the NEP, this deviation of whom Bucharin is the ideologist (laughter), still he covers it. The representatives of this deviation fail to recognise that every expansion of the NEP signifies the strengthening of not only the socialist elements, but at the same time of the capitalist elements in town and country.

Kamenev contested the assertion that the decisions of the XIV. National Party conference on facilitating the leasing of land, and permitting agricultural wage labour, can be of advantage to the broad masses of the middle and poor peasantry. He did not contest the correctness of the decisions, but considers them **solely as concessions to the kulaks**.

The dispute over state capitalism again affords an opportunity for the tendency to beautify the NEP. We do not contest the consistently socialist character of state industry, but this socialist character consists of the socialisation of the means of production, whilst the working conditions in these undertakings are not yet socialist. There are people in our Party who maintain that our state industry is perfect socialism. (Interjection: "That is your imagination!")

The accusations brought against the minority of lack of understanding of the necessity of civil peace after the period of civil war, are untenable and again betray the tendency to glorify the NEP, and the failure to recognise the class war in the NEP. There is no danger of the NEP being destroyed, but there is a growing resistance among the capitalist elements, and the danger exists that if we fall behind in the support of the growth of the socialist economic elements, we may lose much ground.

Kamenev emphasised how greatly the economic plans projected by the state are dependent on the pressure exercised by the peasantry, as evidenced in particular in the reduced quantity of grain procured. (Interjection: "That is just where you miscalculated!"). It must be recognised that the kulaks are doing their utmost to take advantage of the development of the forces of production in a capitalist direction.

We are not liquidators, but give warning of existing dangers.

Comrade Tomsky.

Since some members of the Political Bureau have declared at the Party conference that the Political Bureau of the C. C. has possessed no definite political line, it is necessary that the whole of the Party members be quite clear as to **how the differences of opinion have arisen**.

The first misunderstandings arose shortly after the conclusion of the last Party discussion against Trotzkyism, and were the consequence of the various attitudes taken towards the former and now non-existent opposition. Some comrades were of the opinion that the Party has not such a superfluity of forces at its disposal that it should not give every comrade who has committed an error which has been corrected by the Party the opportunity of returning to the normal line of work. Others considered that the former members of the opposition should not only be defeated, but crucified at the same time so to speak.

But this difference of opinion was not fought out within the confines of the Political Bureau, whose majority maintained the first standpoint, but the Leningrad organisation of the Communist Youth was mobilised in the most irresponsible manner against this majority and against this first standpoint. We were well aware that the initiative did not come from the Communist Youth, but had been forced upon it. Still our sole care was the preservation of unity, and we contented ourselves with calling the Leningrad Youth to order.

When the resolution on the peasant policy was drawn up before the XIV. National Conference, nobody declared that it contained concessions to the rich peasantry; the disagreement in the C. C. referred to the question of whether it is possible to build up Socialism in one single country. Zinoviev and Kamenev the whole time swore allegiance to the resolution of the XIV. National Party Conference; to the Leningrad organisation they invariably expressed their solidarity with the policy of the C. C. only to appear on the scene at the Conference with a co-report. For the Leningrad organisation would never send delegates who would oppose the policy of the C. C. Instead of settling all differences of opinion with the C. C. itself attempts were made in Leningrad to create an opposition.

Bucharin has repeatedly withdrawn his words: "Enrich yourselves"; he has repeatedly acknowledged this error before the whole Party; this slogan has been disavowed by the C. C. And yet it is still being subjected to criticism, simply for the reason that there are comrades who are anxious, not so much to disavow this slogan, as to discredit Bucharin. The attempt is thus being made to crucify not only the members of the former opposition, but Bucharin with them. This will not succeed. (Applause.)

Where has any real fundamental change in the political situation taken place in the period between the XIV. National Party conference and this year's October plenary session of the C. C.? There has been no such fundamental alteration in the political and economic situation. And yet Zinoviev makes allusions to this effect in his series of articles directed against Professor Ustrjalov, the "Philosophy of the Epoch". In these articles Zinoviev declares that the idea uppermost in the thoughts of the people at the present time is that of equality. But Zinoviev does not deal with the question of equality on that large scale where we declare that every day of our work is bringing us nearer to perfect equality, to complete abolition of class society, class antagonisms, and wage labour; he applies the idea to the present epoch. Under present conditions the desire for equality arises, for instance among the rich peasantry, who want their political rights to be made equal with those of the workers; and again among the workers themselves, where the less qualified workers desire to receive wages equal to those of the better paid highly skilled workers. It is not very loyal to bring such slogans suddenly before the public, without first discussing them thoroughly with the other members of the C. C.

The same applies to the question of the workers' sharing in the profits of the undertakings in which they are employed; this question has been raised in the same manner by Kamenev. Apart from the fact that this slogan can only be regarded theoretically, for the undertakings actually making profits, and cannot satisfy the wishes of the whole working class, but only of a few categories of workers, the slogan is in itself false, even as discussion slogan. Kamenev confines himself today to the explanation that he merely touched upon this slogan in general, but he forgets that every such declaration has a practical effect, and he further feels himself impelled to attack Bucharin once more on account of his well-known and frequently revoked error ("Enrich yourselves").

Molotov's peasant resolution was passed unanimously at the October plenary session. Kamenev and Zinoviev proposed no amendments whatever. Who is it then who under-estimates the importance of the rich peasantry and of the class war among the peasantry, as maintained by the critics of the C. C.?

The other members of the Party see the difficulties of the present situation just as plainly as the Leningrad comrades. These latter are making a mistake if they suppose that the Party will overcome these difficulties more easily by admitting fresh masses of the working class into the Party.

It is to be regretted that comrade Krupskaja, who is so familiar with Lenin's views, should not have mentioned his

opinions on the composition and increase of the membership of the Party, on the occasion of the Party conference.

Tomsky quoted the exact wording of two of Lenin's letters. The first was written to Molotov with regard to a motion brought before the plenary session of the C. C. in March 1922. In this Lenin proposed that the period of probation suggested by Zinoviev for candidates for admittance into the Party, i. e. six months for workers, should be applied only to such workers as have actually worked for no less than ten years in leading industrial undertakings; for all other workers the probation period to be eighteen months, for peasants and Red Army soldiers two years, for other candidates three years. Lenin's actual words are:

"I consider it to be dangerous to retain the short period of probation proposed by Zinoviev. There is no doubt that there are among us many, who are counted to the workers who have not passed through the slightest big industrial training. Often enough these are real petty bourgeois, temporarily in the position of workers by some accident. All intelligent White Guard elements cherish the hope that the alleged proletarian character of our Party will not really secure it from the preponderance of the petty bourgeois element within the not distant future. If we have 300,000 to 400,000 members in the Party, even this is too many, since we know that many of the members are inadequately schooled."

Two days later Lenin addressed a second letter to the C. C., expressing the same idea in greater detail. This contains the following:

"It must always be taken into account that it is a great temptation to enter the party of the government. The throng of petty bourgeois and even anti-proletarian elements anxious to join our Party will increase enormously in the near future. The six months period probation for the workers will not be able to dam back this throng, the more so as it will be easy for the petty bourgeois elements to become workers for the time being. If we are not to deceive ourselves and others, we must apply the definition of worker solely to those whose life has imparted to them a proletarian psychology, and who have worked for several years in shops or factories, not for the attainment of outside aims, but in consequence of the general social and economic conditions. To state the matter openly: it must be recognised that at the present time the proletarian Party policy is determined not so much by its membership as by the unlimited and powerful authority of that thin layer which we may name the old Party guard."

In this letter Lenin proposes various concrete measures for testing the suitability of the candidates, and for the prolongation of the period of probation.

Tomsky regretted that Kamenev and Zinoviev made no mention of the rôle and position of the Communist Party under the present historical conditions, especially the conditions formed by the idea that anyone wanted to get rid of Kamenev or Zinoviev. The Party is not so rich in leading forces that anyone could have such a mad idea. Kamenev's attempts to show that Stalin is trying to acquire sole rule, and that the majority of the Political Bureau are aiding him, are equally ridiculous. Tomsky declared that a truly collective leadership is exercised in the Political Bureau, and the system of individual rulers will never be permitted; this system never can and never will exist. (Enthusiastic applause.)

Tomsky concluded his speech by calling upon the critics of the C. C. to exercise loyalty and discipline, and pointed out that Zinoviev and Kamenev had never laid before the C. C. these questions of the Party leadership which they were now submitting to the Party conference. Zinoviev and Kamenev have never made any definite suggestions for the alteration of important decisions of the C. C. The Party sees the difficulties, but the critics of the C. C. should not raise additional ones by their attitude; they should admit their errors and respect the will of the Party. (Prolonged and enthusiastic applause.)

The next speaker was comrade Rutsutak (People's Commissar for traffic service). He protested against Sokolnikov's opinion that our economics contain no socialist elements and that Bucharin is relapsing into Left infantile diseases.

It was already shown by Lenin that the passing of industry from the hands of the capitalist class into the hands of the working class creates all the pre-requisites for the building up of Socialism. It was not the "infantile diseases" of Bucharin which were at fault for the failure of Sokolnikov's beautiful financial and economic plans. Sokolnikov even intended to regulate the whole money market of Europe with the aid of our state bank. Now that economic derangements had become apparent, and we have committed errors in our campaign for raising the required amount of grain, Sokolnikov throws all the blame on Bucharin's "infantile diseases". And why did Kamenev protest against the admittance of Stalin and Kujbishev into the collegium of the council for labour and defence. This was merely a most justifiable attempt on the part of the C. C. to bring about an even closer contact between the political and economic leaders.

Comrade Zinoviev has drawn a very melancholy picture of the faulty estimation of state capitalism, of the lack of faith in the working class, etc. But Zinoviev's co-report gives us even greater proofs of pessimistic deviation.

The Leningrad organisation suffers from too much self-conceit. The C. C. must more than ever realise firm leadership, and then the mistakes committed hitherto will not occur. Then there will be no room for such plans as those of Sokolnikov, according to which our economics are to develop on the basis of foreign industry. Our path is that pointed out by Stalin, that is the development of our economics on the basis of our own industry, thus securing the firm proletarian foundation of the Soviet power.

The next speaker, Sarkis (Leningrad) protested against the false interpretation of his demand that the Party membership should be proletarianised up to 90%. Only it must not be permitted that the workers' quote in the Party is lessened by the admittance of peasants and employees. Stalin is wrong in deeming the deviation which under-estimates the importance of the middle peasantry to be more dangerous than the deviation of under-estimating the danger represented by the kulaks.

Comrade Sarkis was followed by Comrade Larin. He pointed out that the views held by the opposition on State capitalism involve important practical conclusions. Sokolnikov has stated that purely state undertakings should be converted into private economic undertakings, participated in by foreign capital. Lenin spoke of the conversion of the private undertakings of the big and petty bourgeoisie into the form of state capitalism. Lenin called upon us to advance, Sokolnikov calls the retreat. If we speak of a purely academic interpretation of the cover sought for the retreat represented by the NEP, this has the practical result that there will be talk of abolishing the foreign trade monopoly.

The question of the possibility of a "Stoicism" in one single country again appears purely theoretical to many. But when Kamenev and Zinoviev take the technical backwardness of our industry, and its economic backwardness — that is, the petty bourgeois character of our country — as a reason for setting all their faith in the international revolution, is this not much worse than the views held by the opposition of 1923?

There are fundamental differences of opinion between the majority and the opposition. For instance in the question of the existence of the Soviet power, the task of the NEP, the abolition of the foreign trade monopoly. We shall tell this to the Leningrad workers. We shall propose to them that they do not discuss the academic formulation of these differences of opinion, but their practical consequences.

The next speaker was Comrade Lombov. He declared that the question in dispute regarding practical work will be solved. In the course of his speech comrade Lombov protested against the attitude taken by Sokolnikov, who stands for the development of the economics of the rich peasantry and against the development of industry. The Party must emphatically reject Sokolnikov's views. The new Central must receive directions from the Party Conference to take energetic measures against all who commit errors.

The next speaker, Kirov, polemised against Sarkis and Sokolnikov, and called upon the Leningrad delegation to adopt the standpoint of the majority.

The next speaker, Schdanov, defended Bucharin as one of the best theoreticians in the Party. The speaker condemned Zinoviev's view of the NEP as a mere retreat, this being an expression of lack of faith in the powers of the working class. The standpoint of the Leningrad delegation is by no means the standpoint which should be held by the vanguard of the organisation. The speaker closed with a protest against the attempt to create two centrals in the Party.

The next speaker, the representative of the C. C. of the Youth League, Tschaplin, declared that the plenary session of the C. C. of the Youth Union had declared itself, before the Party conference, by a majority of votes, to be in perfect agreement with the line taken by the C. C. of the Party.

The questions in dispute are of immediate importance for the education of our Youth. The speaker, after describing the history of the struggle within the Youth C. C., declared that Zinoviev's attitude has resulted in the Youth being set up against the C. C. of the Party. The speaker further declared that the Youth movement should be developed under the leadership of the whole Party and the whole C. C., and must not become the monopoly of individual leaders intent on exploiting the Youth in the interests of their internal struggles in the C. C. of the Party.

Zinoviev's proposal to organise delegate meetings of the middle peasant Youth shows a state of panic in face of the tremendous increase of the Communist Youth in the villages. The Youth League is according to its membership, a workers' and peasants' league, but according to its character and tasks it is a proletarian and communist league. The leadership of the league must be secured to the Party cadre.

The speaker protested against the view that the Youth should be more Left than the Party. This would lead to the destruction of the Party leadership in the Youth League. The speaker concluded, with the assurance that the leadership of the Youth League will always and everywhere be realised in harmony with the collective Party and its C. C.

The next speaker, Safarov, declared that the obscuring of the questions of state capitalism and of the struggle against petty bourgeois tendencies involve an enormous danger for the Party. The speaker attacked the attitude of those comrades sharing the views of the majority of the C. C.

The next speaker, Lomov, declared that the opposition is composed of various self-contradictory elements. Of Left elements on the one hand, such as Salutzky, of Right elements on the other, such as Sokolnikov. The speaker charged the opposition with lack of principle, and closed by expressing the hope that the Leningrad organisation would overcome these individual currents and fall into line with the C. C. (Applause.)

Comrade Vorochilov, People's Commissar for war, declared:

Our opposition is built up on the territorial principle. (Laughter and applause.) The Leningrad comrades maintain that the discussion has taken them by surprise. This is not the case. Even the White Guard newspaper "Dni" wrote as early as the 10. December that at the Leningrad Gouvernement conference Zinoviev had discussed the necessity of a severe struggle against the deviations in the Communist Party. Thus it was the Leningrad comrades who first opened the attack against the C. C. How was it possible for them to do this? Simply because the Leningrad organisation has been isolated from the Party and the C. C. for a number of years. We appreciate the merits of the Leningrad organisation very highly, but an individual organisation must not have a privileged position. The system of the privileged position must cease. The Moscow organisation has overcome this error, and has realised actual Leninist unity by means of collective work.

Shortly before the Party conference, responsible comrades of the opposition denied the existence of any great differences of opinion. But at the Conference itself they come forward with their own views, which actually differ but little from those of the C. C. The reason is to be found in the fundamental question: in the structure of the organisation of our leading centres. What

is required is a really collective leadership. The opposition has its own peculiar views on this point: This collective leadership should be placed in the hands of two or three persons. We others want a collective leadership in which the entire power and authority is in the hands of the whole C. C. The practical work accomplished by young members of the C. C. has proved that these are really capable of collective leadership and work.

The opposition is desirous of altering the mutual relations between the Political Bureau and the Secretariat. But the opposition has no idea of the extent of the work carried out by the Secretariat. The Secretariat does not occupy itself with politics at all. But Stalin as General Secretary is, of course a member of the Political Bureau as well. The opposition believes that Stalin, because he has the apparatus in his hands, arranges everything. That is, they do not grasp the organisation and structure of our Party. The Party represents an enormous organism. This organism requires careful treatment, if it is to develop properly and lead the whole state. The comrades who believe, that the leadership of the Party can be altered have but an empty and wrong conception of this leadership.

Comrade Rykov.

No uniform political line has ever existed, exists, or can exist, among the separate representatives of the new opposition. When Kamenev, Zinoviev, Sokolnikov, Laschevitsch, and Krupskaja, now form a group, it is one held together only by the desire to change the Party leadership. In the important questions themselves these comrades hold entirely different views from one another.

Comrade Sokolnikov, for instance, supports the opposition from the Right, from the standpoint that the existing dangers and the difficulties of socialist development render further concessions necessary, Comrade Krupskaja points out that the slogan: "Enrich yourselves" has been as damaging as the tendency, originated by Sokolnikov, towards the abolition of the foreign trade monopoly.

The fundamental point of contention is the peasantry question, and the dangers from the village. In the present stage of our revolution passive sympathy or neutrality towards the peasants is no longer sufficient. It is now time to work along with the peasantry towards the realisation of socialism, and to find effective means of gaining political and economic influence over the peasantry, to the end that the progress of socialism may be facilitated. Thus the question of our relations to the middle peasantry, already raised by Lenin with the utmost clearness at the VIII. Party Conference, is of the greatest importance. The necessity of lending further support to the poor peasantry and to the agricultural labourers, who form our main auxiliary in the work of winning over the middle peasantry, needs not be emphasised.

The negative aspects of the NEP, which are being especially emphasised at the present time, will continue to exist until our whole state of society has been rebuilt on socialist principles. But this is no reason to keep shrieking out the whole time that the negative aspects of the NEP, must be combatted; the transitional stage will be better employed in examining what new tasks are imposed by the new changes in the economic situation and in class relations. The task imposed by the present period differs from that of the last in demanding the establishment of a really firm alliance between the working class and the middle peasantry for the common task of constructive socialism, by means of the co-operatives, the industrialisation of agriculture, etc.

The real danger represented by the kulak peasantry at the present time does not consist of any immediate danger of a bourgeois restoration, but in the fact that the rich peasant strata are striving to drag the middle peasantry in their train. Thus the fight against the rich peasantry is a struggle for the winning of the middle peasantry. To win over the middle peasantry is synonymous with rendering the rich peasantry harmless. It is necessary to isolate the rich peasant strata, and gradually to induce the middle peasantry to take part in the work of constructive socialism. Comrade Stalin was therefore right in laying special emphasis on the necessity of combatting that deviation which under-estimates the importance of the middle peasantry. When fighting against the rich peasantry for the middle peasantry, and when assimilating agriculture into the system of our planned state economics, we shall make not a few

mistakes, the more so as there are not sufficient trained workers available, and there are many difficulties to overcome, including that of the resistance within the Party itself, supported by some of the Party leaders possessing their own press organ and their own organisation centre.

Comrade Zinoviev has polemised against the negation of the petty bourgeois social character of the middle peasantry which he alleges exists in the Party. Not only is the middle peasant a petty bourgeois, but the small peasant as well, but still they differ from the rich peasant, from the village bourgeoisie, in that the poor and the middle peasant can join us in the work of realising socialism, which is what the real village bourgeoisie will never do. To identify the middle peasantry with the rest of the bourgeoisie is to disorientate the Party on an important matter, and to undermine the policy of winning over the middle peasantry. Comrade Kamenev has attempted to prove to the Party conference that the deviation of under-estimating the importance of the middle peasantry differs from the deviation of failing to recognise the negative aspects of the NEP in not being dangerous. Comrade Stalin was right in repeatedly emphasising the harmfulness of both these deviations, and the fact that it is particularly difficult for the Party to establish an alliance with the middle peasantry, as we have no experience in this direction, so that it is especially necessary to remove all obstacles in the way of this alliance. Comrade Zinoviev's assertion that there is a current in the Party which identifies the NEP with socialism is untenable; this current only exists in Zinoviev's imagination.

I must further draw attention to the erroneousness of Zinoviev's thesis in his book: "Leninism", according to which the alliance between the workers and the peasants will continue to be necessary after the victory of the proletarian revolution in the other countries, whilst the NEP, is merely a temporary expedient. Zinoviev's idea that a transitional period lies between the NEP and socialism arises from his lack of belief in the building up of socialism through the NEP. On the other hand it is equally false to regard the economic structure as unalterable during the whole of the transition stage of the NEP. At the time when our industrial production only amounted to 5% of the pre-war level, our economic system was very different to what it is at present, now that we have almost reached the pre-war level. The idea of the transitional stage presupposes a change in the economic elements, the continuous advance from capitalism to Socialism.

Comrade Sokolnikov stated that the Soviet state industry cannot be designated as fully socialist, since there still exists so much lack of culture, illiteracy, house shortage, etc. But socialist constructive work consists precisely in abolishing these negative aspects. The specific peculiarity of the present stage of economic development consists in the fact that various decisive factors in socialist construction, for instance state industry, are developing favourably, and that the right line of advance to socialism, and the right class relations between workers and working peasants, this first pre-requisite for the realisation of socialism have been found. To the assertion that it is not possible to realise Socialism in technically backward Soviet Russia without the aid of the proletarian revolution in the West, we reply that, on the contrary, this is entirely possible, given the right policy. Whether we can secure our socialism from foreign intervention does not depend upon us, but upon our surroundings. Comrade Zinoviev's pamphlet, "The philosophy of the Epoch" contains many repetitions of the statement that the idea mainly possessing the masses of the people in the Soviet Union at the present time is the idea of equality, and that the Party must place itself at the head of the struggle for equality. To this I reply in Lenin's words:

"So long as a class difference exists between workers and peasants we cannot speak of equality, or we should only be supplying grist to the mill of the bourgeoisie. Those who do not understand that during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism there can be no equality between the workers and the peasants, and those who promise any such equality, are following Koltshack's programme: even though they may not be conscious of it."

With respect to the inner Party situation, I recall Kamenev's assertion that in the C. C. there are no deviations from Leninism, but that a group of young Red professors is forming round Bucharin, and setting up wrong theories. Even if this were really

the case, would it be sufficient reason to throw the Party into the present fever of discussion, and to oppose a co-report to the C. C.? On the eve of the Conference, comrade Zinoviev declared that he recognised the possibility of a unanimous common drafting of the resolution to the political report, all Stalin's theses being acceptable, but that no changes must be made in the present leadership of the Leningrad organisation. Thus the differences of opinion resolve themselves into a conflict as to whether the Party should have one or two centres. We are of the opinion that there can only be one Centre in the Party. (Hear hear!) We therefore declined to accede to Zinoviev's demand with regard to Leningrad, in consequence of which Zinoviev refused to take part in the common drawing up of the draft resolution, and moved that his co-report be heard at the Party conference. (Cries of "Shame"!)

If the opposition had made any practical proposal for combatting or lessening the negative effects of the NEP, this proposal would have been accepted without discussion. But apart from Sokolnikov's suggestion of abolishing the foreign trade monopoly, not a single practical suggestion was submitted. It is nonsense to accuse anyone of under-estimating the rich peasantry danger. Let the opposition name even one delegate who fails to recognise the negative aspects of the NEP or the growing strength of the village bourgeoisie.

I must remind you that the accusation of under-estimating the rich peasant danger, and of emphasising the existing difficulties, became particularly vehement just at the moment when it became evident that the expectations placed upon the good crops had been exaggerated. The members of the opposition held the resistance of the rich peasantry to be the cause of the grain deficiency of 200 million poods. As a matter of fact the middle and small farmers have been equally unwilling to part with their grain. The whole point is not the resistance of the rich peasantry, but the wrong economic plans, which was not corrected in time by comrade Kamenev, although his position as chairman of the council for labour and defence imposed upon him the duty of regulating the economic plans in general. The majority of the C. C. on the other hand, recognised the error in time and altered the first plans. The opposition should remember that the great public discussion demanded by the opposition cannot possibly under present conditions remain

within the confines of the Party. The question of the varying attitude taken to the various strata of the peasantry would be discussed with even greater passion by these strata themselves, and political strife would be aroused with the non-partisan masses. When the opposition makes such impossible demands, it does it with the object of intimidating the majority, for the opposition is quite aware that the Party is anxious that comrades Stalin, Zinoviev, Rykov, Kamenev, and the others, should all work together. The opposition and all other members of the Party may take note that the Party will never accede to such demands, and that the Party never has, and never will, bow down either to Stalin or Kamenev (Enthusiastic applause.)

The party has grown; fresh trained cadres have been brought forward during the years of the revolution, and the Party will not be placed in any difficulty if it has to do without one or the other of us. (Applause.)

I must also remind you of various declarations made by comrade Zinoviev at the time of last year's discussion against comrade Trotzky, at which time he most strenuously opposed any formation of fractions, any grouping of Comrades and I express the wish that comrade Zinoviev and the Leningrad delegation would repeat their words regarding unshakeable Party unity and impermissibility of group formation today, now that this is doubly necessary. (Applause.)

I will not deny that our socialist construction is encountering, and will encounter obstacles, or that the NEP contains negative and dangerous aspects. But every member of the Party should realise that the conduct of the opposition at the Party conference will be the cause of hundredfold greater difficulties, should a fraction struggle result therefrom. The Party conference must therefore see to it that the future C. C., regardless of the elements of which it is composed, does not find itself opposed by another Centre, another organisation with its own press and its own connections. A double Centre, feudalism, and the League of Nations, all these have no place in our Party. (Enthusiastic and prolonged applause with ovations. Singing of the Internationale. Shouts of: "Long live the unity of the Russian Communist Party!")

Comrade Zinoviev's Concluding Speech.

We can divide the questions into three groups:

1. Questions of principle;
2. History of the differences of opinion;
3. Solution of the situation and practical programme.

Attempts were made at a preventive understanding, in order to avoid the discussion at the Party Conference. We declined to entertain this attempt, since without any guarantee of what was to follow, our capitulation and the revision of the organisatory decisions of the Leningrad Party conference were demanded. This circumstance, as also some of the declarations made in Stalin's report, induced us to bring forward a co-report.

Comrade Bucharin accuses us of regarding the NEP merely as a retreat, which means a deviation from Leninism. I have frequently spoken of Bolshevism as an advance against the bourgeois system, against counter-revolutionary social democracy, and against imperialism, and I have especially emphasised that the retreat was made in order to render a greater advance possible.

Comrade Zinoviev, quoting from his own work: "Leninism", declared that he protests categorically against the attempt to represent him as an apologist of retreat. With reference to the accusation in the question of the under-estimation of the middle peasantry, Zinoviev referred to the fact that the slogan: "The Face to the peasantry!" was issued by him. This slogan referred to the whole peasantry, and thus included the middle peasantry. As to the question of the leadership of the revolution the speaker declares that at the present time the forms of the proletarian dictatorship should be rendered more mild along the lines of Soviet democracy.

With regard to the possibility of realising socialism in one single country, Stalin has asserted that the organisation of socialist production is only possible with the assistance of the proletariat of some other civilised countries, and he denies that in the Political Bureau he pointed out our technical backwardness.

Comrade Zinoviev denied having tried to cover up the error committed by him in October 1917. Comrade Bucharin has accused him of not having mentioned the peasantry when describing the events in 1905, in his history of the Party. Incontestably this was a mistake but not one from which it need be concluded that the writer of the book ignores the peasantry. The peasantry is widely dealt with in the book. Zinoviev further protested against Bucharin's assertion that he had maintained that the Soviet Union was still without any socialist foundation. Much has been recovered, the Soviet Union approaches the pre-war standard. It would however be wrong to take this fact as basis for the assertion that we have built up the foundation of a socialist economy.

The speaker proceeded to deal with the question of the differences of opinion existing on the peasant policy: Comrade Stalin's report laid special emphasis on a thesis which is not contained in the resolution of the October plenary session of the C. C. and of the Moscow Party conference. This is the thesis on the concentration of the fire of the Party against the deviation of under-estimating the importance of the NEP.

The Party conference is of course supreme, and can make decisions independent of the plenary session. But Stalin's addition is polemical in character. The more events develop, the clearer does it become that it was a grave political error to direct our fire against those who pointed out the Kulaki danger. The fact that the kulak is gaining ground arises out of our whole present political and economic situation. The political appetite of the kulak grows with his growth, and he will find his

political complement in the city. This danger can be fought, if we foresee the danger early enough.

There is no doubt that much successful work has already been accomplished toward a rapprochement with the middle peasantry, but on the other hand nothing has been accomplished towards a rapprochement to the poor peasantry. This constitutes a tremendous political danger. The policy pursued, by the Party among the peasantry is correct in principle, but in the course of the actual execution of this policy a number of difficulties have been encountered. The task set us at the present juncture is to expend every effort upon reaching the poor peasantry. Thus our fire must be directed against those who fail to fully realise the kulak danger.

The speaker protested against the assertion that he regards the agricultural labourer objectively as a dominant factor. The agricultural labourer is exploited by the kulak. It must be admitted that the C. C. is not to blame for the discontent among the poor peasantry. But the danger must be fully realised; not that we need fall into a panic, but that we may recognise the political problem.

The speaker referred to Lenin's formulation, at the VIII. Party conference, of the two counter agents: the working class and the poor peasantry on the one hand, and the middle peasantry on the other. So it must remain. Not the working class on the one side, and the poor and middle peasantry on the other.

The speaker then proceeded to reply to the attacks made on his article entitled: "The Philosophy of the Epoch." In the first place the article was not written for the purpose of forming a platform for the Party Conference. The most far reaching accusation is that which places a vulgarly democratic interpretation upon the slogan of "equality". This slogan has been described as social-revolutionary and liberal demagogy. The attempt to prove that the slogan of "equality" was intended to be thrown in to the masses in a bourgeois-democratic sense is a gross misrepresentation. It may be admitted that the term "socialist equality" is more accurate, and the slogan may be well thus altered. But when Rykov and Karginin deem this slogan demagogic, that is again an over-estimation of the NEP.

The speaker protested against the action of a group of young Red professors, who are revising Leninism.

As to the question of the composition of the Party membership, Zinoviev declared the Leningrad conference to be of the opinion that at the present time 50% of the Leningrad metal workers should be admitted into the Party. This would not mean padding by any means. In the present situation, and given the present relation of class forces, our slogan must be: "Workers, nearer to the state, to the Party, to economic construction!"

The speaker then passed on to the question of the Leningrad organisation, and declared that the latter is not isolated, and will not be isolated. The speaker, in the course of a description of the differences of opinion, declared that he had altered his attitude after being accused of being a liquidator and defaiteist. Leningrad is entitled to one of the leading positions, for its organisation has earned prominent importance in our historical development. The Leningrad delegation has the right to make proposals for the alteration of the political line.

The speaker then described the differences of opinion in the C. C. After the second discussion with Trotzky, Bucharin and Kalinin represented the standpoint that no organisational consequences were necessary, as the Party masses would not understand them. The speaker and the comrades sharing his

views represented on the other hand the standpoint that if Trotzky were accused of being a semi-Menshevik, there could be no place for him in the general staff of Leninism. (Interjection from Trotzky: Quite so!) The same may be maintained with regard to the present discussion. If the Party conference is seriously of the opinion that he and the comrades accused of being defaiteists really are such, then they should not be permitted to hold the highest leading positions in the Party. The accusation of defaiteism was never raised against Trotzky.

The differences of opinion accumulated, it became increasingly difficult to work together. The differences of opinion have matured, and it would be wrong to maintain that no political differences of opinion exist. Great problems are maturing in connection with the peasant question, and from these arise the differences of opinion in the Party. It is beyond doubt that new groups are growing in the Party, and these will take leading parts. There is no doubt whatever that the leadership must lie in the collective hands of the C. C.

The assumption that the opposition demands Bucharin's head is entirely wrong. We must remember Lenin's remark that it was impossible to be angry with Bucharin, even during the sharpest fight. It must further be remembered that the foreign communists, and the communist and social democratic press, will be deeply interested in the discussion. It is decidedly undesirable to bring the discussion to a close, for the accused comrades have had no opportunity of publicly replying to the accusations.

The speaker then proceeded to deal with the solution of the situation. After stating that he opposed no special policy to that of the C. C., he passed on to the enumeration of the concrete proposals:

1. Combating of the revisionist "school" created by the young Red professors. The slogan must be: "Back to Lenin".
2. Inadmissibility of a revision of Leninism in the question of state capitalism.
3. The thesis on the concentration of our fire against one of the deviations in the peasant question must be rejected.
4. In the question of the composition of the Party membership there must be no deviation from the decisions of the XIII. Party conference.
5. The question of the extension of inner Party democracy must be raised.
6. The agitation against Leningrad must cease. The Leningrad organisation must be given the opportunity of choosing its own leaders.
7. The Central must induce all the forces of the former groups to participate in the work, and give them the possibility of working under the leadership of the C. C. (Noise, shouts: repeat!).
8. Security must be given that the functionaries are chosen by election.
9. At the first session of the C. C. the question of the limitations of the functions of the Political Bureau, of the Organisation Bureau, and of the Secretariat, in the direction of setting up a fully competent Political Bureau and the Secretariat subordinate to it, is to be dealt with.

Comrade Zinoviev closed with the hope that the discussion closes a chapter, and enables one to be begun in which co-operation will be possible. The responsibility lies with the majority of the Party conference. (Prolonged applause from the Leningrad delegation.)

Comrade Molotov's Concluding Speech.

I shall first deal with the general questions discussed at the Party Conference.

The opposition has brought forward no uniform or special political line. Neither has it attempted to undertake a uniform correction of the errors of the Party line. Protest must be raised against the attempt to puff up a few slight errors on the part of youthful comrades into a matter compromising the whole political line of the C. C. This the opposition has done in order to conceal its own deviations from the Leninist standpoint. Comrade Zinoviev himself, in designating the present epoch as the "Epoch of construction", has contributed nothing definite on the actual tasks of our politics or on the new relations of class forces.

Comrade Kamenev is more anxious to systematise his views. But in doing this he plainly betrays his own deviation from the correct Party policy which he defends.

Comrade Sokolnikov has detailed his oppositional views even further, and obviously deserts the Leninist base. Or is the opinion that the foreign trade monopoly should be abolished, and co-operation among the peasantry substituted by municipal shops, not too free an interpretation of the Leninist conception of a policy adapted to the needs of the moment? Comrade Krupskaja will certainly not share these views. The utter heterogeneousness of the opposition has been quite revealed here.

Now to the question of our policy among the peasantry. The October plenary session of the C. C. proclaimed the necessity of a fight against two deviations, these being the under-estimation of the importance of the NEP. for the development of the Soviet state, and on the other hand the under-estimation of the negative aspects of the NEP. Stalin declared that of the two deviations which under-estimate the kulaki danger and under-estimate the importance of the middle peasantry, the second deviation demands our chief attention. It need not be said that here the Party by no means under-estimates the dangers of the NEP. But our comrades of the opposition have not made any new proposals for combating these dangers either, unless we are to count comrade Sokolnikov's proposal to abolish the foreign trade monopoly among these.

At the present moment the main question of Party policy among the peasantry is undoubtedly the organisation and rallying of the poor and middle peasantry round the Party. Hitherto we have accomplished but little in this direction. But it is not true when Zinoviev states that we had put a distance between us and the poor peasantry during the past year. The decisions arrived at at the XIV. National Party Conference have improved the political situation in the village. Still, we cannot yet regard the poor peasantry as organised around our Party. The October plenary session of the C. C. admitted this, and decided to continue with greater energy this work under new conditions. We have accomplished successful work in the organisation of the agricultural workers, special attention being devoted to this

by the trade union of the agricultural and forest workers, aided by the Party. But since we are anxious to begin with building up socialism among the peasantry, we must above all reach the middle peasantry. We must separate the middle peasantry from the rich peasant usurers, gather the poor peasantry around us, and create at the same time the alliance between the poor and the middle peasantry.

In the question of state capitalism the opposition is wrong in stating that our economic system is state capitalism.

With regard to Zinoviev's slogan of "equality", this furnishes fresh evidence that Lenin did not speak for nothing when he condemned the harmfulness of a fraudulent slogan on "liberty and equality". The slogan of "equality", as slogan for the extermination of class, has always been, and always will be, the slogan of our Party. To speak in general of equality for the two classes forming our state may receive a socialist interpretation for the working class, but for the petty bourgeois masses and for the peasantry this slogan can only bear the meaning of the equality of the two classes. Thus this slogan, in an indefinite and ambiguous form, is entirely inadmissible at present.

In conclusion to the organisation question of the Party. If the activation of the non-party elements surrounding the Party continues to increase, then the Party will draw its new members from these, and the growth of the Party will be properly regulated. But the Party must remain the strongly organised vanguard of the working class. The Leningrad comrades would fill the Party out with mere padding.

Regarding the question of Party democracy, demanded with great emphasis by the opposition since it has been in the minority, we must point out that the Party democracy has been very badly applied especially in Leningrad, at the elections to the Party conference and to the Gouvernement committee. Surely the Leningrad comrades were not aware of the views represented by the opposition. Yet these views are put forward in their name at the Party conference. And if the opposition is going to alter the system of the leading Party organs, and create new relations between the Political Bureau and the Secretariat, it will first have to convince the Party of the correctness of its views. But until this has been done the Political Bureau will remain the leading organ of the C. C., and will continue to work on the firm line uniting the Party. (Applause.)

The speaker concluded with the assurance that the Leningrad organisation will gather round the C. C., as the active Party workers of the Vyborg district of the Leningrad organisation have already done. A meeting held by these Party workers yesterday expressed the firm conviction that the Leningrad organisation as a whole will identify itself with the Party Conference. (Prolonged applause from the whole Party conference, protests from the Leningrad comrades.) The Party Conference expects, wishes, and hopes, that the Leningrad organisations as a whole will adopt the line of the Party Conference.

Comrade Stalin's Concluding Speech.

Comrade Stalin, welcomed by enthusiastic storms of applause, said:

I shall not make any reply to the attacks of a personal nature, since the Party Conference possesses sufficient material for ascertaining the truth and recognising the real motives for these attacks.

I shall first reply to comrade Sokolnikov's declaration that I have incorrectly drawn the two general lines of the economic development of the Soviet Union. I should not have spoken of the import of industrial equipment, but of the import of finished manufactures. Objectively considered, comrade Sokolnikov here makes himself to an adherent of the Dawesation of the Soviet Union. Everyone is aware that we are forced to import machinery at present. But comrade Sokolnikov makes a virtue of this necessity, a principle, a theory, a line of development. Here is his error. My outline of the two general lines of economic construction was intended to help to clear up the question of

the possibility of securing the independent economic development of the Soviet Union in a capitalist environment.

Our general line consists in the conversion of the Soviet Union from an agrarian country into an industrial one. If we remain sticking at that stage of development where we ourselves do not produce the machinery, but have to import it, then we cannot be sure of safeguarding our country against being transformed into an appendage of the capitalist system. Thus we must devote our energies to developing the production of means of production. The Dawes plan is anxious to see the German payments guaranteed by the German exploitation of foreign markets, especially the Soviet market. That is, it is anxious to maintain a state of affairs in which we import machinery, export agricultural products, and permit our industry to follow in the train of Europe. When speaking of this I declared that the Dawes plan stands on feet of clay so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, for we are not going to remain

an agrarian country for love of any other country, but are determined to become an industrial country.

The whole of our economists must adopt this idea. It is the **only guarantee for our economic independence**. To deviate from this line like comrade Sokolnikov is to renounce socialist construction altogether.

In the second place I must reply to comrade Kamenev's assertion that the decisions of the XIV. National Party Conference which precisely defined the legislation on land leases and agricultural wage labour are not concessions to the peasantry, but to the kulaki, the capitalist elements. I ask the opposition why they voted for these decisions if they consider them to be a fresh extension of the NEP. We are all against the extension of the NEP. But comrade Kamenev forgets that the NEP. includes free trade, capitalism, and wage labour, and that the decisions of the XIV. National Party Conference are an expression of this new economic policy introduced in Lenin's time. Lenin fully recognised that at first the NEP. would be exploited by the capitalists, kulaki, and profiteers. But he never said that the introduction of the NEP. meant a concession, not to the peasantry, but to the capitalist elements. On the contrary, he pointed out that the admission of free trade and the introduction of the NEP. represented a concession to the peasantry, granted in order that an alliance might be formed and firmly established with the peasantry. This is further proved by the emphasis laid by Lenin on the decisive importance of the middle peasantry among the peasantry of Russia today.

When the land was seized during the revolution, the whole of the peasantry joined against the land owners, but the kulaki gained the most, whilst but little fell to the poor peasantry. During the further course of the revolution, the poor peasantry organised with the aid of the Soviet power, and wrested much from the kulaki. The relations of forces among the peasantry have become better balanced, and the middle peasant has become the decisive figure in the village. Lenin wrote that we must accommodate our state economics to those of the middle peasantry.

It must be emphasised that the NEP. and its trade possibilities are not only exploited by the capitalists and kulaki, but at the same time by the state and co-operative organs which are now supplanting private trade more and more, and connecting state industry with the peasant undertakings. Our concessions aim at strengthening the alliance between the working class and the peasantry. Those who do not grasp this are not Leninists, but liberals.

Comrade Sokolnikov declares that the present economic complications are due to the over-estimation of our powers and of our socialist maturity. Comrade Sokolnikov even goes so far as to attribute the mistakes of our leading economic organs, which are to blame for our adverse foreign trade balance, to the errors of the so-called theoretical Bucharin school, which is accused of an over-estimation of the socialist maturity of our economics. Even the fervour of discussion must have its limits however. Comrade Sokolnikov declares further that in his capacity as finance commissary he is prevented from imparting the character of an income tax to the agricultural tax, and in this manner protecting the interests of the poor peasantry.

The agricultural tax is already an income tax, and the formal alterations in this regard are in course of preparation. But the sworn protector of the poor peasantry, comrade Sokolnikov, frequently forgets to protect their interests in actual practice. For instance he recently protested against the decision of comrade Miljutin, finance commissary to the R. S. P. S. R., to abstain from insisting on the collection of taxes less than one rouble in amount, although this only meant a loss of 300,000 roubles, whilst it possesses the advantage of releasing the poor peasantry from this tax, and of freeing the State from the costs of collection. The C. C. was obliged to intervene before Sokolnikov could be induced to adopt this correct measure.

Now to the assertion made by the opposition, and propagated in one of their publications on the questions under contention, that I had expressed myself to a delegation of peasant correspondents as being in favour of the restoration of the private ownership of land. This could be inferred from the impressions of a peasant correspondent belonging to this delegation, published in the peasant newspaper "Bednota". Similar rumours of such a declaration on my part were spread all over

the world by a bourgeois press agency in Riga. Despite the obvious absurdity of such a supposition, I published a letter in the "Bednota" in which I declared that solely the very imaginative writers of all such inventions were responsible for them. In spite of this public denial on my part, and in spite of the obviously untrue character of the assertion, the opposition utilises the methods of the lying bourgeois press, and seizes upon this lie.

With respect to comrade Krupskaja, I must emphasise the extreme erroneousness of her interpretation of the NEP. as capitalism permitted by the proletarian state. The correct definition of the NEP. is the following:

The NEP. is the special policy of the proletarian state, so adapted that it admits capitalism whilst retaining in the hands of the proletarian state the essential commanding positions of economics, as big industry, transport service, foreign trade monopoly, etc. It is a policy adapted to the struggle between the socialist and capitalist elements, to the increasing importance of the socialist elements at the cost of the capitalist, to the victory of the socialist elements over the capitalist, to the abolition of the classes, and to the creation of the foundation of socialist economy.

Those who fail to realise the dual transitional character of the NEP. deviate from Leninism. If the NEP. were capitalism, Lenin would have said: Capitalist Russia will become socialist Russia. But Lenin did not do this; he gave us his famous proposition: NEP. Russia will become socialist Russia. Let the opposition state clearly whether it is in agreement with comrade Krupskaja's definition of the NEP. as capitalism.

In the discussion on state capitalism the comrades of the opposition remind us of Bucharin's error in disagreeing with Lenin's assertion that the theory of state capitalism is compatible with the proletarian dictatorship. Bucharin has admitted this error. It is not that Lenin's views changed in agreement with Bucharin's, but Bucharin's in agreement with Lenin's. Therefore Bucharin has our full support. (Applause.)

Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev do not deal with the question of state capitalism on the dialectic method, but on the scholastic, and without consideration of the given historical conditions. I may remind you that in 1921 Lenin, in face of the unheard of industrial depression and great shortage of goods among the peasantry, considered the best way out of the situation at that time to be the admission of foreign capital to build up industry, that is, in the introduction of state capitalism and in the strengthening of the alliance between workers and peasantry. In the depressed economic situation of that time other possibilities did not exist. Today the situation is different; the Soviet industries approach the pre-war standard, the transport service has been restored, Soviet industry is establishing with its own powers the connection with the peasantry, the socialist forms of economics dominate over the state capitalist forms, and the latter, the undertakings under concession and lease, are employing only 58,000 workers out of a total proletariat of seven millions. To represent state capitalism as the dominant economic form today is to misrepresent the socialist character of our state industry, to fail to grasp the difference between the previous and the present situation, and to treat the question of state capitalism on the methods of scholasticism and metaphysics instead of on those of dialectics. Comrade Sokolnikov has gone so far astray in this direction that he holds the state bank and the whole Soviet financial system to be state capitalist. As opposed to this it will be remembered that in 1917 Lenin, although at that time he still represented the standpoint of the control and not the nationalisation of production, regarded the state bank, to nine tenths in the hands of the proletarian state, as a socialist institution. Sokolnikov will perhaps go so far as to designate the finance commissariat and other proletarian state institutions as state capitalist. Sokolnikov has not grasped the dual nature of the new economic policy, or the dialectics of development under the proletarian dictatorship during the period of transition, in which the methods and weapons of the bourgeoisie are successfully applied by the socialist economic elements against the capitalist, combating these capitalist elements on the one hand, and building and establishing the socialist foundation of economy on the other.

Now to the peasant question! It may be seen from the speeches and articles of Zinoviev that up to lately Zinoviev still held the standpoint of the neutralisation of the middle peasantry,

and that he only went over to the standpoint of the necessity of a firm alliance with the middle peasantry after the inner political struggle had begun, that is shortly before the Party Conference, when the under-estimation of the importance of the middle peasantry was being severely condemned by the whole Party. At the beginning of the year Zinoviev wrote in the "Pravda" that a common task falls to all the Parties of the Comintern: to win over the agricultural proletariat, the semi-proletariat, the tenant farmers, and the small holders, as allies for the proletariat, and to neutralise the middle farmers. (Interjection from the Leningrad delegation: Russia was not meant) Stalin: Is our Party then not a part of the Comintern? (Applause.) As early as the VIII. Party Conference of the Russian C. P. Lenin contended energetically against the under-estimation of the middle peasantry, and pointed out that what was necessary was not the neutralisation, but the winning, of the middle peasantry. Numerous other declarations on the part of Zinoviev might be adduced, in which the middle peasantry is either completely ignored or represented as an object to be neutralised.

With respect to Zinoviev's declarations in the "Philosophy of the Epoch" on the domination of the idea of equality among the masses of the people, it must be emphasised that the idea of equality cannot be dealt with without an exact specification of the equality meant, whether between workers and peasants, between skilled and unskilled workers, or in connection with the final abolition of class society. The slogan of equality should be as little played with in a responsible article appearing in the central organ of the Party as the word "Leninism" can be played with without definitely realising the actual tasks of Leninism in the sphere of peasant politics. It was not until shortly before the Party Conference that comrade Zinoviev declared at a discussion in Leningrad that he was in favour of a firm alliance with the middle peasantry. Unfortunately we possess no guarantee that comrade Zinoviev will not deviate again from this slogan before long, for the facts show us that comrade Zinoviev has never been distinguished by the necessary consistency in the peasantry question. (Applause.)

When we are told that we must contend with equal energy against both deviations, that is, against the under-estimation and the over-estimation of the kulaki danger, we must take into account that up to the present the first of these tendencies has only been expressed by a non-responsible member of the Party, in the theoretical periodical: "The Bolshevik", whilst the second tendency is represented by a Zinoviev and a Kamenev, who have at their disposal their own press organ in Leningrad and their own organisation centre. Boguschewsky is however politically done for.

We must recollect how the differences of opinion arose at the end of 1924, when the Leningrad organisation moved that Trotsky be expelled from the Party. The majority of the C. C. declared themselves opposed to this, and confined themselves to superseding Trotsky from his position as war commissary; the majority of the C. C. were of the opinion that this motion, as also the proposal moved by Zinoviev and Kamenev for the expulsion of Trotsky from the Political Bureau, involved grave dangers for the Party; expulsions are infections, and can go too far. (Applause.)

Further differences of opinion arose when the Leningrad organisation of the Communist Youth took upon itself the functions of a second central of the Young Communist League and endeavoured to transform the Leningrad Gouvernement conference into a sort of all Russian Young Communist Conference, and the C. C. was obliged to take measures against this attempt at forming a system of double centres. The C. C. was further obliged to reject comrade Zinoviev's proposal to issue a second theoretical periodical in Leningrad, edited exclusively by comrades of the opposition. The C. C. considered itself to be acting rightly in considering the interests of the Party higher than the observance of a formal Party democracy, and it prohibited the publication of a fraction periodical, just as it will have to prohibit this in the future. (Applause.)

The comrades of the opposition, who are still nagging on about the slogan to the peasantry: "enrich yourselves", although this has already been disavowed a thousand times both by Bucharin himself and the C. C., might point out one passage in an article in a central organ, or in a declaration of the C. C., in which this slogan is re-issued. The C. C. has on the contrary exercised the utmost care to ensure the ideological purity

of the articles and speeches on this subject, in order that the development of the productive forces of the village may not be interpreted as a slogan issued by the Party for private capitalist accumulation. Bucharin's error, speedily recognised, withdrawn, and regretted, is ridiculously insignificant in comparison with the errors of those comrades who in October 1917 infringed doubly the decisions adopted under Lenin's leadership on the October action.

Not only does the opposition not represent any uniform standpoint, but its assertions are entirely contradictory, and exclude one another: There is only one point upon which it is agreed, and that is the reform of the Secretariat of the C. C. Despite the complete absurdity of such a programme, it is an incontestable fact. After the XII. Party Conference in 1923 a group of comrades worked out a plan for abolishing the Political Bureau and converting the Secretariat into a leading political and organisatory organ, composed of Zinoviev, Trotsky, and Stalin. This plan signified that the Party was to dispense with the leadership of Rykov, Kalinin, Tomsy, Molotov, and Bucharin. This plan fell through at the time, not only on account of its lack of principle, but on account of the impossibility of conducting the Party without these comrades. When an inquiry was addressed to me on the matter, I replied with a decided No, and declared that I am prepared, should the comrades desire it, to evacuate my position without fuss, without open or concealed discussion, without demanding rights, guarantees, and claims for the minority. (Laughter.)

At the present moment precisely the contrary demand is being made; not the politisation of the Secretariat, but its technicisation; not the abolition of the Political Bureau, but its complete dominance. It is possible that a reform on these lines would please comrade Kamenev, but it would not please the Party. (Applause.) A technical Secretariat would scarcely be able to prepare the questions for the Political Bureau and for the Organisation Bureau as hitherto. (Interjections: Hear, hear!) The demand for the complete dominance of the Political Bureau is simply ridiculous, for the Secretariat is subordinate to the Political Bureau and the latter to the plenary session of the C. C. The opposition is fond of talking of the difficulties of the moment, but still it forgets the greatest difficulty of all, the disorganisation of the Party. (Applause.) The majority of the C. C. had this danger in view when it made compromise proposals to the opposition three days before the Party Conference, with the aim of a possible understanding. This communication, signed by comrades Kalinin, Stalin, Bucharin, Rykov, Rutsutak, Tomsy, Molotov, and Dserschinsky, declared complete solidarity with the resolution passed by the Moscow government conference against all deviations from the line of the Party, and emphasised at the same time that, in order to preserve the unity of the Party, and to avoid the alienation of the Leningrad organisation, one of the best in the Party, the undersigned members of the Central Committee are prepared, after a definite political line has been ascertained by the Party Conference, to make several concessions, including: To use the resolution passed by the Moscow Party conference as basis for the Party conference resolution on the political report in moderating, some of the formulations; the avoidance of mutual polemics among the members of the Political Bureau at the Party Conference; the condemnation in the Party Conference speeches of Sarkis' standpoint on the composition of the Party membership, and of Safarov's standpoint on state capitalism; the immediate execution, after the Party Conference, of the C. C. decision to include a Leningrad comrade in the Secretariat of the C. C. the like inclusion of a Leningrad comrade in the editorial staff of the central organ; the selection, in agreement with the C. C. of a better qualified comrade to replace the present incompetent editor of the Leningrad "Pravda".

The opposition preferred not to come to an understanding, and chose an open and obstinate struggle at the Party Conference. This is their love of peace. The majority of the C. C. continues to hold to the essentials of the above communication. As is generally known, some formulations were moderated in the draft of the political resolution in the interest of Party peace.

We are against the policy of expulsion; it is an abomination to us. But this must not be taken to mean that the leaders will be allowed to waver unrestrictedly. The Party wants unity, and will attain it, with Kamenev and Zinoviev if they like, and without Kamenev and Zinoviev if they do not like. (Interjections: Quite so! applause.)

The unity of the Party presupposes the submission of the minority to the majority. Discussions must not be carried too far, and we must not forget that we are a governing Party. With respect to the structure of the leading organs, the Party will scarcely agree to their mutilation. (Interjection: Hear, hear! Applause.)

The Political Bureau is plenipotentiary, and is subordinate to the plenary session of the C. C., which appears to have been forgotten by some comrades who have lost their balance. The unity of the Party can and will be preserved if the Party does not permit itself to be intimidated. **The Party can only be conducted collectively.** It would be nonsense to dream of any other

kind of Party leadership since Lenin's death. (Enthusiastic applause.)

Should any one of us run astray, he will be called to order. With regard to the Leningrad workers, they will doubtless remain in the front rank of the Party. Along with them we have built up the Party, unfolded the banner of revolution in October 1917, defeated the bourgeoisie and along with them we shall combat the difficulties of today. I am firmly convinced that the Leningrad workers and communists will not stand behind their Party brothers in the other industrial centres in the fight for the steel-like Leninist unity of the Party. (Enthusiastic and prolonged applause. Singing of the International.)