

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL -

Vol 6 No. 79

PRESS

25th November 1926

CORRESPONDENCE

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

The 15th Party Conference of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R.

Discussion on Comrade Stalin's Report.

Speech of Comrade Kamenev.

(Verbatim Report.)

Comrades! Two weeks ago the Central Committee accepted "with satisfaction" as its communiqué states, a declaration from a number of the members of the C. C. And next day the editor of our central organ observed that the communiqué of the Central Committee, and our declaration, were "historical documents".

Why have we made this "Declaration of the Six"?

I believe that the words of the Central Committee, and the comment of the central organ, intend to point out that the Party does not regard our declaration as an inner Party manoeuvre, or as a mere move in a game. This declaration, which closes a very difficult period of inner Party history, is not the result of any "manoeuvre", but has been called forth by our comprehension of the conditions in the Party, by our understanding of what is expected of us, we who have signed the declaration and those comrades who have supported it, by the broad masses of the members of the Party.

Above all, the declaration has been called forth by the fear that we might be obliged to face that prospect against which Lenin warned us so urgently during the last few months of his life; the prospect of a split (Sensation). This declaration is therefore, by no means, purely organisatory in character. To us it is a purely political document, an obligation which we undertake towards the central authorities of the Party, towards the whole Party, and towards those proletarian masses who will read our declaration in every quarter of the globe.

We, in the Bolshevist Party, do not set up an impenetrable

barrier between the questions of ideas and principles, and the questions of organisatory forms. It would be incorrect to regard our declaration as an organisatory measure.

Our declaration imposes upon us a number of political obligations. One of these obligations, political in character, is that we shall be obliged to defend our views in forms not permitting anybody either in the Party or among our enemies outside to interpret our attitude, in questions upon which we differ from the Central Committee or other leading bodies, as a renewal of the conflict, or as a preparation for fresh contentions. Our declaration imposes upon us the obligation of renouncing all methods of defence of our views which might be regarded as an attack upon the Central Committee of that Party which embodies the dictatorship of the proletariat in the sole country building up the socialist state of society.

We were of the opinion that these obligations made it incumbent upon us to say as little as possible at the present juncture, since the atmosphere of the recent conflict is not yet by any means dispersed, and there is a danger that any utterance made by us may be interpreted as a fresh preparation for conflict, or as an attack upon the Central Committee. But I think you will understand, comrades, that after we have kept silence during the last few days, we cannot very well renounce making a statement of our standpoint, in view of the accusations contained in a brief form in a document which comrade Stalin has defended here. (Voices: And rightly defended!)

It is my task to ascertain, on the basis of this document, the true extent of our differences of opinion, and to point out as briefly as possible our estimate of the fate of these differences in the course of the further history of our Party.

What are our Differences of Opinion?

I. FICTITIOUS ACCUSATIONS.

The resolution here defended by comrade Stalin places on record differences in fundamental questions, and constructs differences between the so-called opposition bloc and the Central Committee. I assume that if it were really true that fundamental and essential differences existed between us in the main questions of the character and prospects of our revolution, the character and prospects of our state, and the character of the present epoch of the world's history, or differences of opinion with regard to the determination of the general tasks of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, I assume that should we really meet with the great misfortune of differing in opinion with the Central Committee in these main questions, then we should actually be unable to work together. Then we should have to part, and it would be more honourable to part, that each side might perform its own historical task.

Comrades! Although this resolution places on record essential differences of opinion in these main questions, I am of the opinion that this is not the case. I shall endeavour to prove this by reference to the text of the resolution. There is truly no necessity to add non-existent differences of opinion in main questions to those which really exist between us.

Before I pass to the various points of the political indictment brought against us by the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission, I should like to point out that the first preliminary towards characterising our views consists of the following words:

"Some, it is true, only a very small number of our Party members, are frightened by the difficulties, are displaying signs of weariness and hesitation, are falling into doubts and are being overcome by the feelings of disintegration, of unbelief in the creative forces of the proletariat and this is leading them to an ideology of capitulation." (Voices: "This is perfectly true!")

Comrades! I am of the opinion that this characterisation is partly not really psychological. "Unbelief, weariness, feelings of disintegration". These are things which cannot be accurately weighed on a political scale. We, for our part, can say that we are not conscious of any weariness, pessimistic feelings, or lack of faith. (Uproar.) Comrade Voroschilov was right in his observation that it is difficult to weigh up these abstractions; we shall do better to pass on to the ascertainment and formulation of a tangible political accusation. This accusation is contained in the term: ideology of capitulation. This political accusation is a matter which can and must be translated into class language, and not into the mood of this or that individual. But here I must ask: What is meant under an ideology of capitulation, what does this accusation actually signify?

To capitulate means: to lay down our arms, to surrender to the mercy of the victor. (A voice: "That is what you have done! Have you not surrendered?" Uproar.) Before whom have we laid down our arms? At whose mercy have we surrendered? Have we laid down our arms to the Party? This is not the question; we are not accused of laying down our arms before the Party. The accusation insinuates that we surrender our arms to some class enemy. No other interpretation is possible.

What does this accusation mean? To whom has the so-called opposition bloc surrendered its weapons? To the Nepmen? This is a class force against which Communism must fight. Have we surrendered our weapons to the Nep? Is this what you accuse us of? (A voice: Not against the capitalists, but against the Party.)

The second force which is hostile to Communism is the kulak. Is it to him that the opposition bloc is surrendering its weapons? (Comrade Babuschkin: "You are afraid of him!")

The third class force against which Communism has to fight is the international bourgeoisie, the international Stock Exchange. Have we laid down our arms to this?

And finally, the last of the great class forces opposing Communism, to whom it would be shameful to surrender — after the Nepman, after the kulak, after the international bourgeoisie — is the Second International. Have we surrendered to this? (Comrade Moissevko: "You surrender to all of them!")

Comrades, this harsh term of "capitulation ideology" cannot be maintained. It goes too far. (A voice: "It is right!") But, comrades, you do not name the force, you do not name in our Marxist Bolshevik class language the force to which you accuse us of surrendering. We do not want to surrender to the Nepman, but are fighting him. We do not want to surrender to the Second International, but are fighting it. (A voice: "A fine to the kulak, but are fighting him. We do not want to surrender way you have of fighting!") Laughter, excitement among the audience. Voices: "And you are not going to fight against the Party any more?" Comrade Moysseyenko: "Were you fighting against the kulak in the Aviapribor nucleus?"

Comrade Moysseyenko, I was not in the Aviapribor nucleus. (Comrade Moysseyenko: "If you were not, then your friends were!") I have risen to speak here for the purpose of pointing out our errors. I am equally prepared to deal with the suggestion that we have fought badly. But I beg the conference to make it possible for me, in view of the political indictment brought against us, to express what I really believe.

No superfluous accusations! That is the first thing. If we are guilty, then pronounce your verdict on our real sins, of which we have sufficient, but do not invent new and superfluous ones. (Laughter.)

The same applies to the accusation of "defeatism". In the Bolshevik Party we are accustomed to designate as defeatism that political current which desires the defeat of a given country or class. Nothing else has ever been understood under defeatism. At the risk of arousing Comrade Moysseyenko's indignation once more, I must ask you: What are you accusing us of when you accuse us of defeatism? For whose defeat are we anxious? Do you suppose that we desire the defeat of the working class? (Voices: "Yes!". Disturbance.) Do we desire the defeat of the Soviet Union? Or the defeat of the Party? (Voices: "Yes!" Disturbance.)

No, comrades, that is not true, that is not true! (Voice: "Then why have you carried on a fractional struggle? You have been waiting for an economic crisis".) Comrades, surely you are strong enough to condemn all our real errors. But it is not strength, but weakness, when you prevent me at such a moment from stating exactly what we believe. (Hear, hear!) We do not desire any defeat, and we repudiate the designation of "defeatism".

I now pass to the fundamental items of the indictment which has here been brought against us. The first, a really fundamental point is the question of the character of our revolution and its future. The resolution puts this question to us, and we reply to the question of the character and future of our revolution, without a moment's hesitation, that no one of us has ever doubted, since the April conference of 1917 at which Lenin's resolution defined the whole of the future character of our revolution, that our revolution is a socialist revolution, not only because it is headed by the proletariat, but because the proletariat is utilising the power which it has gained for the establishment of the socialist state of society.

Attention has frequently been drawn of late to recollections of 1917. This is extremely useful. I maintain, however, that since that time, since the April conference of 1917, all those differences which existed between me personally and some other comrades on the one hand, and comrade Lenin on the other with regard to the possible character of the revolution, exist no longer. From that moment onwards none of us has ever uttered a single word which could be taken to mean that we doubted the socialist character of our revolution. I, comrades, know of only one declaration, subsequent to that April conference, which really revised the character of our revolution, but which does not by any means originate with us. This declaration, made in February 1918, has been printed in Comrade Lenin's works, and reads as follows:

"In the interests of the international revolution, we consider it necessary to deal with the possibility of the loss of the Soviet power, which has now become purely formal."

This is truly a revision of the socialist import of our revolution and of our State. Happily for our Party this declaration has only been made once during the past nine years of our revolution. This declaration originated in the circle of the "Left communists", and Comrade Bucharin has been the only one to find the courage to declare that the Soviet power assumes a purely formal character. (Disturbance. Voices: "You are using improper methods, Comrade Kamenev!") Comrade Bucharin

speedily abandoned this declaration. But still it remains as the sole revision of the socialist character of our revolution since the time when Comrade Lenin formulated the tasks of our revolution. (Comrade Schvermik: "And who was to be expelled from the Party?" Agitation in the audience.)

We therefore wish, comrades, without doing any violence to our convictions, to express our full and complete agreement with that characterisation of our revolution which is given in the political document defended by Comrade Stalin. Here it is stated:

"The Party holds the standpoint that our revolution is a socialist revolution, and that the October Revolution represents not only the signal, the impetus, and the starting point of socialist revolution in the West, but that it is at the same time, firstly, a base for the advance of international revolution, and secondly, opens the transition period from capitalism to socialism in the Soviet Union (dictatorship of the proletariat)."

I repeat that we do not doubt this in the very least, and you yourselves must admit that our past does not give the slightest reason which could render it in the least difficult for us to agree with this characterisation.

Our whole Party holds the standpoint that our revolution is a socialist revolution, that it represents the basis for the further development of international revolution, and that it forms the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. Indeed, we even believe that this characterisation is somewhat incomplete, that it is not a perfect characterisation of the internationally socialist character of our revolution. (Laughter.)

There is too little expressed when we state that our revolution is a basis for the further development of the world revolution, and that it forms in the Soviet Union the transition period from capitalism to socialism (this calls for no differences); this characterisation could have been supplemented — as in the resolution passed by the XIV Party Conference — by pointing out that our revolution is not only a basis, a support, and a stronghold for international revolution, but the guide and leader of this revolution. We may remember Lenin's words, that in certain historical emergencies the leadership may be transferred from Moscow to Berlin or London, but that during the present period the leadership is not only the fulcrum, but at the same time the lever, of the world revolution.

Why is it then necessary, comrades, to invent differences of opinion on the character of our revolution and its future, since we are able to agree wholly and entirely with everything expressed in this resolution as the point of departure of the Party in the question of the nature of our revolution? (A voice: "Can socialism be established?") Wait, comrades. I cannot say everything at once. Wait till I come to that.

The question of the tasks of our Party is closely bound up with this question. The resolution passed by the Central Committee states that the October revolution

"forms a period of transition from capitalism to socialism in the Soviet Union (the dictatorship of the proletariat), in which the proletariat, provided it pursues a correct policy in its relations with the peasantry, will be able to succeed in establishing the completely socialist state of society".

And further adds:

"Provided, of course, that the power of the international revolutionary movement on the one hand, and the power of the proletariat of the Soviet Union on the other, will be sufficiently great to protect the Soviet Union from a military intervention."

We still hold in every respect to this same standpoint, which we held at the XIV national conference, and have held during the whole course of the revolution since October; the Party has nothing new to say to us here.

II. THE CHARACTER OF OUR REVOLUTION.

Yes, in the course of the transition period between capitalism and Communism the proletariat will be able to establish the completely socialist state of society, provided it pursues a correct policy in its relations with the peasantry. But here the authors of the resolution have themselves put in the word "provided", and this "provided" must be exactly formulated.

"Provided", adds the resolution, "of course, that the power of the international movement on the one hand, and the power of the proletariat of the Soviet Union on the

other, will be sufficiently great to protect the Soviet Union from a military intervention." (Hear, hear!)

Quite right, comrades, but insufficient. First of all I must ask whether this restrictive condition, that is, the possibility of a military intervention, interrupting the victorious progress of socialisation, exhausts the whole of the dangers involved in the fact that we are surrounded on all sides by capitalism.

I have told you, comrades, that as far as possible I shall refer to no quotations or materials except those statements actually given in documents here laid before the conference. I take Rykov's resolution on the economic situation. I read here:

"It is necessary that we endeavour to reach, and then to pass, the level of industrial development in the advanced capitalist countries."

I ask: Is this true? And I reply: It is absolutely true. But why did Comrade Rykov write, and why did you unanimously decide — we are in perfect agreement with this standpoint — that we must catch up to and pass the level of development in the advanced capitalist countries within a historically comparative minimum of time? Why does the resolution not confine itself to saying "it is desirable", or "it would be good"? No, Comrade Rykov has formulated it correctly: it is necessary for us to reach and pass this level. Why? Because it is only by catching up to and outstripping the capitalist countries that we can prove the advantages of socialist economics as compared with capitalist. It is solely for this reason that the resolution speaks of the necessity of reaching and passing the capitalist level. What does this mean? (Comrade Bucharin: "It means that it is possible!") It means that you, as well as we, regard such a speed of development as necessary. (Comrade Rykov: "And possible!")

The point is, comrades, that this speed is necessary, and we must ask why it is considered necessary. It is necessary because the Soviet Union, as the first country of Socialism, must prove to the millions of the working people, the workers and peasants, the real superiority of socialist economy. This means that this country must and can provide for the needs of the population much more completely and cheaply than capitalist economics are capable of doing. (Comrade: "Thank God for that!" Laughter.)

I ask: Does this sentence in the resolution, proclaiming the necessity of reaching and passing the level of the capitalist countries, refer in any way to our environments or does it not? What danger can threaten us? If you find it necessary to draw our attention to this necessity, it appears probable that the failure to fulfil this task is expected to involve dangers and difficulties. And if we have once raised the subject, then we must follow it to its logical conclusion: It is not only military intervention which may prove an obstacle in the path of the realisation of the completely socialist state of society, but the failure to carry out the above instructions. For this reason we raise the question of the rate of development of our economics, and not only the question of military intervention. The rate of our economic development, as compared with the rate of capitalist development, the necessity of rapidly attaining and passing the level of capitalism, is as important a prerequisite for the final victory of Socialism in our country as the necessity of safeguarding against military intervention.

In the resolution passed by the XIV. national conference (April 1925) we find the conditions required for the final victory of socialism referred to somewhat differently. And although the resolution of the XIV. national conference was the result of a compromise, nevertheless it expresses this point more clearly and accurately:

"On the other hand the existence of two directly antagonistic systems of society creates the constant danger of the capitalist blockade and other forms of economic pressure, of armed intervention, and of the restoration of the capitalist order. The sole security for the final victory of Socialism, that is, the sole security against the restoration of the capitalist state of society, is, therefore, the victorious socialist revolution in a number of countries."

Why does the present resolution, dealing with the conditions under which the victory of Socialism is possible, include the "military intervention", but omit the question of the other forms of economic pressure? To answer this question is to admit the necessity of developing our economics at a rate which will convert our country, as Lenin said (Stalin quotes this), from a

"border state of the capitalist world", into an illustration of the tangible advantages of socialist economics, from the standpoint of actually supplying the needs of the vast masses, over the capitalist methods of economic organisation.

It is very necessary to point out the danger of a military intervention. This danger stirs us to muster our forces; it forces us to prepare for the possibility of such an intervention. But we do not point out this danger alone. We are not threatened solely by armoured cruisers and machine guns, but by the danger that the rate of our economic development, of our prices, our wages, and our agricultural progress, remains behind the standard of the capitalist countries, instead of coming nearer and nearer to this level every day, and demonstrating that we shall surpass it.

Does the pointing out of this danger imply pessimism? Will it not rather stimulate the fighting will of the proletariat, as effectually as the threat of military intervention? Will it not arouse the will of the proletariat, and of all other strata, to ward off this danger? Can the pointing out of this possibility be construed even to the slightest extent into a factor of unbelief or despair? (Voice: "We shall judge by your deeds, not by your words." "Less chatter, and more real action.") Comrades, if you regard my efforts to defend myself against the accusations which have been raised here, as mere chatter, I shall leave the platform. Do you know, comrades, when the following words were written:

"We have created the type of the Soviet state, and with this we have begun a new world historical epoch, the epoch of the political rule of the proletariat, succeeding the rule of the bourgeoisie. This cannot be revoked, although only the practical experience of the working class in several countries will enable the type of the Soviet state to be perfected."

Did the author of these words give in them the slightest cause to suspect a lack of faith, have these words spread pessimism abroad, have they robbed the working class of its future, have they in any way disorganised the consciousness and the will of the working class, or have they not rather organised them? And yet this passage contains the statement that not only the economic order, but at the same time the political order, the "type of the Soviet state", can only be perfected by the practical experience of the working class in several countries. The author then passes to the economic aspect of the question:

"But we have not completed even the foundation of socialist economics, and the hostile forces of expiring capitalism may still rob us of it again. We must recognise this clearly, and admit openly that there is nothing so dangerous as illusions (and dizziness, especially at great heights). And there is nothing "frightful", nothing in the least likely to drive us to despair, in the recognition of this bitter truth, for we have always proclaimed and repeated this elementary truth of Marxism, that the victory of Socialism demands the joint efforts of the workers of several countries. (Lenin, Complete works, Russian ed. vol. XX/2, page 487)."

Comrades, do these words contain anything which calls upon us to despair; are they not rather a powerful appeal for the acceleration of our work of building the foundation of socialist economics? (A voice: "When was that written?") I know, comrades, that you would be very pleased if it could be said that this was written in 1917, 1918, or 1919. But I see neither for myself nor for the proletariat the slightest cause for sorrow or despair when I tell you that this article was written in March 1922, actually a few months before that article on the co-operatives, in which we are told that we possess everything which is required and sufficient for the establishment of Socialism. Are these words not right, is it not true that there is nothing "frightful", nothing desperate, in the recognition of the elementary truth of the necessity of the joint efforts of the workers of several advanced countries for the victory of Socialism?

Must these words be repeated again and again today, before the whole of the proletariat and peasantry?

Is it necessary that we abandon ourselves to delusions, is it necessary to assert that our difficulties consist solely of the dreadnoughts and machine guns which may come and bombard us? Would it not greatly spur our proletariat on to action, if it were to learn from the resolutions of our conference the plain truth that the foundation of our socialist state of society is not yet firmly established, that though we have made great progress in comparison with 1922, still we must not delude ourselves into thinking that our failure to keep up the pace of economic

development can only threaten us with dangers in the form of dreadnoughts and cannons, but we must recognise that danger can threaten in even so simple a form as the question of prices, or the question of imports and exports. Is this then despair?

I believe that if we were to add these words of Lenin to the proposed resolution; if we were to take these words as the basis for the enlightenment of the broad masses of the workers with regard to our tasks, we should become stronger, not weaker. If we state that it is not merely military intervention which can hamper us in our work, and then add these words of Lenin, then no further differences can arise, then nothing will prevent us from joining hands, and working together on the common basis furnished by Lenin's words.

Without in the least way violating our theoretical conscience as communists and Leninists, we can accept the characterisation here given of our revolution. We are, however, of the opinion that it would be more accurate if the words on direct military intervention were supplemented by some words pointing out the necessity of accelerating the speed of economic development, as stated by Lenin. Ad then, I repeat, there will be no more differences in this question. (Comrade Ryutin: "Then we can add at the same time a few words on the unity of the Party.") I shall come to that presently. I cannot talk about the possibility of Socialism in one single country and about the unity of the Party, in one breath. One thing at a time.

III. LENIN'S STANDPOINT IN 1915.

Comrade Stalin has here given us a detailed analysis of Lenin's views on the possibility of the realisation of Socialism in one country. In this he referred to an article of Lenin published in 1915. He proved that the theory and practice of the establishment of Socialism in the Soviet Union arise, so to speak, from his quotations, and from this law of the inequality of capitalist development. I cannot deal with this in detail, as the time is too short, and I must still speak of a number of other questions. But I cannot but observe that one must not refer to this quotation as indicating how Lenin conceived the tasks of the revolution in Russia at that time.

The simple duty of being perfectly accurate with respect to quotations from Lenin forces me to this explanation. This quotation, adduced correctly and completely by Comrade Stalin, was published in the "Social Democrat", the then central organ of our Party, on 25. August 1915. The article from which it is taken contains a general criticism of the standpoint of those social traitors who had said: We cannot begin the social revolution in Germany or in England or in Italy, we must begin everywhere at once. Lenin replied to them: You are traitors, for under the cloak of this theory, which compels one country to wait for another, you wish to avoid fulfilling your duty of kindling the proletarian revolution in every country. This was during the epoch of the imperialist war, in 1915. A month and a half later, in number 47 of the "Social Democrat", published on 13. October, exactly six weeks afterwards, Lenin wrote an article dealing specially with the tasks then confronting the Bolsheviks in Russia. Since Lenin stated in September that the victory of Socialism is possible in one country, even a backward country, and since he stated that it was the duty of every proletarian revolutionist to maintain this standpoint, we should naturally expect that he would apply the standpoint first of all to Russia.

But, comrades, this is not the case. We must not carelessly represent the true history of Lenin's views in order to score points in debate. Six weeks after the publication of the passage quoted by comrade Stalin, Lenin wrote in his famous article "Some theses":

"While paying due regard to the demands made by our comrades from Russia, we formulate some theses on the actual questions of our present work".

A number of these are then enumerated, of which the fifth runs as follows:

"The social import of the next revolution in Russia can only be the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry."

The sixth thesis reads:

"It is the task of the proletariat of Russia to carry through the bourgeois democratic revolution to its end, in order to arouse socialist revolution in Europe. This second

task is now following very closely upon the first, but it still continues to remain a special and second task."

(Voices: "What of it?". "We have read that for ourselves". "That will not do. Nothing can be made of that!".) Comrades, I cannot help

it if it is disagreeable for you to hear these sentences. (Voices: "We not only hear them, but we understand them as well!".)

If you will accord a straightforward consideration to the declaration of Lenin, made six weeks after the appearance of the article correctly quoted by Comrade Stalin, you will be bound to admit that Lenin's words in 1915 on the establishment of Socialism in one country referred clearly to the West European States... (A voice: "Nothing of the sort!"), and that at the same time he pointed out another urgent task for Russia. That which I have read to you is his definition of the social import of the impending revolution. (A voice "You would do better to read what the New Economic Policy says".) Nobody will forget that as early as 1905 Lenin was prepared to break through the confines of the bourgeois democratic revolution at any moment, as soon as the power of the proletariat should be great enough to render it possible.

There are two points upon which we have no doubt whatever. Firstly, we were told by Lenin in 1917, as soon as the first rumblings of revolution were heard, that:

"We must break through the confines of our old Bolshevism, based on the idea that the import of the revolution in Russia will be bourgeois democratic, and we must go ahead with full steam towards socialist revolution."

Secondly. At that time many of us held to this old Bolshevik idea, but none of us denies that we were wrong, and Lenin completely right. But do not these references to the history of the Leninist standpoint confirm us in the belief that the passage quoted by Comrade Stalin from the year 1915 could not by any means have been intended to apply to Russia, and that Lenin was thinking of other countries? (A voice: "What leads you to suppose that?") I have already shown you what Lenin regarded as the task of the revolution in Russia in 1915. But if it appears to you that this has no connection whatever with the revolution of 1917, then you may permit me to read you another passage:

"Immediately after the February revolution of 1917, when Lenin was organising the propaganda of Bolshevik views, he wrote as follows to Comrade Ganetzky:

"Above all I must at any price have new editions — even if under the title," From the History of the last years of Czarism' — of the local "Social Democrat", of the pamphlets by Lenin and Zinoviev on War and Socialism, of the "communist", and of the "Sammelheft des Sozialdemokraten". But most of all and before all the new edition of the theses from No. 47 of the "Social Democrat" (13. October 1915). These theses state directly, clearly, and accurately, a year and a half before the revolution, what we are to do in a revolution in Russia."

These theses have been magnificently confirmed by the revolution, down to the last letter.

I repeat once more, in order to avoid any possible misunderstanding: You cannot quote a single passage out of any of our works which could indicate the slightest doubt on our part as to the socialist character of our revolution. I no not doubt in the least that the criticism exercised by Lenin on our views, which prevailed in our circle in the editorial staff of the "Pravda", and were held by me personally, until the arrival of Lenin, and the designation of these views as old-Bolshevist, and entirely incapable of application to the socialist revolution of 1917, was absolutely correct. But this is no reason whatever why we should confine ourselves, at the present juncture, to insisting upon the danger of military intervention as the sole difficulty in the way of the complete establishment of an independent socialist state of society. This, comrades, is the first and main question to which I referred when stating that: If a difference of opinion existed between us on the leading question of the character and future of the revolution, then indeed it would be extremely difficult to carry on a joint policy.

IV. THE CHARACTER OF OUR STATE.

The second question, not dealt with directly in Comrade Stalin's theses, but frequently raised of late, and in my opinion greatly in need of a clear definition — and you have a right to demand a perfectly clear answer from us in this question — is the question of the character of our State. We maintain, clearly and completely, the standpoint that our State is a proletarian State in the double sense of the word. (Laughter. A voice: "And Trotzky?").

Comrades, if your accusations touched on matters referring to our real differences of opinion, I should have to answer them. (Uproar.) Comrades, permit me to put the question directly: Is it disagreeable to you to hear that in the question of the State we are entirely of your opinion? (Laughter, disturbance, voices: "Extremely agreeable!"). I am much afraid, comrades, or at least the impression cannot be avoided, that when I here declare my absolute agreement with this or that view of the Party, Comrade Moysseyenko is dissatisfied for some reason or another. (Comrade Moysseyenko: "I sit and say nothing, Comrade Kamenev, but I shall tell you what I think afterwards." A voice: "And when are you going to speak of Trotzky?") You will hear something about Trotzky too, comrades.

We regard our State as a proletarian State, not only because it is a State ruled by the dictatorship of the proletariat, but because the proletariat is utilising state power and state organisation as an instrument for raising up to Socialism the whole of the non-proletarian strata of the workers.

But, comrades, we must add — and it is our duty to do this — all that Lenin said on this question. Were we to state that we have a proletarian State and nothing more, then we should not be stating the truth, nor what Lenin said. For Lenin told us that we have a proletarian State in a double sense: the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the raising of the whole stratum of the workers to an ever higher level; but we have a proletarian State in a country with a preponderant peasant population and with bureaucratic deformations. (A voice: "True, but what follows?") If nobody disputes this, then let us register it in that golden book in which we write all the things we are agreed upon, (Laughter.) Some entries will still remain in that other book in which we register all the points upon which we are not agreed. But we must not confuse these two books with one another. The matter must not be represented as if differences of opinion existed on questions in which the whole Party is actually in full agreement.

But when a proletarian dictatorship is realised in a country with a preponderantly peasant population, the inevitable practical result is that in ordinary daily work the lowest stories of the building of state power will not be found to be in the hands of the purely industrial proletariat, but in the hands of the peasantry. (Disturbance. Voices: "Where then is the proletariat?" "Should we send the proletariat into the village Soviets, instead of to work in the factories?") Permit me to ask, comrades, if this a fact or is it not? If you say that it is not a fact, then you deny all arithmetic, geography, and so forth. It is a fact. If we are to pursue a correct proletarian policy, and to realise the right leadership, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat in our country, and if we are to take the lead over the peasantry as we should, then it is useless to close our eyes to this fact. It is a fact, and cannot be otherwise. If we have 100 million peasants, and if we pursue the correct line of Soviet democracy, the certain result is the fact which I have just stated. It is to redouble our efforts towards adapting the proletarian methods of leadership to those subordinate organs of the Soviet apparatus and the Soviet power which are unavoidably in the hands of the peasantry. (Voices: "What object do these facts serve?"). As soon as we touch upon this necessary task, then you begin to say: You are exaggerating, that is not a fact at all. In this way we can come to no understanding, comrades.

And precisely as this fact is the inevitable consequence of the realisation of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the proletarian State in an agrarian country, in the same manner the bureaucratic deformations of the state apparatus are an expression of class.

What does this mean? In my opinion it means that the state apparatus, viewed from the class standpoint, is endeavouring to oust the workers from immediate participation in the administration of the State, and to subordinate the independent activity

of these masses more and more to the bureaucratic apparatus. When we place this fact on record, and say: This is a tendency in the state apparatus, promoted by the whole petty bourgeois atmosphere; it must be combatted by increased participation on the part of the workers, by the methods of furthering the proletarianisation of the State, then we are told on the one hand that a proletarian State cannot be proletarianised, since it is already proletarian, and on the other hand we are told that we exaggerate the facts. There are no differences of opinion in principle between us and the Party on the subject of the character of the State. It is solely our endeavour to ascertain from this Leninist characterisation what are our actual tasks with reference to the leadership of the peasantry, the proletarianising of the state apparatus, and the struggle against bureaucratism. We regard this as our duty.

I have raised the question of the character of our revolution, and have found no fundamental differences of opinion with regard to it. I have raised the question of the general tasks of the Communist Parties in the present situation, and have pointed out those prerequisites for the complete realisation of a socialist state of society which have, in part, not been dealt with exhaustively in the resolution. (Disturbance. Voices: "Then why have you fought against us?") Surely you do not believe that we have fought against you for the reason that we regard our revolution as a bourgeois revolution. You write a great deal, Comrade Ruben, but you do not understand anything about our dispute. (Laughter, disturbance, the chairman calls for order. A voice: "It was not Ruben, but his cousin".) Unfortunately not only Ruben, but his relations as well, do not understand the import of our contention.

I pass to the fourth question. (Voices: "You have been talking for three hours and a half already.")

Chairman: I believe that I am acting in accordance with the wishes of the conference in not limiting Comrade Kamenev, who represents the Opposition. Comrade Kamenev has already spoken for one hour, and asks for another half hour. (Voices: Agreed.)

Comrade Kamenev: Comrades, you will understand that my wish to make our standpoint perfectly clear is justified. (Disturbance.) I shall not keep you much longer, and shall speak in thesis form.

I have discussed three central questions, in which such differences of opinion as are imputed to us would make our joint work impossible, were these differences to exist.

V. THE QUESTION OF THE ESTIMATE TO BE FORMED OF THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION OF CAPITALISM.

The fourth point is the question of how we judge the international situation, the present stage of the world's history. Should we disagree on this question, should we have formed a different estimate of the whole international situation, of the whole present stage of development in the world revolution, then it would be difficult indeed for us to come to an understanding on any subject. I am, however, of the opinion that in this question, too, no such difference of opinion exists.

In the resolution proposed by comrade Stalin we read:

"The Party holds the standpoint that the advanced capitalist countries are, for the most part, in a state of partial and temporary stabilisation, that the present period represents a period between two revolutions, imposing upon the Communist Parties the duty of preparing the proletariat for the impending revolution; that the offensive of capital, vainly endeavouring to secure the stabilisation, must call forth the defensive struggle and the combination of the forces of the working class against capital, that the Communist Parties must take part in the aggravated class struggle, and convert the attacks of capital into counter-attacks of the proletariat, aiming at the dictatorship of the proletariat."

I do not see the slightest reason why we should not adopt this characterisation of the present period as a period between two revolutions as the common standpoint of the whole Party. If you have been told, whilst working out this resolution, that we are of the opinion that during the given period, today or within a few weeks, a revolutionary situation will arise which will compel us to go over to the attack, or if you have been told that we do not believe in the world revolution at all, then, comrades, you have been told falsehoods. (A voice! "You yourself

have written 25 pages of print about it!") It does not matter who has written 25 pages of print about it, or 25,000 — our standpoint is that we are in the midst of a partial and temporary stabilisation, and that this is being shaken by the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and can be transformed, by a correct policy on the part of our Party and the Comintern, within a more or less brief period, into an offensive of the proletariat against capitalism. (A voice: "And Zinoviev's speech?") I shall come to Zinoviev.

But when I read in the speech of Comrade Lozovsky, leader of the Red International of Labour Unions, in the course of the five points which he formulates, of:

"... an element of stabilisation, a very powerful element indeed, extending the period of stabilisation over decades." then, comrades, I must say: I am not in agreement with this.

The period between 1905 and 1917 may be designated as a period between two revolutions; these 12 years, in which the forces of the revolution expanded, organised themselves, were thrown back and recovered again and went forward, may be called a period between two revolutions. But what would you think of anybody who maintained that the period, let us say, between the Paris Commune of 1871 and the revolution of 1905, was a period between two revolutions? It is obvious that those comrades who expect the stabilisation to last for decades are on quite another track. Those who calculate on decades of stabilisation must certainly revise their tactics.

Tactics suitable for a period between two revolutions are of no use for a period of capitalist stabilisation extending over decades. This is where our difference of opinion comes in. (A voice: "That is to say a difference with Lozovsky.") No, comrades, Lozovsky is not alone. I maintain that an article by a fertile writer (Laughter), Comrade Sten, entitled "The stabilisation and its prospects", repeats substantially Comrade Lozovsky's anticipations with regard to the stabilisation, and I can only offer Comrade Sten my sincere condolence that the social democrats have praised him greatly, and declared that they are perfectly in agreement with his view of the stabilisation. Comrades, is it quite fair to criticise a few separate sentences, perhaps unhappily expressed, from a speech of Comrade Zinoviev's? Is it really so very dreadful when Comrade Zinoviev exclaims, in the course of an agitation speech, something to the effect that: "I do not care a rap for the stabilisation, I think nothing whatever of the stabilisation." (A voice: "But it is permissible to criticise Lozovsky." Another voice: "That was not a speech, but theses.") Zinoviev did not write any theses alone; the theses are a collective work, and we are responsible for them. (Disturbance.) Pardon me, comrades, but I have only half an hour, and cannot continue if you interrupt.

Take our standpoint as it is; criticise it, but do not criticise the words, but the substance. Combat those who declare that the revolution will break out tomorrow, and declare us to be mad, if we have stated anywhere that there will be a revolutionary situation tomorrow.

But at the same time you must combat those who cultivate the idea of decades of stabilisation, and veil their propagation of this idea behind attacks on us. Do not forget to combat these comrades; they will do you much more harm than we, for they speak the language of another class.

I have finished this part of my speech. I maintain that in the central questions, in the question of the character and future of the revolution, in the question of the character and future of our State, in the question of the general tasks connected with establishing Socialism in our country, and in the general estimate of the international situation, no such fundamental differences of opinion exist between us as could separate us into two Parties, or give anyone the right to insult us, and to label us as social democrats before the astonished eyes of the whole world.

VI. THE RELATION OF CLASS FORCES IN OUR COUNTRY.

There are, however, other categories of differences of opinion, comrades; there are differences of opinion relating to the estimate of the relation of class forces in our country. These are political differences of opinion. The question of the estimate of the relation of class forces in our country is a political question. It cannot, however, force us to such conclusions as we should be obliged to draw in the case of differences of opinion referring to the general character of our revolution, or to the general character of our State. But they

can throw difficulties in the way of practical work, and have already done so.

These differences of opinion in the estimate of the concrete situation at a given moment, and of the comparative forces of the different classes, can lead to practical differences. Certain organisational conclusions can be drawn from this. It may be said: if you are not agreed with such an estimate of class forces at a given moment, if you do not agree with such an estimate of the relations between the kulak, the peasant poor, the proletariat, etc. then you cannot be a member of the staff which has to form practical decisions on the basis of the given estimate. If you say this, you are right from your point of view. But there is no need to call us social democrats, in flat contradiction of the truth and of history, in order to arrive at such practical and organisational conclusions.

These differences, comrades, undoubtedly exist, and we must estimate their extent. And you have a right to ask what has induced us to sound the alarm. (A voice: "Your fractional attitude.") But I did not come into the world with a fractional attitude, nor was it laid in my cradle. It did not make its appearance until 1925. (A voice: "No, already in 1917.") A fractional attitude in 1917? No, that is not the case. I became "infected" with the fractional attitude in 1925.

It must be of interest to you, comrades, to ask how it could come about that Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotzky — all comrades who have not suffered from this affection during the last eight years — (A voice: "Trotzky has not suffered from it?") Laughter, uproar. I assure you, comrades, that I shall come to Trotzky presently. (Laughter, disturbance.) I have risen to speak here with the intention of telling you straightforwardly why the practical policy of the Party is causing us anxiety at the present moment. (A voice: "Why?"). Why? Let me tell you. Because we have formed the opinion that in the question of the estimate of the concrete class relations in our country in 1925, the Party is not on the right road. We have therefore felt it to be our duty to point out that the wrong path is being taken, and to raise an alarm. In doing this we exceeded the limits of Party discipline and of the Party statutes. Punish us for this. We are already sufficiently punished; but you must not deny that this violation of discipline has arisen from no other cause than the anxiety for a correct Party policy, and the wish to convince the Party. We have not been able to convince the Party. We do not wish to force our views upon it.

At the Party Congress you rejected our standpoint. You rejected it both in April and in June. We have no desire to force our convictions upon you at any price. (Disturbance. Comrade Schvernik: "That was the only thing you failed to do.") If you hold the opinion that when one is politically accused one has the right to state how he has come to this or that conviction, hear me quietly.

At the given moment we were profoundly and sincerely anxious on account of the policy being pursued by the Party, and it seemed to us that a number of comrades, and especially the press, were underestimating those processes which are taking place, not in the socialist section of our economics, but in the capitalist. It appeared to us that the Party is not sufficiently aware of those difficulties resulting from the increasing accumulation in the hands of the kulak and the Nep-man, and the increasing estrangement between us and the poor peasantry. Whether we were right or not is another matter. We were, however, convinced that it was our duty — within the confines of the Party statutes of course — to tell the Party of this.

We were further of the opinion that the Party underestimates the influence, exercised by this process of accumulation however slow in the non-socialist section of our economics upon the socialist section.

Comrades, the Central Committee has already once declared me to be liable to a social democratic deviation, but this cannot hinder me from declaring the following here before the C. C. Before the beginning of the last economic year, I personally pointed out not only our successes, but our difficulties, and now, a year later, everyone who observed carefully will admit that the difficulties have proved greater than could have been anticipated in September 1925, and that these difficulties have been along the lines of which I warned you, of which we

warned you. (Disturbance.) Difficulties arose with regard to the process of accumulation among the kulaks and the Nep-men, which attained such proportions that the development of our state section was hampered in such a manner that we were unable to obtain the grain and other products required for export, and were obliged to restrict imports. (A voice: "Panic!") Ah, panic: I do not know, comrades, what you understand under the word panic. If some comrade points out this or that difficulty, and you call that a panic, perhaps you prefer that we come to you and say: There are no difficulties whatever. Is that what you want? We cannot oblige you.

The main task confronting us in this regard is the correct solution of the question of the firmer establishment of the alliance with the peasantry. The resolution, in stating that we "must pursue an economic policy (price policy, taxation policy, etc.) which cements more firmly the bond between industry and peasantry, and preserves the alliance between the working class and the main mass of the peasantry", is, in our opinion, quite correct, but much too general in expression. It is a standpoint equally correct for 1921 and 1925, and for 1930. The alliance is necessary, but the question is, what are the dangers threatening this alliance in 1925/26, what is likely to destroy it? (A voice: "The high prices and the two milliards!")

The alliance is threatened by the disproportion, by the goods famine with all its consequences. That is, by the high retail prices, by the incomplete stabilisation of the chervonetz, etc. This, comrades, was the reason for our disquietude in this matter. Are we proposing measures, as has been said here, which treat the peasantry as a hostile element? It is not true, it is an invention (A voice: "And Preobraschensky?"). We Leninists could not possibly regard the peasantry as a hostile element. I declare that anyone maintaining such a standpoint must not merely be called a social democrat, but must be told that he is dead to politics, and can pack up and go home. (Disturbance, laughter.)

The essential point of the question is: Does our country possess inner resources enabling industry to be raised to a level ensuring that the peasantry is not aroused against us by the shortage of goods and the high prices, but can be convinced of the advantages of the proletarian economics in big industry? Does our country possess material resources sufficing for this? We reply: It does. (A voice: "Two milliards!"). Disturbance, laughter.) Would you be displeased if we had two milliards?

Now, comrades, these inland resources exist. The next question is, how we can reach them. (A voice: "That is the most important!") Comrades, if the standpoint that the accumulation in the hands of the kulak and the Nep-man is proceeding only to a very small extent gains the upper hand in our Party, if those elements which are undoubtedly striving to veil the increased differentiation among the peasantry, and the growth of the kulaks and the Nep-men, are really to determine the policy of our Party, then we must really ask: Where are we to find in our own country the material resources required for the industrialisation, if the workers receive low wages, if the "unhappy" "little" kulak is still to be pitied, and promises besides to "grow gradually into socialism", and if the Nep-man is earning four roubles per head — where are we to find the money? We must not deceive ourselves. We must admit that the development of Socialism will proceed at such a "snail-like pace", as Comrade Bucharin says, that nothing will remain of the necessity of reaching and passing the capitalist countries except the beautiful phrases of Comrade Rykov.

We shall certainly not apply to Poincaré for money. There is no difference of opinion among us about this. We shall not pay for foreign credits by means of the foreign trade monopoly (A voice: "And Sokolnikov?") Where are we then to find material resources?

If a correct taxation policy is to be pursued, the Party must first of all recognise two things. Firstly, that the growth of private capitalist accumulation in town and country is a fact which it is useless and dangerous to conceal; secondly, you must acknowledge that the question of the distribution of national income, that is, the transference of the means accumulated in the non-socialist section of our industry into the state section, is a question of the class struggle. These two facts must first be recognised, before we sit down at our desks with pencils, and calculate the amount of the taxes, etc.

I maintain that our disquietude was caused by the fact that the recognition of these two factors of the growth of capitalist

accumulation, and of the class struggle for the redistribution of this fresh accumulation, had not found a sufficient echo in Party consciousness, and was not accorded its proper place in the practice of the policy of the Party.

You may tell us that we are exaggerating, that the Party has been perfectly aware of conditions, that everything is in perfect order.

No, comrades. We declare: In this sense everything has not been in perfect order in the Party, there has been no clear conception of the importance of these facts. When it is stated, as it is in the proclamation issued by Comrades Stalin, Rykov, and Kuybyshev on the regime of economy (dealing substantially with various deformations of the regime of economy, the attempts at raising the means for industrialisation at the expense of the working class), that a section of the communists are proposing to plunder the peasantry, then I must really say: Accuse us of what you will, comrades, but remember that we are no longer living in the Middle Ages. The day in which witches were burnt to death is past. It is unallowable to say to living human beings, who have stated that the taxation screw should be tightened on the kulak, the peasant poor should be helped, and that we should build up socialism in conjunction with the peasant poor, — it is unallowable to accuse such comrades of wanting to plunder the peasantry, and to burn them at the political stake. Lenin once said to the Left S.R.:

“Anyone who classifies the kulak and the peasantry in one category, and speaks of the peasantry as a whole instead of the kulak, is a criminal.”

If you can find so much as a single comma in all our writings which might hint that we demanded the taxation screw to be tightened upon the whole of the peasantry, then it would be a different matter. But did we not point out the necessity of a clearer definition in the resolution of the Party, of the differentiation in the peasantry? Have we not proposed a reduction of taxes for the poor peasantry? You cannot have it both ways.

First we are accused of wanting to over-indulge the village poor, for we propose that 40 per cent of the peasantry should be freed from taxation instead of 25 per cent; and then we are accused of being unjust to the kulak, and of not believing that he is going to grow into Socialism. Again, we are accused of wanting to plunder the whole peasantry.

No, comrades, this is not true. Punish us for the sins which we have committed, if you think us guilty, but pronounce no verdicts in themselves unjust, and attributing to us views which we have never shared. We do not hold the theory that the middle peasantry represent an element hostile to us. We hold the theory that the peasantry is differentiated... (A voice: Are you for or against Preobraschensky?) Damn it all, I repeat once again, I am for the Party! (Laughter.)

Comrades, I now conclude. (A voice: “And what about Trotsky?”) In a moment. I trust that you will lengthen the time I am permitted to speak, for Trotsky's sake. The five minutes left of my half hour I shall devote to the question of where our differences of opinion begin in this question.

Comrade Stalin's theses begin as follows:

“The complication of the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist elements in our country is characteristic of the present period.”

Complication of the struggle! This does not state the matter very plainly. It is obvious that the struggle is becoming more complicated between the capitalist and the socialist elements. But it is not so obvious in what direction it is becoming more complicated, and with what class content.

We have, however, Comrade Rykov's resolution, which states that the Soviet Union is passing through

“a sharp struggle between the socialist and capitalist elements both in town and in the village.”

And we have Comrade Tomsky's resolution, which defines the words “sharp struggle” more precisely.

I do not ask, comrades, and do not think that I should ask at the present moment, when this “sharp struggle” commenced, after the XIV. Party Conference, or after the April Plenum, or after the July Plenum. (Comrade Zifronovitsch: “It has never stopped!”). Comrade Tomsky says:

“The growth of the productive forces of the country is accompanied by a simultaneous growth of the social antagonisms, and, at a given period, by a certain aggravation of the class struggle in the country,”

so that

“the economic and political activity of the classes and groups hostile to the proletariat, the bourgeoisie and the kulaks, and the activity of the city and rural bourgeoisie, greatly increase.”

Comrades, if you want to disarm the Opposition, if you want to strike the ideological weapon from our hands, (A voice: “Do you want to make capital of that?”), then your best means is to speak in this language (A voice: “We have always spoken in that language”) of the social antagonisms, of the growing activity of the classes and groups hostile to the proletariat. But how all this is to be made consistent I do not know. (A voice: “It now appears that the Party came to the Opposition”.) How can we be accused of social democratic deviations, simply because we propose that the Party should speak in this language.

I have here the leading article of the “Pravda” of 27. October. I must say that this leading article is written in a manner “disarming” us. To be sure, this leading article cannot refrain from asserting that we, the Opposition, have doubted that we can successfully establish Socialism on the basis of our own home resources. This is the inevitable accompaniment, so to speak. But what is the substance of this leading article? I regard this leading article, after the passages quoted from the resolutions drawn up by Comrades Rykov and Tomsky, as one of the most important documents. This leading article says:

“We are faced by the task of our growing economics, but there is another task demanding even more imperatively the energies of the proletariat, the task of the proper utilisation of the accumulation taking place in the country.

This task is a task of the class struggle, for in a country surrounded by capitalism, and under the conditions imposed by the capitalist accumulation going on in town and country (kulak and private capitalism), the question of the utilisation of the means accumulated, for the object of the consolidating the positions of Socialism, is bound to be a question of acutest class warfare.”

These words, this estimate of the present situation, concentrates the attention of the Party upon the fact that we are now faced by the question of the redistribution of our national income, and that this question is one of acutest class struggle, in which the kulak and the poor peasant are on different sides of the barricade, and the Nep-man and the socialist industry opponents of one another. If this were the principle upon which the members of the Party were educated, if this estimate of the situation were taken as the signpost for showing the way to the proletariat, if the working class were being prepared for the consequences of this situation, then the Opposition would be satisfied. (A voice: “In any case it is disarmed”.)

Let us read what the “Pravda” has to say further:

“The problem of the utilisation of the means accumulated is at the same time decisive for the question of the speed of industrialisation, as well as for the question of our increasing strength as compared with that of the hostile capitalism surrounding us... If we regard the situation at the beginning of the economic year, it is perfectly clear that it is imperative for us to increase our industrial production.

The same will probably be the case next year. The rate of industrial production and of investment of capital laid down by our plan will not abolish the shortage of goods. What is to be done?

What we have to do is to find ways and means for increasing the mobilisation of the means which have accumulated in our country, and to apply these to industrialisation.”

This is an acknowledgement of the fact that even the sums allotted for industrialisation by the council for Labour and Defence under my chairmanship — sums alleged to be too generous — and now allotted under the chairmanship of Comrade Rykov, are insufficient to meet the needs of the shortage of goods. What is to be done? We must find out the right means of mobilising the accumulated capital. This is a class struggle problem. In this struggle for the firmer establishment of proletarian power at the expense of the means accumulated by the

capitalist section of our economics both in town and country — among the Nep-men, the new bourgeoisie, and the kulaks — the Party will have no differences of opinion with us, we shall place no difficulties in the way.

My time has expired, and I shall only say two words on the apparatus, on bureaucracy, and on Trotzky. Comrades, I promise to be finished with all this in two minutes. You state in your resolution that we have not only criticised, not only tried to have things done differently, but that we have insulted the Party apparatus. I now reply to this. You write in the resolution, which constitutes an indictment against us:

“The Party apparatus comprises the best members of the working class; it can and must be criticised, and it can and must be “revived”, but it cannot be insulted without the danger being incurred of disintegrating and disarming the Party.”

This is true, comrades, perfectly true. (A voice: “And the declaration?”). I shall read to you what the declaration says. Now, comrades, what did we say in this fighting document — you are well aware that it is a fighting document? (A voice: “A disgraceful document!”) In this document, in your opinion a disgraceful one, you may read:

“The importance of a closely united and centralised apparatus in a Bolshevik Party requires no further substantiation. Without this framework the proletarian revolution would be impossible. The majority of the members of the Party apparatus are disinterested and faithful soldiers of the Party, influenced only by the struggle for the interests of the workers. (A voice: “And further?”). Given the right regime, and a suitable distribution of forces, these same functionaries could demand with success the realisation of Party democracy.”

And now, comrades, another point, and a new idea. (Laughter.) This document, our declaration at the July Plenum of the C. C. and the C. C. C., is a fighting document. That is true. In this document we have concentrated everything which we had to say to the Party, and wanted to say, and in my opinion it would be better if the resolution, in criticising our standpoint, would not refer to quotations from 1922/23, or to isolated ideas uttered at the Communist Academy, but to this document, for which we bear the responsibility, and to which our signatures are subscribed. Then you could not assert that this historical fighting document “insults” the Party, for you would have the words which I have just quoted before your eyes, and these say something very different.

I do not deny that in the heat of discussion a word or a sentence may fall which might be otherwise interpreted. (Laughter.) If you had been able to find such sentences, comrades, you would have brought them up against us here. But you have not done this. In the official document, thought out by us outside of the heat of discussion, and containing what we really wish to say to the Party, we have spoken about the Party apparatus in the words which I have just read. We are ready to join you in condemning any criticism going beyond this, and assuming the nature of an “insult”.

And now to comrades Trotzky.

THE BLOC WITH TROTZKY.

Comrades. In this question your formulation is as follows:

“The fundamental fact in the development of inner Party relations in the C. P. of the Soviet Union since the XIV. Party Congress, which Congress condemned the principles of the views of the “New Opposition”, consists of the fact that the “New Opposition” (Comrades Zinoviev, Kamenev), who at one time fought against Trotzkyism, against the social democratic deviation in our Party, have gone over to the ideological standpoint of Trotzkyism....

A voice: “True!”

There is only one thing more to be asked, comrades. For what did you condemn us at the Party Congress?

If “the fundamental fact in the development of inner-Party relations since the XIV. Party Congress consists of the Opposition having gone over to the ideological standpoint of Trotzkyism”, then for what did you condemn us at the time

of the XIV. Party Congress? (Disturbance. A voice: “At the XIV. Party Congress there were other sins to condemn!”) You condemned us at the XIV. Party Congress, although we had not gone over to the standpoint of Trotzkyism. Now you want to condemn us because we are alleged to have gone over to Trotzkyism. I fear that you condemn us, whatever the standpoint we adopt. (Laughter.)

Facts remain facts. I declare that you cannot prove to us by a single quotation, or a single fact, that we have “gone over” to the ideological standpoint of Trotzkyism. Not even the exhaustive report given by Comrade Stalin could bring evidence of this. (A voice: “And the declaration?”). We have never and nowhere defended, do not defend, and never shall defend — of this we may assure you — that which specifically differentiates historical Trotzkyism from Leninism. (Laughter.) For us, comrades, Leninism is sufficient. (A voice: “So Trotzky has abandoned his standpoint?”) Wait, comrades.

We have joined forces with Trotzky for the defence of particular views against particular deviations in the Party. In doing this we have merely followed the practice of Lenin (Laughter) of joining forces with this or that group within the leading Party organs in the case of inner-Party conflicts. Comrade Lenin, as you should be aware, fought with us against Trotzky, and at other times fought with Comrades Trotzky against this or that deviation, against Rykov or Tomsky. These are facts in the history of the Party. They are recorded in the history of the Party. And the fact that we have been induced by what we consider — rightly or wrongly — to be our duty at the present time, to co-operate with comrade Trotzky in the defence of a certain line — in this there is nothing impermissible, much less anything detrimental.

One of the political documents of this political bloc consists of these words of Comrade Trotzky's (quoted from his “Reply to the questions put by comrades to the Opposition”, printed in the “Stenographic minutes of the sessions of the Polit Bureau. 8. and 11. Oct. 1926):

“We proceed from the conviction that, as experience has incontestably shown, Lenin was without doubt invariably right in all questions, touching to any extent on principles, in which any one of us was not agreement with Lenin.”

And when you read further that Comrade Trotzky has stated, in this same document, that:

“In the question of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, we are in complete and entire agreement with the theoretical and practical teaching formulated by Lenin.”

Then I think you will admit that our bloc with Trotzky is nothing extraordinary or extravagant, and that the question in hand is not whether the bloc has included Trotzky or not, but whether its general lines have been correct or the contrary.

Comrades, after all this I ask you: Can the existing differences of opinion be settled within the boundaries set by our joint work, and by the solidarity and responsibility felt by every one of us for the work of the Party.

We declare: Yes, this can and must be done. You do not realise, comrades, that the acceptance of the resolution on the social democratic deviation throws great difficulties in the way of joint work. We for our part are prepared to exert our utmost efforts to engage in practical work in accordance with the Party decisions, the decisions of the C. C., and of the Conference, and to subordinate all our steps, all our actions and utterances, to the supreme principle of the unity of the Party and the firmer establishment of the dictatorship. We place on record that our declaration, to the effect that the system of fractions is inconsistent with the interests of Party Unity and the proletarian dictatorship, is our political declaration, that we stand on this platform only; and that we recognise that no individual member of the Party, whatever position he may occupy, can avoid the responsibility incurred by the general policy of the Party. We believe that it is our duty as communists to defend our views within the limits of those differences of opinion which actually exist, but that it is also our duty — which we will fulfill — to submit to the Party discipline, and to recognise our responsibility for the joint work.

Speech of Comrade Trotzky.

Comrades! The resolution accuses the Opposition, including me, of a social-democratic deviation. I have thought over all the points of contention which have divided us, the minority of the C. C., from the majority during the period just past, that is, the period in which the designation "opposition bloc" has been in use. I must place on record that the points of contention, and our standpoint with respect to the point of contention, offer no basis for the accusation of a "social democratic deviation".

THE QUESTIONS IN DISPUTE.

The question upon which we have disagreed most, comrades, is that which asks which danger threatens us during the present epoch: the danger that our state industry remains backward, or that it rushes too hastily forward. The Opposition — in which I am included — has proved that the real danger threatening us is that our state industry may remain behind the development of the national economy as a whole. We have pointed out that the policy being pursued in the distribution of national income involves the further growth of the disproportion. For some reason or other this has been named "pessimism". Comrades, arithmetic knows neither pessimism nor optimism, neither discouragement nor capitulation. Figures are figures. If you examine the control figures of our planned economics, you will find that these figures show the disproportion, or more exactly expressed, the shortage of industrial goods, to have reached the amount of 380 million roubles last year, whilst this year the figure will be 500 millions, that is, the original figures of the planning commission show the disproportion to have increased by 25 per cent. Comrade Rykov stated in his theses that we might hope (merely hope) that the disproportion will not increase this year. What justification is there for this "hope?" The fact that the harvest is not so favourable as we all expected. Were I to follow in the false tracks of our critics, I might say that Comrade Rykov's theses welcome the fact that the unfavourable conditions obtaining at harvest time detracted from crops which were otherwise not bad, since, had the harvest been greater, the result would have been a greater disproportion. (Comrade Rykov: "I am of a different opinion.") The figures speak for themselves. (A voice: "Why did you not take part in the discussion on Comrade Rykov's report?") Comrade Kamenev has here told you why we did not. Because I could not have added anything to this special economic report, in the form of amendments or arguments, that we had not brought forward at the April Plenum. The amendments and other proposals submitted by me and other comrades to the April Plenum remain in full force today. But the economic experience gained since April is obviously too small to give us room for hope that at the present stage the comrades present at this Conference will be convinced. To bring up these points of contention again, before the actual course of economic life has tested them, would arouse useless discussion. These questions will be more acceptable to the Party when they can be answered by the statistics based on the latest experience; for objective economic experience does not decide whether figures are optimistic or pessimistic, but solely whether they are right or wrong. I believe our standpoint on the disproportion to have been right.

We have disagreed on the rate of our industrialisation, and I have been among those comrades who have pointed out that the present rate is insufficient, and that precisely this insufficient speed in industrialisation imparts the greatest importance to the differentiation process going on in the villages. To be sure it is no catastrophe that the kulak raises his head, or — this is the other aspect of the same subject — that the poorer peasantry no longer preponderates. These are some of the serious accompaniments of the period of transition. They are unhealthy signs. It need not be said that they give no cause for "alarm". But they are phenomena which must be correctly estimated. And I have been among those comrades who have maintained that the process of differentiation of the village may assume a dangerous form if industry lags behind, that is, if the disproportion increases. The Opposition maintains that it is our duty to lessen the disproportion year by year. I see nothing social democratic in this.

We have insisted that the differentiation of the village demands a more elastic taxation policy with respect to the various strata of the peasantry, a reduction of taxation for the poorer

middle strata of the peasantry, and increased taxation for the well-to-do middle strata, and an energetic pressure upon the kulak, especially in his relations to trading capital. We have proposed that 40 per cent of the poor peasantry should be freed from taxation altogether. Are we right or not? I believe we are right; you believe we are wrong. But what is "social democratic" about this is a mystery to me. (Laughter.)

We have asserted that the increasing differentiation among the peasantry, taking place under the conditions imposed by the backwardness of our industry, brings with it the necessity of double safeguards in the field of politics, that is, we were entirely unable to agree with the extension of the franchise with respect to the kulak, the employer and exploiter, if only on a small scale. We raised the alarm when the election inspectorates extended the suffrage among the petty bourgeoisie. Were we right or not? You consider that our alarm was "exaggerated". Well, even assuming that it was, there is nothing social democratic about it.

We demanded and proposed that the course being taken by the agricultural cooperatives towards the "highly productive middle farmer", under which name we generally find the kulak, should be severely condemned. We proposed that the tendency of the credit cooperatives towards the side of the well-to-do peasantry should be condemned. I cannot comprehend, comrades, what you find "social democratic" in this.

There have been differences of opinion in the question of wages. In substance these differences consist of our being of the opinion that at the given stage of development of our industry and economics, and at our present level of economics, the wage question must not be settled on the assumption that the worker must first increase the productivity of labour, which will then raise the wages, but that the contrary must be the rule, that is, a rise in wages, however modest, must be the prerequisite for an increased productivity of labour. (A voice: "And where is the money coming from?") This may be right or it may not, but it is not "social democratic".

We have pointed out the connection between various well known aspects of our inner-Party life and the growth of bureaucratism. I believe there is nothing "social democratic" about this either.

We have further opposed an overestimation of the economic elements of the capitalist stabilisation, and the underestimation of its political elements. If we inquire, for instance: What does the economic stabilisation consist of in England at the present time?, then it appears that England is going to ruin, that its trade balance is adverse, that its foreign trade returns are falling off, that its production is declining. This is the "economic stabilisation" of England. But to whom is bourgeois England clinging? Not to Baldwin, not to Thomas, but to Purcell. Purcellism is the pseudonym of the present "stabilisation" in England. We are therefore of the opinion that it is fundamentally wrong, in consideration of the working masses who carried out the general strike, to combine either directly or indirectly with Purcell. This is the reason why we have demanded the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee. I see nothing "social democratic" in this.

We have insisted upon a fresh revision of our trade union Statutes, upon which subject I reported to the C. C. A revision of those statutes from which the word "Profintern" was struck out last year, and replaced by "International Trade Union Association", under which it is impossible to understand anything else than "Amsterdam". I am glad to say that this revision of last year's revision has been accomplished, and the word "Profintern" has been replaced in our trade union statutes. But why was our uneasiness on the subject "social democratic"? That, comrades, is something which I entirely fail to understand.

I should like, as briefly as possible, to enumerate the main points of the differences of opinion which have arisen of late. Our standpoint in the questions concerned has been that we have observed the dangers likely to threaten the class line of the Party and of the workers' State under the conditions imposed by a long continuance of the Nep, and our encirclement by international capitalism. But these differences of opinion, and the standpoint adopted by us in the defence of our opinions, cannot be construed into a "social democratic deviation" by the most complicated logical or even scholastic methods.

THE CHARACTER OF OUR REVOLUTION.

It has therefore been found necessary to leave these actual and serious differences of opinion, engendered by the given epoch of our economic and political development, and to go back into the past in order to construe differences in the conception of the "character of our revolution" in general — not in the given period of our revolution, not with regard to the given concrete task, but with regard to the character of the revolution in general, or, as expressed in the theses, the revolution "in itself", the revolution "in its substance". When a German speaks of a thing "in itself", he is using a metaphysical term placing the revolution outside of all connection with the real world around it; it is abstracted from yesterday and to-morrow, and regarded as a "substance" from which everything will proceed. Now then, in the question of the actual "substance" of revolution I have been found guilty, in the ninth year of our revolution, of having denied the socialist character of our revolution! No more and no less! I discovered this for the first time in this resolution itself. If the comrades find it necessary for some reason to construct a resolution on quotations from my writings — and the main portion of the resolution, pushing into the foreground the theory of original sin (Trotzkyism"), is built up upon quotations from my writings between 1917 and 1922 — then it would at least be advisable to select the essential from all I have written on the character of our revolution.

You will excuse me, comrades, but it is no pleasure to have to set aside the actual subject, and to retail where and when I wrote this or that. But this resolution, in substantiating the "social democratic" deviation, refers to passages from my writings; and I am obliged to give the information. In 1922 I was commissioned by the Party to write the book: "Terrorism and Communism" against Kautsky, against the characterisation of our revolution by Kautsky as a non-proletarian and non-socialist revolution. A large number of editions of this book were distributed both at home and abroad by the Comintern. The book met with no hostile reception among our nearest comrades, nor from Lenin. This book is not quoted in the resolution.

In 1922 I was commissioned by the Polit Bureau to write the book entitled: "Between Imperialism and Revolution." In this book I utilised the special experience gained in Georgia, in the form of a refutation of the standpoint of those international social democrats who were using the Georgian rising as material for agitation against us, for the purpose of subjecting to a fresh examination the main questions of that proletarian revolution which has a right to tear down not only petty bourgeois prejudices, but also petty bourgeois institutions.

At the III. Congress of the Comintern I give a report, on behalf of the C. C., declaring in substance that we had entered on an epoch of unstable balance. I opposed Comrade Bucharin, who at that time was of the opinion that we should pass through an uninterrupted series of revolutions and crises until the victory of Socialism in the whole world, and that there would not and could not be any "stabilisation". At that time Comrade Bucharin accused me of a Right deviation (perhaps social democratic too?) In full agreement with Lenin I defended at the III. Congress the theses which I had formulated. The import of the theses was that we, despite the slower speed of the revolution, would pass successfully through this epoch by developing the socialist elements of our economics.

At the IV. World Congress in 1923 I was commissioned by the C. C. to follow Lenin with a report on the NEP. What did I prove? I proved that the Nep. merely signifies a change in the forms and methods of socialist development. And now, instead of taking these works of mine, which may have been good or bad, but were at least **fundamental**, and in which, on behalf of the Party, I defined the character of our revolution in the years between 1920 and 1923, you seize upon a few little passages, each only two or three lines, out of a preface and a postscript written at the same period, I repeat that none of the passages quoted is from a fundamental work. These four little quotations (1907 to 1922) form the sole foundation for the accusation that I deny the socialist character of our revolution. The structure of the accusation thus being completed, every imaginable original sin is added to it, even the sin of the opposition of 1925. The demand for a more rapid industrialisation, and the proposal to increase the taxation of the kulaks, all arise from these four passages. (A voice: "Form no fractions!")

Comrades, I regret having to take your time, but I must quote a few more passages — I could adduce hundreds — in

confutation of all that the resolution ascribes to me. First of all I must draw your attention to the fact that the four quotations upon which the theory of my original sin is based, have all been taken from writings of mine between 1917 and 1922. Everything that I have said since appears to have been swept away by the wind. Nobody knows whether I subsequently regarded our revolution as socialist or not. Today, at the end of 1926, the present standpoint of the so-called Opposition in the leading questions of economics and politics is sought in passages from my personal writings between 1917 and 1922, and not even in passages from my chief works, but in works written for some quite chance occasion. I shall return to these quotations, and answer for every one of them. But first permit me to adduce some quotations of a more essential character, written at the same period:

For instance, the following is an extract from my speech at the conference of the Moscow Trade Union Council on 28. October 1921, after the introduction of the Nep:

"We have reorganised our economic policy in anticipation of a slow development of our economics. We reckon with the possibility that the revolution in Europe, though developing and growing, is developing more slowly than we expected. The bourgeoisie has proved more tenacious. Even in our own country we are obliged to reckon with a slower transition to Socialism, for we are surrounded by capitalist countries. We must concentrate our forces on the largest and best equipped undertakings. At the same time we must not forget that the taxation in kind among the peasantry, and the increase of leased undertakings form a basis for the development of the economics of commodities, for the accumulation of capital, and for the rise of a new bourgeoisie. At the same time the socialist economy will be built up on the narrower but firmer basis of big industry.

At a members' meeting of the C. P. of the S. U., on 10. November of the same year, in the Moscow district of Sokolniki, I stated:

"What have we now? We have now the process of socialist revolution, in the first place in a State, and in the second place in a State which is the most backward of all both economically and culturally, and surrounded on all sides by capitalist countries."

What conclusion did I draw from this? Did I propose capitulation? I proposed the following:

"It is our task to make Socialism prove its advantages... The peasant will be the judge who pronounces on the advantages or draw-backs of the socialist state. We are competing with capitalism in the peasant market..."

"What is the present basis for our conviction that we shall be victorious? There are many reasons justifying our belief. These lie both in the international situation and in the development of the Communist Party; in the fact that we retain the power in our hands, and in the fact that we permit free trade solely within the limits which we deem necessary."

This, comrades, was said in 1921, and not in 1926!

In my report at the IV. World Congress (directed against Otto Bauer, to whom my relationship has now been discovered) I spoke as follows:

"Our main weapon in the economic struggle, as based on the market, is state power. Only shortsighted reformists are unable to grasp the importance of this instrument. The bourgeoisie knows it well. That is proved by its whole history.

Other tools in the hands of the proletariat are: the possession of the most important productive forces of the country, of all economic traffic, of all mines, of the majority of the undertakings working up raw materials. These are subject to the immediate economic control of the working class. At the same time the working class owns the land, and the peasant gives hundreds of millions of poods of grain for it every year, in the form of taxation in kind.

The frontiers of the country are in the hands of the Workers' state; foreign goods, and foreign capital, can only be imported into the country to the extent approved by the workers' state.

These are the instruments and means for building up Socialism".

In a booklet published by me in 1923, under the title of "Questions of daily life", you may read on this subject?

"What has the working class actually attained and secured by its struggle up to now?"

1. The dictatorship of the proletariat (with the aid of the workers' and peasants' State led by the Communist Party).

2. The Red Army as the material support of the proletarian dictatorship.

3. The socialisation of the most important means of production, without which the dictatorship of the proletariat would be an empty form, without meaning.

4. The monopoly of foreign trade, a necessary premise for the building up of socialism in a country surrounded by capitalism.

These four elements, irrevocably gained, form the steel framework of our work. Thanks to this framework, every further economic or cultural success which we achieve — provided it is a real and not a supposed success — will necessarily become a constituent part of our socialist structure."

This same booklet contains another and even more definite formulation:

"The easier the revolutionary upheaval has been — relatively speaking — to the Russian proletariat, the more difficult is its task of establishing the socialist state of society. But the framework of our new social life, welded by the revolution, supported by four fundamental pillars (see beginning of chapter), imparts to every sincere and sensibly directed effort in economics and culture an objectively socialist character. In the bourgeois state of society the worker, unconsciously and unintentionally, enriches the bourgeoisie more and more the better he works. In the Soviet State the good and, conscientious worker, without thinking of it or troubling himself about it (if he is a non-political worker), performs socialist work, and increases the means of the working class. This is the actual import of the October revolution, and in this sense the New Economic Policy brings no change whatever."

TOWARDS CAPITALISM OR SOCIALISM?

I could prolong this chain of quotations indefinitely, for I never have and never could characterise our revolution differently. I shall confine myself however to one more passage, from a book quoted by Comrade Stalin ("Towards Capitalism or Socialism?"). This book was published for the first time in 1925, and was printed originally as feuilleton in the "Pravda". The editors of our central organ have never drawn my attention to any heresies in this book with respect to the character of our revolution. This year the second edition of the book was issued. It has been translated into different languages by the Comintern, and it is the first time that I hear that it gives a false idea of our economic development. Comrade Stalin has read you a few lines picked out arbitrarily in order to show that this is "unclearly formulated". I am thus obliged to read a somewhat longer passage, in order to prove that the idea in question is quite clearly formulated. The following is stated in the preface, devoted to a criticism of our bourgeois and social democratic critics, above all Kautsky and Otto Bauer. Here you may read:

"These judgments (formed by the enemies of our economics) assume two forms: in the first place they assert that in building up socialist economics we are ruining the country; but in the second place they assert that in developing the forces of production we are really returning to capitalism.

The former of these two criticisms is characteristic of the mentality of the bourgeoisie. The second is peculiar to social democracy, that is, to the bourgeois mentality socialistically veiled. There is no strict boundary between these two descriptions of criticism, and very frequently interchange of arguments between them, without either of them noticing that he is using his neighbour's weapon, in the enthusiasm of the hold way against "communist barbarity."

The present booklet hopes to serve the object of showing the unprejudiced reader that both are deceivers — both the openly big bourgeois and the petty bourgeois masquerading as socialist. They lie when they say that the Bolsheviks have ruined Russia... They lie when they say that the development of productive forces is the road to capitalism; the rôle played by state economics in industry, in transport and traffic service, trade, finance, and credit, does not

lessen with the growth of productive forces, but on the contrary increases within the collective economics of the country. Facts and figures prove this beyond all doubt.

In agriculture the matter is much more complicated. To a Marxist there is nothing unexpected in this. The transition from the "atomised" individual farming system of agriculture to socialist agriculture is only conceivable after a number of steps have been surmounted in technics, economics, and cultivation. The fundamental premise for this transition is that the power remains in the hands of the class anxious to lead society to Socialism, and becoming increasingly capable of influencing the peasant population by means of state industry, by means of technical improvements in agriculture, and thereby furnishing the prerequisites for the collectivisation of agricultural work."

The draft of the resolution on the Opposition states that Trotsky's standpoint closely approaches that of Otto Bauer, who has said that "in Russia, where the proletariat represents only a small minority of the nation, the proletariat can only maintain its rule temporarily, and is bound to lose it again as soon as the peasant majority of the nation has become culturally mature enough to take over the rule itself".

In the first place, comrades, who could entertain the idea that so absurd a formulation could occur to any one of us? Whatever is to be understood by: "as soon as the peasant majority of the nation has become culturally mature enough?" What does this mean? What are we to understand by "culture?" Under capitalist conditions the peasantry have no independent culture. As far as culture is concerned the peasantry may mature under the influence of the proletariat or of the bourgeoisie. These are the only two possibilities existing for the cultural advance of the peasantry. To a Marxist the idea that the "culturally matured" peasantry, having overthrown the proletariat, could take over power on its own account, is a wildly prejudiced absurdity. The experience of two revolutions has taught us that the peasantry, should it come into conflict with the proletariat and overthrow the proletarian power, simply forms a bridge — through Bonapartism — for the bourgeoisie. An independent peasant state founded neither on proletarian nor bourgeois culture is impossible. This whole construction of Otto Bauer's collapses into a lamentable petty bourgeois absurdity.

We are told that we have not believed in the establishment of Socialism. And at the same time we are accused of wanting to pillage the peasantry (not the kulaks, but the peasantry!).

I think, comrades, that these are not words out of our dictionary at all. The communists cannot propose to the workers' State to "plunder" the peasantry, and it is precisely with the peasantry that we are concerned. A proposal to free 40 per cent of the poor peasantry from all taxation, and to lay these taxes upon the kulak, may be right or it may be wrong, but it can never be interpreted as a proposal to "plunder" the peasantry.

I ask you: If we have no faith in the establishment of Socialism in our country, or (as is said of me) we propose that the European revolution be passively awaited, then why do we propose to "plunder" the peasantry? To what end? That is incomprehensible. We are of the opinion that industrialisation — the basis of socialisation — is proceeding too slowly, and that this places the peasantry at a disadvantage. If, let us say, the quantity of agricultural products put upon the market this year be 20 per cent more than last — I take these figures with a reservation —, and at the same time the grain price has sunk by 18 per cent and the prices of various industrial products have risen by 16 per cent, as has been the case, then the peasant gains less than when his crops are poorer and the retail prices for industrial products lower. The acceleration of industrialisation, made possible to a great extent by the increased taxation of the kulak, will result in the production of a larger quantity of goods, reducing the retail price, to the advantage of the workers and of the greater part of the peasantry.

It is possible that you do not agree with this. But nobody can deny that it is a system of views on the development of our economics. How can you assert that we do not believe in the possibility of socialist development, and yet at the same time that we demand the plundering of the mujik? With what object? For what purpose? Nobody can explain this. Again, I have often asked myself why the dissolution of the Anglo-Russian Committee can be supposed to imply a call to leave

the trade unions? And why does the non-entry into the Amsterdam International not constitute an appeal to the workers not to join the Amsterdam trade unions? (A voice: "That will be explained to you!") I have never received an answer to this question, and never will. (A voice: "You will get your answer".) Neither shall I receive a reply to the question of how we contrive to disbelieve in the realisation of Socialism, and yet endeavour to "plunder" the peasantry.

The book of mine from which I last quoted speaks in detail of the importance of the correct distribution of our national income, since our economic development is proceeding amidst the struggle of two tendencies: the socialist and the capitalist tendency.

"The issue of the struggle depends on the rate of development of these tendencies. In other words: Should state industry develop more slowly than agriculture; should the opposite poles of capitalist farmer "on top" and proletariat "at the bottom" separate more widely and rapidly in the course of development — then the process would of course lead to the restoration of capitalism.

But our enemies may do their best to prove the inevitability of this possibility. Even if they go about it much more skillfully than the unfortunate Kautsky (or MacDonald), they will burn their fingers. Is the possibility just indicated entirely excluded? Theoretically it is not. If the ruling Party were to commit one error after another, both in politics and economics, if it should thus hamper the development of industry now so promising, and if it were to relinquish control of the political and economic development of the peasantry, then, of course, the cause of Socialism in our country would be lost. But we have not the slightest reason to adopt such premises for our prognosis. How to lose power, how to throw away the achievements of the proletariat, and how to work for capitalism, these are points which were made brilliantly clear by Kautsky and his friends to the international proletariat after the 9. November 1918. Nobody needs to add anything on this subject.

Our tasks, our aims, and our methods are very different. What we want to show is the way to maintain and firmly establish the power once seized, and the way in which the proletarian form of state is to be given the economic content of socialism."

The whole contents of this book (A voice: "There is nothing about the cooperatives in it!") — I shall come to the co-operatives — the whole contents of this book are devoted to the subject of how the proletarian form of State is to be given the economic content of Socialism. It may be said (insinuations have already been made in this direction): Yes, you believed that we were moving towards Socialism so long as the process of reconstruction was going on, and so long as industry developed at a speed of 45 or 35 per cent yearly, but now that we have arrived at a crisis of foundation capital, and you see the difficulties of extending foundation capital, you have been seized with a so-called "panic".

I cannot quote the whole of the chapter on: "The rate of development, its material possibilities and its limits". It points out the four elements characterising the advantages of our system over capitalism, and draws the following conclusion:

"Taken all in all, these four advantages — properly applied — will enable us to increase the coefficient of our industrial growth not only to double the 6 per cent of the pre-war period, but to triple this, or even more."

If I am not mistaken, the coefficient of our industrial growth will amount, according to the plans, to 18 per cent. In this there are, of course, still reconstruction elements. But in any case the extremely rough statistical prognosis which I made as an example eighteen months ago coincides fairly well with our actual speed this year.

IS THIS TROTZKYISM?

You ask: What is the explanation of those frightful passages quoted in the resolution. I shall have to answer this question. I must first, however, repeat that no single word has been quoted from the fundamental works which I wrote on the character of the revolution between 1917 and 1922, and complete silence is preserved on everything that I have written since 1922 even on that written last year and this year. Four passages are quoted. Comrade Stalin has dealt with them in detail, and they are

referred to in the resolution, so you will permit me to devote some words to them as well.

"The workers' movement is victorious in the democratic revolution. The bourgeoisie becomes counter-revolutionary. Among the peasantry the well-to-do elements, as well as a considerable section of the middle farmers, will become more "sensible", quieten down, and go over to the counter-revolution, in order that they may snatch the power out of the hands of the proletariat and the poor peasantry.... The struggle would be almost hopeless for the Russian proletariat alone, and its defeat would be inevitable... were the European socialist proletariat not to hasten to the aid of the Russian proletariat."

I am afraid, comrades, that if anyone told you that these lines represented a malicious product of Trozkyism, many comrades would believe it. But this passage is Lenin's. The 5 Lenin portfolio contains the draft of a pamphlet which Lenin intended to write at the end of 1905. Here this possible situation is described: The workers are victorious in the democratic revolution, the well-to-do section of the peasantry and a great part of the middle peasantry go over to counter-revolution. I may say that this passage is quoted in the last number of the „Bolshevik", on page 68, but unfortunately with a grave misrepresentation, although the quotation is given in inverted commas: the words referring to the considerable section of the middle farmers are simply left out. I call upon you to compare the 5 Lenin portfolio, page 451 with the last number of the „Bolshevik", page 68.

I could quote dozens of such passages from Lenin's works: Vol VI, page 398; vol IX, page 410; vol VII/I, page 192. (I have not the time to read them, but anyone may look up the references for himself.) I shall only quote one passage from vol. IX, page 415:

"The Russian revolution (he is referring to the democratic revolution) cannot maintain and firmly establish its achievements by its own powers.... if there is no revolution in the West. Without this prerequisite a restoration of the old order is unavoidable, both in communalisation and nationalisation, and in the distribution of land, for the small farmer will always form a support of restoration of any form of property or ownership. After the complete victory of the proletariat, the small farmer will inevitably turn against the proletariat." (A voice: We have introduced the Nep.)

True, I shall refer to that presently.

Let us now turn to that passage which I wrote in 1922, in order that we may see how my standpoint on the revolution in the epoch 1904/05 had developed.

I have no intention, comrades, of raising the question of the theory of permanent revolution. This theory — both in respect of what has been right in it, and of what has been incomplete and wrong — has nothing whatever to do with our present contentions. In any case this theory of permanent revolution, to which so much attention has been devoted of late, is not to the smallest extent among the responsibilities of either the opposition of 1925 nor the opposition of 1923, and even I myself regard it as a question which has long been settled ad acta.

But let us return to the passage quoted in the resolution. (This I wrote in 1922, but from the standpoint of 1905/06.)

"After seizing power, the proletariat will come into hostile conflict with not only all those groups of the bourgeoisie which supported it at the commencement of its revolutionary struggle, but with the broad masses of the peasantry with whose help it came into power."

Although this was written in 1922, it is put in the future tense: The proletariat will come into conflict with the bourgeoisie, etc., since pre-revolutionary views are being described. I ask you: Has Lenin's prognosis of 1905/06, that the middle peasantry will go over to counter-revolution to a great extent, proved true? I maintain that it has proved true in part. (Voices: In part? When? Disturbance.) Yes, under the leadership of the Party, and above all under Lenin's leadership, the division between us and the peasantry was bridged over by the new economic policy. This is indisputable. (Disturbance.) If any of you imagine, comrades, that in 1926 I do not grasp the meaning of the new economic policy you are mistaken. I grasp the meaning of the new economic policy in 1926, perhaps not so well as other comrades, but still I grasp it. But you must remember that at that time, before there was any new economic policy, before there had been a revolution of 1917, and we were

sketching the first outlines of possible developments, utilising the experience won in previous revolutions — the great French revolution and the revolution of 1848 — at that time all Marxists, not omitting Lenin (I have given quotations), were of the opinion that after the democratic revolution was completed and the land given to the peasantry, the proletariat would encounter opposition from not only the big peasants, but from a considerable section of the middle peasants, who would represent a hostile and even counter-revolutionary force.

Have there been signs among us of the truth of this prognosis? Yes, there have been signs, and fairly distinct ones. For instance, when the Machno movement in the Ukraine helped the White Guards to sweep away the Soviet power, this was one proof of the correctness of Lenin's prognosis. The Antonov rising, the rising in Siberia, the rising on the Volga, the rising in Ural, the Cronstadt revolt, when the "middle peasantry" expressed their opinions to the Soviet power by means of ships' cannon — does not all this prove that Lenin's forecast was correct for a certain stage of development in the revolution? (Comrade Moysseyenko: "And what did you propose?"). Is it not perfectly clear that the passage written by me in 1922, on the division between us and the peasantry, was simply a statement of these facts?

We bridged over the schism between us and the peasantry by means of the Nep. And were there differences between us during the transition to the Nep? There were no differences during the transition to the Nep. (Disturbance.) There were differences in the trade union question before the transition to the Nep, whilst the Party was still seeking a means of escape from the blind alley. These differences were of serious importance. But in the question of the Nep, when Lenin submitted the Nep standpoint to the X. Party Congress, we all voted unanimously for this standpoint. And when the new trade union resolution arose as result of the new economic policy — a few months after the X. Party Congress — we again voted unanimously for this resolution in the C. C. But during the period of transition — and the change wrought by it was no small one — the peasants declared: "We are for the Bolsheviki, but against the communists." What does this mean? It means a peculiarly Russian form of desertion from the proletarian revolution on the part of the middle peasantry at a given stage.

I am reproached with having said that it is "hopeless to suppose that Revolutionary Russia can maintain itself in opposition to a conservative Europe". This I wrote in August 1917, and I believe that it was perfectly right. Have we maintained ourselves against a conservative Europe? Let us consider the facts. At the moment when Germany concluded the peace treaty with the Entente, the danger was especially great. Had the German revolution not broken out at this point — that German revolution which remained incomplete, suffocated by the social democrats, yet still sufficing to overthrow the old regime and to demoralise the Hohenzollern army — had, I repeat, the German revolution, such as it was, not broken out, then we should have been overthrown. It is not by accident that the passage contains the phrase "in opposition to a conservative Europe", and not "in opposition to a capitalist Europe". Against a conservative Europe, maintaining its whole apparatus, and in particular its armies. I ask you: Could we maintain ourselves under these circumstances, or could we not? (A voice: "Are you talking to children?"). That we still continue to exist is due to the fact that Europe has not remained what it was. Lenin wrote as follows on this subject:

"We are living not only in one State, but in a system of States, and the continued existence of the Soviet republic side by side with imperialist States is unthinkable as a permanency. In the end either one system or the other will win."

When did Lenin say this? On 18. March 1919, that is, two years after the October revolution. My words of 1917 signified that if our revolution did not shake Europe, did not move it, then we were lost. Is this not in substance the same? I ask all the older comrades, who thought politically before and during 1917: What was your conception of the revolution and its consequences?

When I try to recollect this, I can find no other formulation than approximately the following:

"We believed: either the international revolution will hasten to our aid, and then our victory is perfectly secure, or we shall perform our modest revolutionary work in

the consciousness that even if we are defeated we have served the cause of revolution, and that our experience will be useful for later revolutions. It was clear to us that the victory of proletarian revolution is impossible without the support of the international, the world revolution. Both before and after the revolution we believed: Now, or at least very soon, the revolution will break out in the other highly developed capitalist countries, or, should this not be the case, we are lost."

This was our conception of the fate of the revolution. Who said this? (Comrade Moysseyenko: "Lenin!". A voice: "And what did he say later on?"):

Lenin said this in 1921, whilst the passage quoted from me dates from 1917. I have thus a right to refer to what Lenin said in 1921. (A voice: "And what did Lenin say later on?") Later on I too said something different. (Laughter.) Both before the revolution, and after it, we believed that:

"Now, or at least very soon, the revolution will break out in the other highly developed capitalist countries, or, should this not be the case, we are lost."

But in spite of this:

"we exerted every effort to maintain the Soviet system at all costs, for we were aware that we were not only working for ourselves, but for the international revolution. We knew this, and we expressed this conviction both before the October revolution and after it, and at the time when the Brest-Litovsk peace was concluded. And speaking generally, we were right.

This passage goes on to say that our path has become more intricate and winding, but that in all essentials our prognosis was correct. As I have already said, we went over to the NEP unanimously, without any differences whatever. (Comrade Moysseyenko: "To save us from utter ruin!")

True, just for that reason, to save us from utter ruin.

Comrades, I beg you to extend the time allotted for my speech. I should like to speak on the theory of Socialism in one country. I ask for another half hour. (Disturbance.)

Comrades, in the question of the relations between the proletariat and the peasantry...

Chairman: Please wait till we have decided. I submit three proposals: firstly, to adhere to the original time allotted to Comrade Trotzky; secondly: a prolongation of half an hour; thirdly, a prolongation of a quarter of an hour. (On a vote being taken there is a majority for the half hour prolongation.)

RELATIONS TO THE PEASANTRY.

The next passage quoted from my writings has brought me the reproach that: Whilst Lenin said: ten to twenty years of correct relations with the peasantry, and our victory is assured on an international scale, Trotzkyism, on the contrary, assumes that the proletariat cannot enter into any correct relations with the peasantry until the world revolution has been accomplished. First of all I must ask the actual meaning of the passage quoted. Lenin speaks of ten to twenty years of correct relations to the peasantry. This means that Lenin did not expect Socialism to be established within ten to twenty years. Why? Because under Socialism we must understand a state of society in which there is neither proletariat nor peasantry, or any classes whatever. Socialism abolishes the opposition between town and country. Thus the term of twenty years is set before us, in the course of which we must pursue a political line leading to correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry.

It has been asserted however that Trotzkyism is of the opinion that there can be no correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry until the world revolution has been accomplished. I am thus alleged to lay down a law according to which incorrect relations must be maintained with the peasantry as far as possible, until international revolution has been victorious. (Laughter.) Apparently it was not intended to express this idea here, as there is no sense in it whatever.

What was the NEP? The NEP has been a process of shunting onto a new track, precisely for the establishment of correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry. Were there difference between us on this subject? No, there were none. What we are quarrelling about now is the taxation of the kulak, and the forms and methods to be adopted in allying the proletariat with the village poor. What is the actual matter in hand? The best method of establishing correct

relations between the peasantry and the proletariat. You have the right to disagree with individual proposals of ours, but you must recognise that the whole ideological struggle revolves around the question of what relations are correct at the present stage of development.

Were there differences between us in 1917 on the peasant question? No. The peasant decree, the "social revolutionary" peasant decree, was adopted unanimously by us as our basis. The land decree, drawn up by Lenin, was accepted by us unanimously, and gave rise to no differences in our circles. Did the policy of "de-kulakisation" afford any cause for differences? No, there were no differences on this. (A voice: "And Brest?") Did the struggle commenced by Lenin, for winning over the middle peasantry, give rise to differences? No, it gave rise to none. I do not assert that there were no differences whatever, but I definitely maintain that however great the differences of opinion may have been in various and even important questions, there were no differences of opinion in the matter of the main line of policy to be pursued with regard to the peasantry.

In 1919 there were rumours abroad of differences on this question. And what did Lenin write on the subject? Let us look back. I was asked at that time by the peasant **Gulov**: "What are the differences of opinion between you and Ilyitsch?", and I replied to this question both in the "Pravda" and in the "Izvestia". Lenin wrote as follows on the matter, both in the "Pravda" and the "Izvestia", in February 1919:

"The 'Izvestia' of 2. February 1919 published a letter from a peasant named **Gulov**, who raises the question of the relations between our workers' and peasants' government and the middle peasantry, and states that there are rumours spread about to the effect that there is no harmony between Lenin and Trotzky, that there are great differences of opinion between them, and precisely in the question of the middle peasantry. Comrade Trotzky has already replied in his 'Letter to the Middle Peasants', published in the 'Izvestia' on 7. February. Comrade Trotzky states in this letter that the rumours of differences between me and him are the most monstrous and wicked lies, spread abroad by the landowners and capitalists, or their willing and unwilling accomplices. I for my part fully endorse the declaration thus made by Comrade Trotzky. There are no differences between us, and with reference to the middle peasants there are not only no differences between me and Trotzky, but no differences in the whole Communist Party, of which we are both members. Comrade Trotzky explains in his letter, clearly and in detail, why the Communist Party and the present workers' and peasants' government, elected by the Soviets, and composed of members of the Party, do not regard the middle peasantry as their enemies. I give my signature doubly to every thing said by comrade Trotzky."

This was before the NEP. Then came the transition to the NEP. I repeat once more that the transition to the NEP gave rise to no differences. On the NEP question I gave a report before the IV. World Congress, in the course of which I polemised against **Otto Bauer**. Later I wrote as follows:

"The NEP is regarded by the bourgeoisie and the Mensheviks as a necessary (but of course "insufficient" step towards the release of productive forces. The Menshevik theoreticians, both of the Kautsky and the Otto Bauer variety, have welcomed the NEP as the dawn of capitalist restoration in Russia. They add: Either the NEP will destroy the Bolshevik dictatorship (favourable result), or the Bolshevik dictatorship will destroy the NEP (regrettable result.)"

The whole of my report at the IV. Party Congress went to prove that the NEP will not destroy the Bolshevik dictatorship, but that the Bolshevik dictatorship, under the conditions given by the NEP, will secure the supremacy of the socialist elements of economics over the capitalist.

LENIN ON SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

Another passage from my works has been brought up against me — and here I come to the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country —, which reads as follows:

"The contradictions in the position of the workers' government in a backward country with an overwhelming agrarian population can only be solved on an international

scale, and in the arena of the proletarian world revolution."

This was said in 1922. The accusing resolution makes the following statement:

"The Conference places on record that such views as these on the part of comrade Trotzky and his followers, in the fundamental question of the character and prospects of our revolution, have **nothing in common** with the views of our Party, with Leninism."

If it had been stated that a shade of difference existed — I do not find this even today —, or that these views have not yet been precisely formulated (and I do not see the precise formulation). But it is stated quite flatly: these views "have nothing in common with the views of the Party, with Leninism".

Here I must quote a few lines closely related to Leninism:

"The complete victory of the socialist revolution in one country is unthinkable, and demands the active co-operation of at least some advanced countries, **among which we cannot count Russia.**"

It was not I who said this, but a greater than I. Lenin said this on 8. November 1918. Not before the October revolution, but on 8. November 1918, one year after we had seized power. If he had said nothing else but this, we could easily infer what we liked from it by tearing one sentence or the other out of its context. (A voice: "He was speaking of the final victory!") No, pardon me, he said: "demands the active co-operation". Here it is impossible to sidetrack from the main question to the question of "intervention", for it is plainly stated that the victory of Socialism demands — not merely protection against intervention — but the co-operation of "at least some advanced countries, **among which we cannot count Russia.**" (Voices: "And what follows from that?") This is not the only passage in which we see that not merely an intervention is meant. And thus the conclusion to be drawn is the fact that the standpoint which I have defended, to the effect that the internal contradictions arising out of the backwardness of our country must be solved by international revolution, is not my exclusive property, but that Lenin defended these same views, only incomparably more definitely and categorically.

We are told that this applied to the epoch in which the law of the unequal development of the capitalist countries is supposed to have been still unknown, that is, the epoch before imperialism. I cannot go thoroughly into this. But I must unfortunately place on record that Comrade Stalin commits a great theoretical and historical error here. The law of the unequal development of capitalism is older than imperialism. Capitalism is developing very unequally today in the various countries. But in the nineteenth century this inequality was greater than in the twentieth. At that time England was lord of the world, whilst Japan on the other hand was a feudal state closely confined within its own limits. At the time when serfdom was abolished among us, Japan began to adapt itself to capitalist civilisation. China was, however, still wrapt in the deepest slumber. And so forth. At this time the inequality of capitalist development was greater than now. These inequalities were as well known to **Marx** and **Engels** as they are to us. Imperialism has developed a more "levelling" tendency than has pre-imperialist capitalism, for the reason that financial capital is the most elastic form of capital. It is, however, indisputable that today, too, there are great inequalities in development. But if it is maintained that in the nineteenth century, before imperialism, capitalism developed less unequally, and the theory of the possibility of Socialism in one country was therefore wrong at that time, whilst today, now that imperialism has increased the heterogeneity of development, the theory of Socialism in one country has become correct, then this assertion contradicts all historical experience, and completely reverses facts. No, this will not do; other and more serious arguments must be sought.

Comrade Stalin has written:

"Those who deny the possibility of the establishment of Socialism in one country must deny at the same time the justifiability of the October Revolution." (Stalin: "Problems of Leninism", p. 215.)

But in 1918 we heard from Lenin that the establishment of Socialism requires the direct co-operation of some advanced countries, "to which we cannot count Russia." Yet Lenin did not deny the justifiability of the October revolution. And he wrote as follows regarding this in 1918:

"I know that there are some ingenious people (this was written against the adherents of Kautsky and Suchanov), who think themselves very clever, and even call themselves

socialists; these maintain that we should not have seized power until revolution had broken out in all countries. They are not aware that in speaking thus they are departing from revolution, and going over to the bourgeoisie. To wait until the working masses accomplish the international revolution is to wait till we are stiff and rigid, to wait till we are frozen to death. This is nonsense..."

I am sorry, but it goes on as follows:

"This is nonsense. The difficulty of revolution is known to all of us. For the final victory can only be on an international scale, and can only be brought about by the joint exertions of the workers of all countries. (Lenin, vol. 15, page 287, written on 14. May 1918.)

Despite this, Lenin did not deny the "justifiability" of the October revolution.

And further. In 1921 — not in 1914, but in 1921, Lenin wrote:

"In the advanced capitalist countries there is a class of agricultural labourers, created by decades of wage work. It is only in countries where this class is sufficiently developed that the transition from capitalism to Socialism is possible."

Here it is not a question of intervention, but of the level of economic development, and of the development of the class relations of the country.

"In many of our works, and in all our utterances in the press, we have emphasised that this is not the case in Russia, that in Russia the industrial workers are in the minority, and that the overwhelming majority are small farmers. Social revolution in such a country as this can only be finally successful under two conditions: firstly the condition that it is supported at the right time by the social revolution in one or several more advanced countries....

The other condition is the understanding between the proletariat and the majority of the peasant population....

We know that only an understanding with the peasantry can save the socialist revolution in Russia, so long as social revolution has not broken out in other countries. This must be stated openly at all meetings, and in the whole press." (Lenin, speech at the X. Party Congress of the R. C. P., 1921.)

Lenin did not state that the understanding with the peasantry sufficed, enabling us to build up Socialism independent of the fate of the international proletariat. No, this understanding is only one of the conditions. The other condition is the support to be given the revolution by other countries. He combines these two conditions with each another, emphasising their special necessity for us as we live in a backward country.

And finally, it is brought up against me that I have stated that "a real advance of socialist economy in Russia is only possible after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe". It is probable, comrades, that we have become inaccurate in the use of various terms. What do we understand under "socialist economy" in the strict sense of the term? We have great successes to record, and are naturally proud of these. I have endeavoured to describe them in my booklet: "Towards Socialism or Capitalism", for the benefit of foreign comrades. But we must make a sober survey of the extent of these successes. Comrade Rykov's theses state that we are approaching the pre-war level. But this is not quite accurate. Is our population the same as before the war? No, it is larger. And the average consumption of industrial goods per head is considerably less than in 1913. The people's Supreme Economic Council calculates that in this respect we shall not regain the pre-war level until 1930. And then, what was the level of 1913? It was the level of misery, of backwardness, of barbarism. If we speak of socialist economy, and of a real advance in socialist economy, we mean: no antagonism between town and country, general content, prosperity, culture. This is what we understand under the real advance of socialist economy. And we are still far indeed from this goal. We have destitute children, we have unemployed, from the villages there come 3 million superfluous workers every year, half a million of whom seek work in the cities, where the industries cannot absorb more than 100,000 yearly. We have a right to be proud of what we have achieved, but we must not distort the historical perspective. What we have accomplished is not yet a real advance of socialist economy, but only the first serious steps on that long bridge leading from capitalism to Socialism. Is this the same thing? By no means. The passage quoted against me stated the truth.

In 1922 Lenin wrote:

"But we have not yet even completed the foundation of our socialist economy, and the hostile forces of expiring capitalism may even yet deprive us of it again. This must be clearly recognised and openly admitted, for there is nothing so dangerous as illusions and dizziness, especially at great heights. And there is nothing "frightful", nothing which can give the slightest cause for despair, in the recognition of this bitter truth, for we have always proclaimed and repeated that elementary truth of Marxism, that the joint efforts of the workers of some advanced countries are necessary for the victory of socialism." (Lenin, Complete works, Russian ed., vol. XX/2, page 487.)

The question here is therefore not of intervention, but of the joint efforts of several advanced countries for the establishment of Socialism. Or was this written by Lenin before the epoch of imperialism, before the law of unequal development was known? No, he wrote this in 1922.

There is, however, another passage, in the article on co-operatives, one single passage, which is set up against everything else that Lenin wrote, or rather the attempt is made so to oppose it... (A voice: "Accidentally!") Not by any means accidentally. I am in full agreement with the sentence, it must be understood properly. The passage is as follows:

"As a matter of fact all the great means of production are in the possession of the State, the state power is in the hands of the proletariat; the alliance of this proletariat with the many millions of poor and poorest peasantry, the security of the leadership of this proletariat over the peasantry, etc., is then this not everything which we require to enable us to build up out of the co-operatives, of the co-operatives alone, which we treated at one time in a step-motherly manner, as petty tradesman affairs, and which we are now justified to a certain extent in so treating under the NEP — to build up out of the co-operatives alone the complete socialist state of society? This is not yet the establishment of the socialist state of society, but it is everything which is necessary and sufficient for this realisation."

(A voice: "You read much too quickly." Laughter.) Then you must give me a few minutes more, comrades. (Laughter. A voice: "Right!") Right? I am agreed. (A voice: "That is just what we want.")

What is the question here? What elements are here enumerated? In the first place the possession of the means of production, in the second the power of the proletariat, thirdly the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, fourthly the proletarian leadership of the peasantry, and fifthly the co-operatives. I ask you: does any one of you believe that Socialism can be established in one single isolated country? Could, perchance, the proletariat in Bulgaria alone, if it had the peasantry behind it, seize power, build up the co-operatives and establish socialism? No, that would be impossible. Consequently further elements are required in addition to the above: the geographical situation, natural wealth, technics, culture. Lenin enumerates here the conditions of state power, property relations, and the organisatory forms of the co-operatives. Nothing more. And he says that we, in order to establish Socialism, need not proletarianise the peasantry, nor need we any fresh revolutions, but that we are able, with power in our hands, in alliance with the peasantry, and with the aid of the co-operatives, to carry our task to completion through the agency of these state and social forms and methods.

But, comrades, we know another definition which Lenin gave of Socialism. According to this definition Socialism is equal to Soviet power plus electrification. Is electrification cancelled in the passage just quoted. No, it is not cancelled. Everything which Lenin otherwise said about the establishment of Socialism — and I have adduced clear formulations above — is supplemented by this quotation, but not cancelled. For electrification is not something to be carried out in a vacuum, but under certain conditions, under the conditions imposed by the world market and the world economy, which are very tangible facts. The World economy is no mere theoretical generalisation, but a definite and powerful reality, whose laws encompass us; a fact of which every year of our development convinces us.

THE NEW THEORY.

Before dealing with this in detail, I should like to remind you of the following: Some of our comrades, before they created an entirely new theory, and in my opinion an entirely wrong one, based on a one-sided interpretation of Lenin's article on the co-operatives, held quite a different standpoint. In 1924 Comrade Stalin did not say the same as he does today. This was pointed out at the XIV. Party Congress, but the passage quoted did not disappear on that account, but remains fully maintained even in 1926.

Let us read:

"Is it possible to attain the final victory of Socialism in one single country without the joint efforts of the proletariats of several advanced countries? No, it is impossible. The exertions of a single country suffice to overthrow the bourgeoisie — this is shown by the history of our revolution. But for the final victory of Socialism, for the organisation of socialist production, the efforts of one single country, especially of such an agrarian country as Russia, are not sufficient — for this the efforts of the proletariats of several advanced countries are necessary." ("The principles of Leninism." April 1924.)

This was written by Stalin in 1924, but the resolution quotes me only up to 1922. (Laughter.) Yes, this is what was said in 1924: For the organisation of socialist economy — not for protection against intervention, not as guarantee against the restoration of the capitalist order, no, no, but for "the organisation of socialist production", the efforts of one single country, especially such an agrarian country as Russia, do not suffice. Comrade Stalin has given up this standpoint. He has of course a right to do so.

In his book "Problems of Leninism" he says:

"What are the defects of this formulation?

They consist of the fact that it throws two different questions together: the question of the possibility of the establishment of Socialism in one country, by its own unaided efforts — to which an affirmative reply must be given; and the question of whether a country in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established can be considered as completely secure against intervention, and consequently as completely secure against the restoration of the capitalist order, unless a victorious revolution has taken place in a number of other countries — to which a negative reply must be given." (Stalin: "Problems of Leninism." Page 44, 1926.)

But if you will allow me to say so, we do not find these two questions confused with one another in the first passage quoted, dating from 1924. Here it is not a question of intervention, but solely of the impossibility of the complete organisation of a completely socialised production by the unaided efforts of such a peasant country as Russia.

And truly, comrades, can the whole question be reduced to one of intervention? Can we simply imagine that we are establishing Socialism here in this house, whilst the enemies outside in the street are throwing stones through the window panes? The matter is not so simple. Intervention is war, and war is a continuation of politics, but with other weapons. But politics are applied economics. Hence the whole question is one of the economic relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries. These relations are not exhausted in that one form known as intervention. They possess a much more continuous and profound character. Comrade Bucharin has stated in so many words that the sole danger of intervention consists of the fact that in the event that no intervention comes:

"we can work towards Socialism even on this wretched technical basis (we can work towards it, that is true. L. T.), that this growth of Socialism will be much slower, that we shall move forward at a snail's pace; but all the same we shall work towards Socialism, and we shall realise it." (At the XIV. Party Congress.)

That we are working towards socialism is true. That we shall realise it hand in hand with the world proletariat is incontestable (Laughter). In my opinion it is out of place,

at a communist conference, to laugh when the realisation of Socialism hand in hand with the international proletariat is spoken of. (Laughter. Voices: "No demagoguery!" "You cannot catch us with that!") But I tell you that: we shall never realise socialism at a snail's pace, for the world's markets keep too sharp a control over us. (A voice: "You are quite alarmed!") How does Comrade Bucharin imagine this realisation? In his last article in the "Bolshevik", which I must say is the most scholastic work which has ever issued from Bucharin's pen (laughter), he says:

"The question is whether we can work towards socialism, and establish it, if we abstract this from the international questions."

Just listen to this: "If we can work towards socialism, and establish it, if we abstract this question from the international questions." If we accomplish this "abstraction" then of course the rest is easy. But we cannot. That is the whole point. (Laughter.)

It is possible to walk naked in the streets of Moscow in January, if we can abstract ourselves from the weather and the police. (Laughter.) But I am afraid that this abstraction would fail, both with respect to weather and to police, were we to make the attempt. (Laughter.)

"We repeat once more: it is a question of internal forces, and not of the dangers connected with abroad. It is therefore a question of the character of our revolution." (Bucharin, No. 19/20 of the "Bolshevik".)

The character of our revolution, independent of international relations! Since when has this self-sufficing character of our revolution existed? I maintain that our revolution, as we know it, would not exist at all but for two international prerequisites: firstly, the factor of financial capital, which, in its greed, has fertilised our economic development, and secondly Marxism, the theoretical quintessence of the international labour movement, which has fertilised our proletarian struggle. This means that the revolution was being prepared, before 1917, at those cross-roads where the great forces of the world encounter one another. Out of this clash of forces arose the great war, and out of this the October revolution. And now we are told to abstract ourselves from the international situation, and to construct our Socialism at home for ourselves. That is a metaphysical method of thought. There is no possibility of abstraction from world economics.

What is export? An internal or an international affair? The goods to be exported must be produced at home, thus it is an internal matter. But they must be exported abroad, hence it is an international transaction. And what is import? Import is international! The goods have to be purchased abroad. But they have to be brought into the country, so it is a home affair after all. (Laughter.) This example of import and export alone suffices to cause the collapse of Comrade Bucharin's whole theory, which proposes an "abstraction" from the international situation. The success of socialist construction depends on the speed of economic development, and this speed is now being determined directly and more sharply than ever by the imports of raw materials and machinery. To be sure we can abstract ourselves from the shortage of foreign securities, and order more cotton and machines. But we can only do that once. A second time we shall not be able to accomplish this abstraction. (Laughter.) The whole of our constructive work is determined by international conditions.

If I am asked whether our State is proletarian, I can only reply that the question is out of place. If you do not wish to form your judgment on two or three words picked at random from an uncorrected stenographic report, but on what I have said and written in dozens of speeches and articles — and this is the only way in which we should form a judgment on one another's views —, if we do not wish to trip one another up with an uncorrected sentence, but seek to understand one another's real opinions, then you must admit without hesitation that I join with you in regarding our State as a proletarian State. I have already replied by several quotations to the question of whether this State is building up Socialism. If you ask whether there are in this country sufficient forces and means to carry out completely the establishment of Socialism within 30 or 50 years, quite independent of what is going on

in the world outside, then I must answer that the question is put in an entirely wrong form. We have at our disposal adequate forces for the furtherance of the work of socialisation, and thereby also to aid the international revolutionary proletariat, which has no less prospect of gaining power in 10, 20 or 30 years, than we have of establishing Socialism; in no way less prospect, but much greater prospect.

I ask you, comrades — and this is the axis upon which the whole question turns — what will be going on in Europe whilst we are working at our socialisation? You reply: We shall establish Socialism in our country, independent of what is going on all over the world. Good.

How much time shall we require for the establishment of Socialism? Lenin was of the opinion that we shall not have established Socialism in 20 years, since our agrarian country is so backward. And in 30 years we shall not have established it either. Let us take 30 to 50 years as a minimum. What will be happening in Europe during all this time? I cannot make a prognosis for our country without including a prognosis for Europe. There may be some variations. If you say that the European proletariat will certainly have come into power within the next 30 to 50 years, then there is no longer any question in the matter. For if the European proletariat captures power in the next 10, 20, or 30 years, then the position of Socialism is secured, both in our country and internationally. But you are probably of the opinion that we must assume a future in which the European proletariat does not come into power? Otherwise why your whole prognosis? Therefore, I ask what you suppose will be happening in Europe in this time? From the purely theoretical standpoint three variations are possible. Europe will either vacillate round about the prewar level, as at present, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie balancing to and from and just maintaining an equilibrium. We must however designate this "equilibrium" as inconstant, for it is extremely so. This situation cannot last for 20, 30, or 40 years. It must be decided one way or the other.

Do you believe that capitalism will find a renewed dynamical equilibrium? Do you believe that capitalism can secure a fresh period of ascendancy, a new and extended reproduction of that process which took place before the imperialist war? If you believe that this is possible, (I myself do not believe that capitalism has any such prospect before it) if you permit it even theoretically for one moment, this would mean that capitalism has not yet fulfilled its historical mission in Europe and the rest of the world, and that present day capitalism is not an imperialist and decaying capitalism, but a capitalism still on the upgrade, developing economics and culture. And this would mean that we have appeared too early on the scene.

Chairman: Comrade Trotzky has more than exceeded the time allotted him. He has been speaking for more than 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ hours. He asks for a further five minutes. I shall take your vote. Who is in favour? Who is against? Does anybody demand that a fresh vote be taken

Comrade Trotzky: I ask for a fresh vote.

Chairman: Who is in favour of comrade Trotzky's being given 5 minutes more? Who is against? The majority is against.

Comrade Trotzky: I wished to utilise these 5 minutes for a brief summary of conclusions.

Chairman: I shall take the vote again. Who is in favour of Comrade Trotzky's time being extended by 5 minutes? Those in favour hold up their delegate's tickets. Who is against? The majority is in favour. It is better to prolong the time than to count votes for 5 minutes. Comrade Trotzky will continue.

Comrade Trotzky: If it is assumed that during the next 30 to 50 years which we require for the establishment of Socialism, European capitalism will be developing upwards, then we must come to the conclusion that we shall certainly be strangled or crushed, for ascending capitalism will certainly possess, besides everything else, correspondingly improved technics of war. We are, moreover, aware that a capitalism with a rapidly rising prosperity is well able to draw the masses into war, aided by the labour aristocracy which it is able to create. These gloomy prospects are, in my opinion, impossible of fulfilment; the international economic situation offers no basis. In any case we have no need to base the future of Socialism in our country on this supposition.

There remains the second possibility of a declining and decaying capitalism. And this is precisely the basis upon which the European proletariat is learning, slowly but surely the art of making revolution.

Is it possible to imagine that European capitalism will continue a process of decay for 30 to 50 years, and the proletariat will meanwhile remain incapable of accomplishing revolution? I ask why I should accept this assumption, which can only be designated as the assumption of an unfounded and most profound pessimism with respect to the European proletariat, and at the same time of an uncritical optimism with respect to the establishment of Socialism by the unaided forces of our country? In what way can it be the theoretical or political duty of a communist to accept the premise that the European proletariat will not have seized power within the next 40 to 50 years? (Should it seize power, then the point of dispute vanishes.) I maintain that I see no theoretical or political reason for believing that we shall build up Socialism with the co-operation of the peasantry more easily than the proletariat of Europe will seize power.

No. The European proletariat has the greater chances. And if this is the case, then I ask you: Why are these two elements opposed to one another, instead of being combined like the "two conditions" of Lenin? Why is the theoretical recognition of the establishment of Socialism in one country demanded? What gave rise to this standpoint? Why was this question never brought forward by anyone before 1925? (A voice: "It was!"). That is not the case, it was never brought forward. Even Comrade Stalin wrote in 1924 that the efforts of an agrarian country were insufficient for the establishment of Socialism. I am today still firm in my belief that the victory of Socialism in our country is only possible in conjunction with the victorious revolution of the European proletariat. This does not mean that we are not working towards the socialist state of society, or that we should not continue this work with all possible energy. Just as the German worker is preparing to seize power, we are preparing the Socialism of the future, and every success which we can record facilitates the struggle of the German proletariat, just as its struggle facilitates our socialist progress. This is the sole true international view to be taken of our work for the realisation of the socialist state of society.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion I repeat the words which I spoke at the Plenum of the C. C.: Did we not believe that our State is a proletarian State, though with bureaucratic deformations, that is, a State which should be brought into much closer contact with the working class, despite many wrong bureaucratic opinions to the contrary; did we not believe that our development is socialist; did we not believe that our country possesses adequate means for the furtherance of socialist economics; were we not convinced of our complete and final victory: then, it need not be said, our place would not be in the ranks of a Communist Party.

The Opposition can and must be estimated by these two criteria: it can accept the one line or the other. Those who believe that our State is not a proletarian State, and that our development is not socialist, must lead the proletariat against such a State, and must found another Party.

But those who believe that our State is a proletarian State, but with bureaucratic deformations formed under the pressure of the petty bourgeois elements and the capitalist encirclement; who believe that our development is socialist, but that our economic policy does not sufficiently secure the necessary redistribution of national income; these must combat with Party methods and Party means that which they hold to be wrong, mistaken, or dangerous, but must share at the same time the full responsibility for the whole policy of the Party and of the workers' state. (The chairman rings.) I am almost finished. A minute and a half more.

It is incontestable that the inner Party contentions have been characterised of late by extreme acuteness of form, and by the fractional attitude. It is incontestable that this fractional aggravation of the contention on the part of the Opposition — no matter by what premises it was called forth — could be taken, and has been taken by a wide section of the Party members, to mean that the differences of opinion had reached

a point rendering joint work impossible, that is, that they could lead to a split. This means an obvious discrepancy between the means and the aims, that is, between those aims for which the Opposition has been anxious to fight, and the means which it has employed for one reason or another. It is for that reason we have recognised this means — the fraction — as being faulty, and not for any reason arising out of present considerations. (A voice: "Your forces were inadequate, you have been defeated!"). We recognise this in consideration of the whole inner Party situation. The aim and object of the declaration of 16. October was to defend the views which we hold, but to do this under the observance of the confines set by our joint work and our solidarity of responsibility for the whole policy of the Party.

Comrades, what is the objective danger involved in the resolution on the social democratic deviation? The danger lies in the fact that it attributes to us views which would necessarily lead, not merely to a fractional policy, but to a policy of two parties.

This resolution has the objective tendency of transforming both the declaration of 16. October and the communique of the C. C. into fragments of paper that with satisfaction. . . . (A voice: "Is that a threat?") No, comrades, that is no threat. It is my last thought to utter any threat. (A voice: "Why raise this again?") You will hear in a moment. Only a few words more.

In our opinion the acceptance of this resolution will be detrimental, but in so far as I can judge of the attitude of the so-called Opposition, especially of the leading comrades, the acceptance of this resolution will not cause us to depart from the line of the declaration of 16. October. We do not accept the views forced upon us. We have no intention of artificially enlarging the differences, or of aggravating them, and of thus preparing for a relapse into the fractional struggle. On the contrary, each one of us, without seeking to minimise the existing differences of opinion, will exert every endeavour to adapt these differences within the confines of our continued work and our joint responsibility for the policy of the Party.

Speech of Comrade Zinoviev.

Comrades! What is it that the Conference has the right to except of us before everything else? It has the right to ask for an explanation of that sharp conflict concluding with the well-known document of 16th October. On the other hand we have the right to express ourselves with regard to the "social democratic deviation" of which we are accused.

This second point is bound to lend a polemical character to our utterances. It will be understood that if we were to abstain from polemics in this question, this would be tantamount to admitting that we felt guilty of really having deviated in the direction of Social Democracy. But this is not the case, comrades; we do not and can not admit anything of the kind.

WHAT IS OUR ESTIMATE OF OUR DECLARATION OF 16. OCTOBER?

I can imagine that some comrades will probably interpret this polemical observation on the "social democratic deviation" of which we are accused, as a new stage in our policy, as a fresh attempt to continue the sharp conflict which has been carried on. Such a conclusion would be wrong. At the joint sessions of the C. C. and the C. C. C. we openly put the question of whether, at the Conference, we should give our explanation of the so-called "social democratic deviation". And if the comrades of the C. C. and the C. C. C. had said that in the interests of peace we should rather abstain from our declarations, then we should have done so. (Stir among the audience. A voice: "And what were you told?") We were told that nobody had any objection. We therefore take it to be our right, though confining our speeches at the Conference to the briefest possible minimum, to defend ourselves openly — and if necessary in a very sharp form — against these accusations of a "social democratic deviation", which we have not deserved, and which are entirely false. (A voice: "Innocent lamb!").

We have reason to believe that some of our comrades, who share the views of the Opposition, or think that they share them, have not grasped the meaning of our declaration of 16. October. I could adduce an example of this from the ranks of the German communists. I have read the declaration made by Comrades Urbahns and Schimansky, members of the C. C. of the German C. P., at the conference of Party workers' of the Berlin organisation on 20. October, from which it is to be seen that these comrades have not grasped the scope of the declaration of 16. October.

They have not grasped the fact that this document does not represent a "manoeuvre", but the result of the estimate which we ourselves have formed of the effect of our attitude upon the communist workers. We believe that the latter have feared most of all that to permit a discussion at the present time could involve serious danger to the unity of the Party. (A voice: "True.") Our declaration of 16. October aimed at meeting the wishes and the feelings of the mass of our Party members, who demand above all that Party unity shall be secured. (A voice: "And what did you used to think on that point?") Comrades, I shall not reply to interruptions.

To assume, as Comrades Urbahns and Schimansky do, that certain state organs could play any rôle in our declaration, is simply foolish and unheard of. Our declaration, it need not be said, was dictated by our conception of the interests of our Party and of the Comintern, the interests of Party unity. In our opinion, those comrades of the German C. P. who share the views of Comrades Urbahns and Schimansky should also abandon fractional struggles, and the C. C. of the German C. P. should aid them to do so.

I believe, comrades, that our declaration of 16. October, of which Comrade Kamenev has rightly stated that it has not only an organisatory meaning, but at the same a political meaning, will be accepted as we have meant it, that is, as a step, no, more than a step, as the decisive cessation of fractional struggle on our part. We have declared in this document that we shall carry out the Party decisions, the decisions

of the C. C., and of the other leading organs of our Party, to the utmost of our powers, and that we shall perform every work set us by the organs of the Party. And we shall hold consistently to this declaration.

It is only natural that our comrades will follow up with the question: So far good, but in your declaration of 16. October you have stated that you adhere to your views; if this be the case, will a fresh conflict not arise? Is this not a reservation on your part, enabling you to resume the fractional struggle in a new form?

To this we reply in Lenin's words:

"Ideological contentions in the Party do not mean that holders of different views sweep each other out of the way, but that they support one another."

To these words we shall hold fast. We shall defend our views, but within the confines laid down by the Party statutes, and in forms which have always been acknowledged by the Party, and — we are convinced — will continue to be acknowledged by it in the future.

It need not be said that here 99 per cent depends on the majority. (Voices: "Oho!" Disturbance.) Yes, comrades, when the newspapers of our Party, our central organs, have daily published inflammatory leading articles on our silence with respect to the preceding two or three points on the agenda of the Conference, have they been thereby serving the cause of the final establishment of peace, the cessation of the acute contention? (Comrade Babuschkin: "Do you want the Party to fall on its knees before you?") No, we do not want that by any means. It need not be said that we have not had the slightest expectation of being welcomed with open arms after our declaration. Of course we have not expected this. We knew very well that the ideological conflict continues. But we expected that the tone of our press would change. We expected.... (A voice: "Did you expect to be praised?") No, not to be praised, but there is a happy mean between praise and what has actually been done. Thus, for instance, the "Communist Path", the organ of the Saratov Committee of our Party, published an article on 20. October, four days after our declaration, under the title: "For unity in the ranks of the Party", concluding with the following words:

"The Party carefully safeguards its unity. The Party restores unity again, whatever the obstacles, and whoever may lay them in our way.

It is high time for everyone to recognise clearly that the C. P. S. U. will relentlessly repulse any attempt at violating its unity. And no complaints may be made about the Party in this respect.

Are we then to blame if your bones crack and break in our powerful claws?"

I am not opposed to poetical forms of expression, or to the works of Block, but I think that the majority of you will find it somewhat out of place to issue such an article a few days after our declaration.

HOW DID THE PARTY UNDER LENIN TREAT THE OPPOSITION.

We know, comrades, that an opposition has frequently appeared in our Party. And we must look back over the history of the Party to see how these earlier oppositions were dissolved in Lenin's time, and how those comrades at that time in the minority on this or that question then took up their daily work again, thus ending the dispute.

I should like to quote a few instances:

The first fraction formed after the conquest of power was that of the "Left Communists" at the end of 1917 and the beginning of 1918. The conditions under which we were working at that time will be known to you. They were extremely difficult.

The existence of the Soviet hung by a thread. In the midst of this difficult situation a group was formed, participated in by a number of leading comrades. Some of these comrades are at the present moment in the ranks of the majority, others in the minority. It suffices to mention that of the present adherents of the majority the following comrades attached themselves to this group: Bucharin, who headed the "Left Communists", then Yaroslavsky, Kuybyshev, Kossior, Lomov, and others. At that time these comrades published a newspaper of their own in Leningrad and Moscow, and for a time the Petrograd Gouvernement and the Moscow Provincial Bureau were in their hands.

They themselves related afterwards that some of them had negotiated with the Left SRs on alterations to be made in the composition of the Council of People's Commissars. I shall read some of the declarations made at that time. For instance, the exact wording of a resolution accepted at that time by the Moscow Provincial Bureau, conducted by Comrade Bucharin (disturbance.) In this resolution we read:

"After discussing the activities of the C. C., the Moscow Provincial Bureau of the R. S. D. L. P. (the Party was renamed Communist Party later) expresses its mistrust towards the C. C. on account of its political line and its composition, and will insist upon a new election to the C. C. at the first opportunity. Besides this, the Moscow Provincial Bureau does not consider it its duty to subordinate itself unconditionally to the decisions of the C. C. where these deal with the carrying out of the conditions of the peace treaty with Austria and Germany."

The so-called "explanatory comment" to this document states:

"The Moscow Provincial Bureau is of the opinion that it will be difficult to avoid a split in the Party in the near future, and considers it to be its task to endeavour to unite all consistently revolutionary forces, and to join with these in combatting the adherents of a separate peace, and all moderate opportunist elements in the Party. In the interests of international revolution we find it advisable to take into account the possibility of the loss of the Soviet power, which has now become purely formal. We continue to regard it as our leading task to spread the ideas of socialist revolution in all other countries, and to support energetically the dictatorship of the proletariat, at the same time relentlessly suppressing the bourgeois counter-revolution in Russia."

I recollect that when Comrade Lenin wrote his article on the "Revolutionary Phrase", Comrade Bucharin replied in an article entitled "The Opportunist Phrase". This was on 5. March 1918. Bucharin wrote that Lenin "repeated in substance those same errors to which Kautsky has succumbed", that the "phrase-mongers of opportunism (Lenin is meant G. Z.) are objectively destroying the will to action in the proletariat", that the "peace policy of the official C. C. (that is, of the Leninist C. C.) has left the rails of proletarian revolution", that the policy of Lenin "leads to the capitulation of the proletariat in its class war against the foreign and Russian bourgeoisie", and that "in consideration of these facts various members of the C. C. and of the Council of People's Commissaries (Bucharin and others) declared at the time their withdrawal from these institutions". (Voices: "Tell about yourself. Read us the letter which Lenin wrote about you." "Comrade Zinoviev, you have a very bad horse, he will not carry you far". Disturbance.)

And how was this opposition dispersed, despite all this? I took an active part in the conflict against this opposition.

The C. C. sent Sverdlov and me to Moscow to oppose these errors. (Disturbance. A voice: "And who was sent to Leningrad in 1926?") Was this case at that time used as an occasion for drawing up any special theses? No, this was not the case. (A voice: "Tell us about the 'Red Putilov' nucleus!". Disturbance.) Tell me, was there one single comrade expelled from the Party in connection with the extremely sharp opposition of the "Left Communists"? No, this was not done. This is not a minor question. We know that a large number of members are being expelled from the Party, and this was not the case at that time. (Disturbance.)

Did Lenin issue at that time the slogan of "destroying the Opposition"? No, comrades, and in this hall there are sufficient

old comrades who can confirm my statement that no such slogan was issued, although the conflict was severe, as you will have seen from the passages quoted.

I may further remind you of the serious differences in 1919, on the organisation of the Red Army. Many of you will probably recollect the sharp struggles on this question at the VIII. Party Congress. And yet this was not followed by any special organisatory measures, or by special theses on any deviation.

In 1920 there were again important differences, before the IX. Party Congress, on the question of the organisation of our economics. On this occasion Lenin only received two votes at the session of the Communist fraction of the Central Trade Union Council, and the majority were opposed to him. And were any theses on "socialdemocratic deviations" published? Not at all.

And another example. In the autumn of 1920 there was a fierce conflict in the Moscow organisation. One of the groups was headed by the democratic centralists under the leadership of comrade Bubnov. Lenin played the part of intermediary. The municipal conference separated into two parts and met in two different places. (A voice: "That is an old story; better tell us how you organised the fraction.")

At that time comrade Lenin said:

"In connection with the crisis in the Party much was to be observed that was perfectly sound, necessary, and inevitable in a moment of natural growth of the Party, in a moment of transition from a position in which our whole attention was concentrated on political and military tasks, to a position in which we have to devote ourselves to the building up of our organisations, in which we have to cope with dozens of bureaucratic institutions, and in which the cultural level of the majority of the proletariat and of the peasantry is not equal to the task."

Further:

.... "We have lost a great deal of time in quarrels and contentions, and we must now say: enough! And we must endeavour to create sound working conditions under these or other conditions. We must make this or that concession — better too much than too little — to those comrades who are dissatisfied, who call themselves the opposition. But we must ensure that the work is carried on unanimously, or we cannot continue to exist at a time when we are surrounded by enemies at home and abroad."

This is the way to disperse an opposition, comrades. I place on record that the slogan of "destroying the opposition" has now been issued for the first time. And if it was possible to write in such a savage manner in Saratov on 20. October, then it is easy to imagine the tone which will be employed after the proclamation of the slogan of "destroying the opposition". (A voice: "Disperse yourselves, that will be better.")

A FEW WORDS ON THE DIFFERENCES OF OPINION.

I naturally understand that wild exaggerations have crept in in the course of the struggle. We in the Bolshevik Party do not carry on conflicts with kid gloves, and we must not complain at every sharp expression. We have known this and know it still. But yet I cannot but remind you of what has been said about us in the course of daily agitation among the people, and in the country. (Voices: "And what have you said? And what have you done?")

I have here two numbers of the newspaper "Plough and Harrow", published chiefly for the broad masses of the peasantry, by the Leningrad Committee in the town of Kingisepp. The number of 21. August has a big headline on the first page:

"The opposition proposes to deprive the peasants of their last penny."

The author of this loud proclamation begins his article by stating that:

"the peasant question is an extremely complicated one; to some of the proletarian leaders, who have a leaning towards deviations, it is as complicated as the riddle of peasant life is to the bourgeoisie who know of village life only from hearsay."

Further on he arrives at the following conclusion:

"When the power is once in the hands of the proletariat, then, of course, it is very easy for the Party and the Soviet power to deprive the peasants of everything they have in one year, and to apply the money for industrial purposes, upon which industry will naturally make great progress." (Voices: "And what did the Leningrad 'Pravda' write during the XIV. Party Congress?")

In another number of the same newspaper (28. August) our estimate of the last Soviet election campaign was characterised as an abandonment of the policy of drawing the non-Party peasantry into the Soviets, and was formulated as follows:

"Help, save yourselves, the mujik is exercising pressure upon us. Drive him out of the Soviets!"

Some of the comrades here have called out "quite right!" But when I drew the attention of the Polit Bureau to it, all the comrades there said that it was not right, and even promised to take measures preventing the repetition of such occurrences.

I am of the opinion that it was again not right to include, in the proclamation of the C. C., and the C. C. C. on the economy regime (a proclamation correct in the substance of its purport), the following passage:

"There are two means of obtaining these hundred millions. One means is to bleed the peasantry to the utmost, to squeeze everything possible out of him and give this to industry. Some of our comrades are endeavouring to induce us to employ this means."

It was wrong to say this, and especially wrong in an agrarian country. (A voice: "Why will you not say whether you are with Preobraschensky or against him?") Preobraschensky never proposed such a thing. (A voice: "Are you with him or not?") I trust that Comrade Preobraschensky will be given the opportunity of speaking for himself. (A voice: "Now he is dodging!")

Another example may be taken from the central organ of our Trans-Caucasian organisation, the "Saryovostoka", published in Tiflis. In its leading article of 8. October, under the title of: "We want no discussion!", we read:

"What does the opposition want?..... It wants to turn the dictatorship of the proletariat into a democratic republic, into a democratically convoked congress." (Voices: "Quite right!")

Comrades, you know very well that this is not right at all, and could only be attributed to us in the heat of debate. And why not go further than a mere "democratic republic"? Surely it would be even more effective to say at once that we are in favour of the monarchy. (Laughter. Disturbance.) You are perfectly aware, comrades, that this accusation of the "democratic republic" is an unheard of accusation.

It is not to be wondered at if, under these circumstances, our real differences of opinion are seized upon by the elements of a third force. We cannot conceal from ourselves that there are petty bourgeois elements in our country, and that these perhaps dream of a democratic republic. And if these are told that a section of our Party, a number of the members of the C. C., people who have been working for years in the Party, are suddenly in favour of a democratic republic, then elements representing a third force are really given the opportunity of raising their heads.

We know very well that in such conflicts exaggerations are unavoidable, but even in admitting this we must state that the exaggerations brought up against us in the present contention have of late assumed proportions entirely impossible in our Party some years ago. When the peasants of an agrarian country are told that we want to "deprive the peasants of their last penny", and that "the workers' power can, of course, deprive the peasant of everything he has if it wants to", then these are utterances which can have extremely negative consequences, not only for us, but for our State and our whole Party.

WHAT ARE OUR REAL DIFFERENCES OF OPINION?

Comrades, a great many non-existent differences of opinion have been attributed to us. There are undoubtedly serious differences between us, but none which are not entirely possible

with the confines of a united Party. (Voices: "So you say, so you say!") I shall now treat of these differences. (A voice: "Go on!" Another voice: "Or lay diplomacy aside and speak of the differences with Trotzky!") What diplomacy do you mean? There is no diplomacy here.

You want to accuse us of a "social democratic deviation". You will find it difficult to make our workers, or even the social democrats all over the world, believe this. They will believe everything imaginable about us, especially about me, but they will not believe that we are social democrats or incline towards social democracy. Of what do the differences consist? I believe, comrades, that the general line of our differences can best be illustrated by the following words of Lenin's:

... "Yes, in overthrowing the landowners and the bourgeoisie we have cleared the way, but we have not erected the building of Socialism. History shows that on a soil cleared of one bourgeois generation, other generations spring up, if only the soil be fertile; and it generates as many bourgeois as possible." (A voice: "When was that written?")

This was written in 1919. I think, comrades, that this coincides closely with the ideas which have been reflected in our disagreements on the NEP question.

To us it is an absolutely incontestable fact that the path to Socialism in our country is only possible through the NEP. There can be no two opinions on this point. If it is laid to our charge that we want to do away with the NEP, and to return to war communism, then that is of course, a false accusation. (A voice: "And the revision of the NEP?") It is only by means of the NEP that we can lead our country to Socialism; this is incontestable. But we have been of the opinion, and still are, that it would be false to say that we shall arrive easily at Socialism through the NEP. Through the NEP to Socialism — this is right, incontestably right. But it would be wrong to say, through the NEP, "easily" to Socialism, almost without class warfare. I know very well, comrades, that the Party as a whole has never asserted this. But you cannot deny that immediately before the XIV. Party Congress there was among us (and this was the basis of our difference within the Leninist centre) a fairly powerful current in the Party, influenced by other ideas and formulations, and tending to the view that "the kulak will grow into Socialism". You are aware that this was the case. In April 1925 Comrade Bucharin wrote as follows:

"Our policy in regard to the peasantry must be developed along lines enabling many of the restrictions hampering the growth of the well-to-do farmers and kulaks to be altered, and in part destroyed." ("Pravda". No. 92.)

You know very well, comrades, that this current existed in our Party, and that it became conspicuously apparent on the eve of the XIV. Party Congress. Hence the sudden appearance of these differences at the XIV. Party Congress. Why was such a difficult situation created? Because we believed, and were right in believing, that the Party had not discussed the differences sufficiently before the Party Congress, had not heard both sides, — for reasons which I shall not discuss here. We were, of course, partly to blame, but the fact remains that the matter was so.

This is a really fundamental difference. I shall deal with some of the most essential differences; I only beg you not to interrupt me. (A voice: "Say something about discipline.") Comrades, I have already made three declarations regarding discipline, and the other comrades have done the same. If you like, I can make a fourth. It is not a question of the number of repetitions. I am well aware (A voice: "Will you carry out your declarations?") that you will demand that time prove whether we keep our promise. We accept this condition; time will show whether we carry out our declarations or not. (A voice: "We do not believe you!") What more can I say? Only time can show whether we keep our word or not. (A voice: "Your declarations show it in actual practice!")

Comrades, we are accused of being of the opinion that there is "no" stabilisation of capitalism. This is a false accusation. (A voice: "And the July speech?")

My real standpoint on the stabilisation of capitalism is as follows:

A "stabilisation" of capitalism would mean first of all:

a) Low prices in the world's markets, which would have a powerful effect upon the economic progress of the Soviet Union;

b) Impending fresh wars against us. If the growing efforts of expansion of imperialist capital could lead to a war between two groups of imperialist powers, before the first workers' state (Soviet Union) made its appearance, then the growth of this same expansion can lead to an imperialist bloc against the Soviet Union.

The partial stabilisation is a fact. This stabilisation is, however, very shaky and temporary. The general strike in England furnishes a striking proof of this. The general strike in England could have been the spark which kindles flames, had not Purcell, Thomas, and all those working for the stabilisation of capitalism, played a counter-revolutionary part. The subjective factor is of the greatest importance, that is, the degree of organisation of the proletariat, and the fighting capacity of the Communist Party. To speak of a stabilisation extending over decades is equivalent to revising Lenin's views on our epoch of the world revolution.

You accuse us of holding the opinion that no stabilisation exists whatever. This is not true, comrades. I have described our real standpoint with regard to the stabilisation.

You say, comrades, that we do not believe in the **establishment of Socialism in the Soviet Union**. Permit me to refer to this further on. I recollect an interesting resolution passed at a meeting in Kutais. Up to now we have only been accused of lack of faith in the possibility of the establishment of socialism, but here a further step was taken, and a resolution was passed accusing us of "**believing in the impossibility of establishing Socialism**". ("Sarya Vostoka", 8. October 1926.) A slight "correction". I think you must all agree with me that this is going too far. The first one says: "You do not believe in the establishment of socialism", and the second one takes this up and "deepens" it into "**You believe in the impossibility of establishing Socialism**". (Comrade Sturua: "Don't cling so to grammar".) Very good, I shall not cling to grammar. I am indeed of the opinion that it is not a matter of grammar, but of an attempt to represent the whole purport of our lives, the symbol of that belief for which we live and work, as "a belief in the impossibility of socialism".

The theory of the international proletarian revolution, whose foundations were laid by Marx and Engels and elaborated by Lenin, remains our banner. The final victory of Socialism in one country is impossible. The theory of final victory in one country is false. We are working towards the socialist state of society in our Soviet Union and shall realise it with the aid of the world proletariat, with the aid of the main mass of our peasantry. We shall win the final victory, for the revolution is inevitable in other countries.

Now to the **peasant question**. We maintain that the following formulation of Lenin is completely acceptable, and that we can join hands unreservedly on the ground afforded by this formulation:

"We must come to an understanding with the middle peasantry, we must not hesitate one minute in taking up the struggle against the kulak, and we must look for firm support only to the poor peasantry."

This is a formula which has been weighed in a very accurate scale. It does not contain one superfluous word. Let us join hands over this formula. We stand for it in every particular. It need not be said that it is incompatible with those currents which have existed, and still exist, in our Party, such currents as those expecting that the kulak will "grow into Socialism."

You know that Lenin said that we must place **restrictions on the exploiting tendencies of the kulak**. But before the XIV. Party Congress we heard another formula, providing for the suspension or complete abolition of many of the restrictions on the growth of the well-to-do farmers and kulaks. Now, comrades, we take this formula of Lenin: "We must come to an understanding with the middle peasantry, we must not hesitate one minute in taking up the struggle against the kulaks, and we must look for firm support only to the poor peasantry", then you will find us completely in agreement with this.

The **organisation of the village poor, and the aid given to the village poor**, are tasks of ever-growing importance. They must form one of the main criteria by which the success of the work of our local organisations is judged. I do not doubt that in the provinces more and more work is being done towards the accomplishment of this task. And I do not doubt that this will contribute to moderate our differences of opinion. Cooler relations between us and the village poor might prove a serious danger to the revolution. The village poor are the main support of the proletariat in the village.

More attention must be paid to the organisation of the agricultural labourers. More attention to the gradual collectivisation of agriculture! Every tractor must be an instrument of collectivisation! The combat against the kulak is not a combat against the peasantry. The middle peasant remains the chief ally of the proletariat. The alliance is formed on the one hand by the working class and the poorest peasantry, and on the other by the middle peasants, the leading rôle being played by the working class. The alliance between the working class and the peasantry must be unshakable.

We welcome a number of the decisions agreed upon in the C. C. of late; we give our complete support to such decisions as that on wages, that on the removal of the unfavourable aspects of the economy regime, on the annulment of the goods instructions and on the reduction of the costs of administration by 15 per cent.

Many comrades have spoken here of the milliard (A voice: "Two milliards!") It has already swelled to two; and will doubtless be four before long. The circular drawn up by Comrades Stalin, Kuybyshev, and Rykov, declares that the Party has

"no reason to doubt that the costs of administration could be reduced by 300 to 400 millions, these 300 to 400 millions thus being won for industry."

So we can raise 400 millions. (A voice: "You will not raise it, but the C. C.!") Since we are all agreed that accumulation is growing steadily in town and country, there is no reason to doubt that we can not only save 400 millions in officials and by means of the economy regime, but we believe that if we hang determinedly together and exert every effort we can obtain other considerable sums from the really great accumulations in the hands of the upper stratum in town and country. (Laughter.) And if we only obtain 700 millions at present out of the milliard, the miscalculation is not so extensive nor the evil so great. (Laughter, disturbance, voices: "That is your latest miscalculation!") Let us take 700 millions for the present, and postpone the other 300 millions until the first quarter of next year. (Laughter.) We sacrifice these 300 millions on the altar of unity. With these 700 millions we shall promote industry and raise wages. We therefore fully welcome this decision of the C. C. on the 300 or 400 millions. (A voice: "In other words, you make a cat's paw of others!")

We give our complete support to every decision aiming at putting pressure on the private capitalist; we welcome the fact that in the provinces more initiative is being shown on the subject of the organisation of the village than was hitherto the case (disturbance), although the resolution on the organisation of the village poor was passed a year ago. (Laughter. Voices: "And did you welcome the decisions of the Party Congress?") We have already told you that we shall carry out the decisions of the Party Congress. (A voice: "Then why have you not carried them out up to now?")

We welcome the decisions of the C. C. on work in the co-operatives, decisions rejecting the false course towards the "economically powerful" middle peasant. We welcome the decisions of the C. C. on reviving the work in the conferences on production. We welcome the directions of the C. C. with respect to a certain revision of the budget in the direction of an increase in the amounts devoted to the purposes of industrialisation. And we welcome the essential corrections made in our trade union statutes with respect to the affiliation of our trade unions to the Red International of Labour Unions.

Thanks to these decisions, our differences of opinion tend to diminish. We have already mentioned the fact that the abnormality of the situation lies in the fact that the Party had not discussed, before the XIV. Party Congress, those important

differences of opinion which had already arisen before the Congress. You cannot deny that this is the case.

I may remind you of a passage in a resolution passed unanimously by the XIII. Party Congress. This states (I am giving you the sense) that: The abnormality of the inner-Party regime frequently leads even disciplined comrades to fractional activity. I shall not speak of myself. Let us assume that I am the worst disciplined member of the Party (A voice: "Which you are!") But you cannot deny that there are many old and well disciplined comrades in the Opposition. (A voice: "For instance?") For instance Laschevitch, whom you yourselves have regarded as a disciplined Party member. (Disturbance.) And you know that when such members tread the path of the fractional activity this is the expression of some abnormality within our Party. (A voice: "What abnormalities?") Comrade Vorischlov: "That was the result of the leaders having gone off the track!" A voice: "You have turned Laschevitch's head!"

I believe there is a reason why we did not discuss, before the XIV. Party Congress, all those fundamental questions by which we were confronted. I myself take a share of responsibility for it, and it certainly led to an abnormal situation. It has led to a number of differences being attributed to us of which we have never even dreamed, for instance the "democratic republic". We cannot tolerate the assertion, in an agrarian country, that we want to "plunder" the peasantry, nor can we permit it to be said of us that we "believe in the impossibility of establishing Socialism".

We appear to be approaching a juncture at which the real differences of opinion existing between us, and which can be settled within the confines of a united Party, will have proper limits set them. At the same time every one of us is prepared to share the responsibility for the general line and the general decisions of the Party, and to carry these out.

But let us create a situation in which the Party is able to judge these differences as they really are.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

Three quarters of Comrade Stalin's speech of yesterday were devoted to the theory of the establishment of Socialism in one country. And truly this question is a central one, and one upon which there is as yet little clarity in the Party. Hence many comrades are found altering and defending their formulations, again realtering, etc. It is a very complicated and difficult question.

I was much surprised at what Comrade Stalin's said with reference to Engels. I cannot agree with him here. I do not believe that Comrade Stalin is right in regarding as obsolete the theses of Engels, and of Marx, since Marx and Engels invariably worked together — theses taken from the original text of the Communist Manifesto and afterwards used as basis for the final text. I do not believe that we can regard these views as obsolete. Lenin never said so. You will find nothing to this effect in Lenin's works. In 1906 Lenin wrote as follows:

"What we demand is that a firm grasp be kept on the positions of revolutionary social democracy (today we should say: of Communism), against opportunism; we do not demand the creation of any "original" Bolshevik tendency."

To Lenin the task of Bolshevism was to interpret the views of Marx and Engels in a new era in history, in a new concrete situation. And if Lenin had held it to be necessary to correct Engels, he would have said this candidly and clearly. The passage here quoted was written by Engels in 1847. Engels himself lived for 50 years after this, but he did not correct these sentences. Lenin worked in the political arena for three decades. During the whole of this time he was interpreting Marx and Engels. After we had seized power, Lenin wrote many works in which he utilised Engel's views as applied to the new situation created by our Soviet Union. And not once did he say that this sentence of Engels was wrong. Although this is such an important and fundamental question, we heard of it for the first time from Stalin yesterday.

In 1918 Lenin wrote as follows on this subject:

"The great founders of Socialism, Marx and Engels, who observed the development of the labour movement and the approach of the socialist world revolution for decades, saw clearly that the transition from capitalism to Socialism de-

mands prolonged birth pangs, a long period of decay of the old institutions, a ruthless destruction of all the forms of capitalism; they saw that it requires the co-operation of the workers of all countries, that these must join their forces to secure final victory. And they said: the French will begin, and the Germans will carry it on to the end...

Today we see another combination of international Socialism. We see that the movement is most likely to begin in countries which do not belong to that category of exploiting countries possessing the possibility of plundering more easily, and of corrupting the upper stratum of their workers.... Today we can see clearly what course will be taken in the further development of the revolution: The Russians have begun, the Germans, the French, and the English will carry on the cause to the end, and Socialism will triumph."

This is the correction which Lenin made in the views of Marx and Engels. (A voice: "True!") Of course it is true. But here there is no revision of the question of the victory of Socialism in one country. Lenin writes: "Marx and Engels said that the French will begin and the Germans carry on to the end". Matters turned out differently: "The Russians have begun, and the Germans, the French, and the English will carry on the cause to its end". This is the "correction" which has been made by our revolution. Lenin registered this and pointed it out. (A voice: "Stalin does not deny it!") But Lenin did not say that Engel's views on the impossibility of the victory of Socialism in one country were false. (A voice: "On the beginning of revolution in one country!") Not only Engels wrote on this question, but Marx, and I should like to quote here what Marx wrote on the subject. I shall, however, first read the corresponding passage from the final text of the "Communist Manifesto", which is not in the least obsolete. Lenin invariably protested energetically against any assertion that the "Communist Manifesto", was obsolete.

The following passage deals with the subject under discussion:

"The old local and national self sufficiency, and exclusiveness is replaced by general intercourse, by a general dependence of the nations upon one another... National onesidedness and narrowness became more and more impossible... The cheap prices of their (the bourgeoisie) goods are the "heavy artillery..."

This means that not only intervention, is a weapon, but the low prices of goods! (A voice: "But you want to raise the prices!") The laws of the world market, in the hands of the bourgeoisie, are heavy artillery.

Further on we read:

"The united action of at least the civilised countries is one of the first conditions for its (the proletariat's) emancipation."

Marx dealt with this question again in his article "New Year 1849". This article was mainly inspired by the events in 1848 in France. It is dated: Cologne, 31. December (1848). It was therefore written some time after the publication of the "Communist Manifesto". Here Marx writes as follows:

"Revolutionary rising of the French working class, world war — this is the table of contents for the year 1849."

The overthrow of the bourgeoisie in France, the triumph of the French working class, the emancipation of the whole working class, this is the watchword of European emancipation.

The emancipation of Europe... is thus conditioned by the victorious insurrection of the French working class."

Marx expected an insurrection of the French workers in 1849, immediately after the defeat of 1848. This means that Marx was perfectly clear in his conviction that the proletarian revolution can begin in one country. Marx, Engels, and Lenin were all agreed on this point. It is incorrect to present the matter as if the Marxists (including Engels) had at one time believed that the revolution could only begin in all countries at once. Marx, Engels, and of course Lenin, all knew that one single country can begin the revolution. These passages from Marx even show clearly that Marx was perfectly aware that the

revolution is not bound to begin in the country most highly developed, for at that time France was not an industrial country, but a somewhat backward country economically, rather similar to our country. (A voice: "But you maintain that it is impossible to begin!") In spite of the defeat suffered by the workers in June 1848, Marx reckoned with a renewed and victorious rising of the French working class. He at once raised the question of the international situation in which the French proletarian revolution would find itself immediately after its victory, and replied to the question as follows:

"But that country which has converted whole nations into its proletariat, whose gigantic arms embrace the whole world, whose money has once already paid the cost of European restoration, and within whose boundaries class antagonisms are manifested in their worst and most typical forms — England appears to be the rock upon which the waves of revolution break, England will starve the new society almost before it is born. England dominates the world's markets. A revolution of the conditions of national economics in any country of the European continent, of the whole European continent without England, is a storm in a tea-cup. The industrial and commercial relations of every nation are ruled by its intercourse with other nations, and conditioned by its relations to the world's markets. But England rules the world's markets, and the bourgeoisie rules England."

Marx added somewhat later that the task of the working class (that is, what he expected from the French working class; the socialist revolution):

"will not be accomplished in France, but it will be proclaimed in France. It cannot be accomplished anywhere within national limits."

This is what Marx wrote: The social revolution will be proclaimed in France, but it will be decided in England, whose position places the fate of capitalism in its hands. The workers' revolution cannot be accomplished anywhere within national limits.

In 1885 Engels, when writing the history of the First Communist Federation, wrote as follows:

"Both the open society and the secret federation began to assume an increasingly international character, though at first only in the limited sense of the word; in practice they have become international through the various nationalities of their members, and in theory as result of the view that only a revolution in the whole of Europe can be victorious."

We see that the First Communist Federation, even before the issue of the Communist Manifesto, was aware that only a revolution all over Europe can be victorious. When Engels asks if a revolution can be victorious in one country, and replies with "No", then he is not asking whether a revolution can begin. If we refer to some of the chapters of "Principles of Communism" we see that under "such a revolution" Engels understood not only the conquest of power by the working class, but at the same time a number of economic measures leading in their totality to a really socialist order. He names twelve such measures; ten of them were included in a somewhat altered form in the final text of the "Communist Manifesto". The totality of these measures means the transformation of society into the socialist order. Among these measures are such as: "Destruction of all unhealthy and badly built houses and parts of cities". This is not the conquest of power, but the actual realisation of Socialism. Another measure relates to the "organisation of labour", to the "employment of proletarians in the state farms, factories, and workshops", to "equal compulsory work for all members of society, until the complete abolition of private property"; "increase of state factories, workshops, railways, ships, etc. These twelve points, collectively, involve a real socialist revolution. And now Engels asks whether such a revolution is possible in one country, and answers with "No".

I am of the opinion that we must not revise Engels in the manner which I have pointed out; this may lead to grave errors.

Up to now nobody has ever said that Engels is obsolete. (Comrade Ivanov: "It appears that you were right in the October period".) I have acknowledged my errors. (A voice: "You are responsible for your errors".) Engels is not responsible for my errors. The point at present is that it would be extremely rash to regard the above-mentioned standpoint of Engels as obsolete, and it would fail to correspond with the views of Marx and Lenin. We must keep to the old standpoint. It is not true that the inequality of capitalist development was less in the pre-imperialist period. On the contrary. The fact that we have now a monopolist capitalism, a centralised oligarchy of financial capital, facilitates a more or less international capitalist action.

I am of the opinion, comrades, that we must not be too hasty in "canonising" this standpoint, and in officially declaring that the view held by Lenin is obsolete. We must first think it well over, we must disagree about it in thick volumes or in discussion articles, as Lenin advised us to do, but we must not hastily declare this to be the standpoint of the Party. It is not true that Engels' view of this matter has hitherto been the property of the social democrats. That would be too great a compliment for social democracy; in this point they are not by any means in possession of the standpoint of Marx and Engels, but have misrepresented it, and continue to misrepresent it. Therefore I cannot agree with this.

LENIN ON SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY.

What did Lenin say about Socialism in one country? Comrades Kamenev and Trotzky have quoted a number of exact passages. I could quote more, but I have no time. I shall only remind you that during the first discussion on the programme of the Party, at the VII. Party Congress, the following little episode occurred. You will find it recorded in the minutes of the VII. Party Congress, page 185. Comrade Milyutin delivered the following brief speech:

"I propose that the words "international social revolution" should be inserted in the sentence on "the commencing era of social revolution; here the word "international" should be inserted. I believe that it is superfluous to substantiate this, but it is extremely necessary, when dealing with this point, to draw particular attention to the fact that our social revolution can only be victorious as an international revolution. It cannot be victorious in Russia whilst in the countries surrounding us the bourgeois order still exists. It must be especially emphasised that the social revolution can only become firmly established as an international revolution. I therefore propose, in order to avoid misunderstandings, that this be inserted.

Chairman: Comrade Lenin accepts this correction".

This took place at the first discussion of our Party programme, at the VII. Party Congress. At that time it was taken as a matter of course. And until 1924, until the question was raised in Comrade Stalin's book, it was regarded as a matter of course. For this reason I am much disquieted by the attempt at revising this question at the present time.

The view is attributed to us that the technical backwardness of our country is an insurmountable obstacle in the way of the establishment of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

Since there is no written proof of our holding such an idea, a speech delivered in the Polit Bureau is adduced. The word "insurmountable" is falsely laid to my charge. That the technical backwardness of our country is an obstacle to the establishment of Socialism is true, and everyone will admit this. But it is not true that it is an insuperable obstacle, and we have never said that it is.

On the subject of technical progress Lenin observed:

"Socialism is unthinkable without big capitalist techniques built up on the latest achievements of science, or without a systematic state organisation subordinating dozens of millions of human beings to the strictest observance of a uniform standard in the production and distribution of products..." (Lenin, complete works, vol. XV, page 267.)

"... but it is somewhat strange to hear such words from the lips of a Marxist, one who has learnt that Socialism

is impossible without the utilisation of the achievements, technical and cultural, of big capitalism. Here there is nothing left of Marxism. (Ibid. page 277.)

... The real and sole basis for developing resources, and for the realisation of a socialist state of society, is big industry alone. Without the capitalist big undertakings, without highly developed big industry, there can be no thought of Socialism, least of all in an agrarian country. We in Russia know this much more accurately than before, and instead of speaking of an indefinite or abstract form of great industrial equipment, we now speak of a definite, exactly calculated, and concrete plan of electrification." (Lenin. Vol. XVIII 1, page 260.)

Today we still recognise this view as perfectly correct. Lenin grasped perfectly that it is imperative that we overcome our economic backwardness, and he never considered it insurmountable. We have always maintained this standpoint and continue to maintain it. (A voice: "And who is opposed to it?")

This time I am justifying myself, and accusing nobody. We have been accused of regarding our technical backwardness as an insuperable obstacle. I maintain that I have never said this, and the word "insurmountable" has been as falsely attributed to me as the "social democratic deviation." I maintain that our technical backwardness actually renders our development more difficult. And of course we have always maintained this, it is an alphabet which we learnt from Lenin. (A voice: "And what about the article on the co-operatives?") The article on the co-operatives is absolutely correct, but I much regret, comrades, that everyone who has quoted this article up to now — even comrade Stalin yesterday — has cut off his quotation precisely before Lenin's sentence on our international tasks.

"I would be prepared to say that we should attach supreme importance to our cultural development, were it not for our international relations, were it not our duty to fight for our position on an international scale."

And here he is not speaking of our duty as international proletarian revolutionists, but from the standpoint of the necessity of confirming our victory in the Soviet Union internationally.

I am also of the opinion that Comrade Bucharin's formulation is extremely unhappy when he says that "if we abstract ourselves from international affairs... then, etc."

Such an abstraction is **not possible**.

To be sure, if we can perform a process of abstraction from the laws of physiology, then we may maintain that Comrade Bucharin will live for another 200 years and become younger and cleverer every day. (A voice: "You at least will never become cleverer.")

This can be done if the "abstraction" from physical laws is accomplished. Only this cannot be done. And when Bucharin accuses me of lumping together the "international" and the "internal", he is wrong. But that these two factors are connected with one another is incontestable.

Lenin, in a recently published article entitled: "A reply to the questions of the English correspondent Ransome", wrote as follows on the price question:

"The prices are determined... by the prices of production abroad plus our state advance in support of production. ("Pravda", 21. January 1926.)

This is what Lenin said. And can it now be maintained that the only danger threatening us is that of armed intervention? No, and again no. The laws of the world's markets, too, have their influence over us. This was stated in the resolution of the XIV. Party Congress, which represents a compromise resolution, if we take into consideration the manner in which it is drawn up.

Hence it is entirely wrong, comrades, to say that the only danger threatening us is that of armed intervention. When we are asked, comrades, what prospects we have for our work towards Socialism; when we are accused of expecting no future for our cultural work, nor for the trade unions, nor for the youth, then we reply: That is not true. We have a future, and that is the future seen by Lenin. This future is completely bound up with that of the world revolution. (A voice: "Better tell us at once who is right, you or the Party.")

If you ask us whether we shall establish Socialism, we reply: Yes, we shall establish it. If you ask us how we shall establish it, we reply that it will be in alliance with the workers of other countries, in alliance with the world revolution, and, finally, in alliance with the peasantry of our own country and with the colonial peoples.

If we are asked whether this international revolution will come in time, we reply: Yes, it will come in time. We have to maintain our revolution till the revolution breaks out in other countries. Lenin answered this question:

"Our task, so long as we stand alone, is to maintain the revolution, to hold fast at least one stronghold of Socialism, however small and weak it may be, until the revolution matures in other countries, and other troops hasten to our aid."

Comrades, I should like to add a few words on the bloc. (Voices: "You have said enough already. You were going to say everything from the beginning, and you have said nothing. Enough." Uproar.) I should like to say a few words on the bloc and the Comintern. (Voices: "Enough. You ought to have spoken of that, instead of saying all that you have said.") Then you do not consider the question of the realisation of Socialism in one country to be important? Then why did Stalin speak on this subject for three hours, and say that time must be allowed for this question. (Disturbance, protests.) I ask for 10 to 15 minutes, in order to refer to the bloc and the question of the Comintern. (Disturbance. Voices: "Enough!") You are aware, comrades, that the Party is now deciding that I am not to work in the Comintern any longer. (A voice: "That is already decided!") Under the given circumstances this is unavoidable. But it would be just on your part to give me five minutes in which to speak of the Comintern. (Disturbance. Voices: "Enough". The chairman rings.) I ask for 10 to 15 minutes more for these two questions.

Chairman: I take the vote. Who is in favour of Comrade Zinoviev's continuing to speak? Against? The majority is against.