

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 7. No. 6

20th January 1927

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

VII. Meeting of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. *Twenty-Fourth to Twenty-Sixth Session.*

Full Report.

Twenty-Fourth Session.

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

(CONTINUATION.)

Moscow, Dec. 11, 1926.

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman):

Opened the session at 6 p. m. for the continuation of the discussion on the Russian question.

Comrade STUTSCHKA (Latvia):

Comrades, the Communist Parties of the Baltic States: Latvia, Lithuania and Esthonia, have authorised me to speak for them on the Russian question. And it would seem that ours should be a simple greeting, or better to say, a congratulation on the victoriously concluded factional struggle against the Party. It became evident, however, in the last few sessions of the Plenum from opposition speakers who appeared here that the struggle has not yet ceased, but on the contrary, apparently it is to be continued on an international scale. This is to be assumed at least from the speech of Comrade Trotsky, which contained, practically a threat to this effect. In this case our Parties promise to do everything possible to combat these factional endeavours. Our Parties are small to be sure and not numerically powerful, but the whole combined Opposition on a world scale is even smaller than the size of our Parties.

For us this struggle in the Russian Party was of all the greater importance because all our small Parties once belonged to the C. P. S. U. and they did not leave that Party voluntarily, they were torn away by force. This feeling of belonging to the C. P. S. U. has lost no potency in the course of time. Our Parties fought hand in hand in the bloody struggles against czarism and against the whole bourgeoisie of the present Union, and this compact, written in blood, is not so easily forgotten.

Our Parties are strictly disciplined Communist Parties, which not so long ago, even though only for a short time, even wielded State power. They know very well what disunity means in a Party that is fighting, or even ruling. That is why what is happening here in Russia was of special interest to our Parties. Of course the conditions here were better known to us than to the West European Parties. The leaders of the Leninist Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. are known to our comrades as tested Leninists, by whom they have stood, still stand and will continue to stand in the struggle.

I should like to point out a little — I don't know — perhaps it was an accident, but a very peculiar accident — namely, that the first two Opposition speakers, Zinoviev and Trotsky, occupied themselves before the Comintern exclusively with one question, with the question of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union. We have at home really strong Menshevik Social Democratic Parties. In each of our countries these Parties are waging their struggle very cleverly; in their ranks they have collaborators not only like Kautsky and Vandervelde, but also like Otto Bauer and Fritz Adler. And in Riga one very often encounters the "best" names in the international Social Democracy as visitors.

What do these Social Democrats preach? In their press they generally preach one thing about Soviet Russia: Russia is becoming bourgeois, the Soviet Union cannot build Socialism, it can only re-establish capitalism, etc. This is the strongest reproach the Social Democratic press can level against Soviet Russia. Must it not arouse misgivings if the two chief leaders of the Opposition here occupy themselves solely with this theme? They spoke here for the West, for Europe, and

one must remark that for some time already, Riga and Kovno have been counting themselves to Western Europe, if not altogether, then at least as "border Europe", and if the Opposition leaders occupy themselves only with this question — I assume, quite accidentally — this can only mean to us that they are saying the same as our Social Democracy. They want to take from the workers of the West the belief that Socialist construction is at all possible in Soviet Russia.

Of course our workers see beyond the border not only the slogan: "Long live Soviet Russia!" — (even because of the inscription on the frontier stations a note was supposed to have been sent to the Soviet Government) — but they also see how the construction is proceeding here, and our workers, to the extent that they support Communism, are firmly convinced that the Soviet Union can and will build up Socialism. The only possibility that can prevent the building of Socialism is a victorious armed intervention. If it should come to an intervention the territory of our countries will of course, be the field upon which, in part, the battles will be fought, and I am authorised in the name of the three Parties of our Baltic States to pledge our fidelity to the Comintern, that we will stand firm in the struggle for the Comintern. In this fight our slogan is: **Long live the united C.P.S.U.! Down with factionalism! Long live the Socialist construction in the Soviet Union as a foundation stone of world Socialism! (Applause.)**

Comrade BUCK (Canada):

In the same of the Canadian Party, the Canadian Delegation unreservedly endorses the decisions of the XV. Conference of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and expresses solidarity with it in the task of constructing Socialism in the First Workers and Peasants Republic.

While in this discussion a most serious question of principle is involved, the outstanding feature of the Opposition bloc which forced the discussion, is its absolute lack of principle. It is clear from the most casual examination of the elements of which this bloc was composed, that the basis of this bloc was not unity of opinion on questions of principle, but a common will to fight against the unity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

In face of the existing relative stabilisation of capitalism, the Opposition showed an astounding lack of contact with reality in its proposal that the Russian Unions should withdraw from the Anglo-Russian Committee. This Committee gave us direct contact with millions of British workers, it provided a window through which the British proletariat saw our revolution in a new light, and despite all the attempts of the traitors on the General Council to sabotage and destroy, it has led to the Anglo-Russian Miners Committee which is destined to play a historical role in the development of our international revolutionary movement.

The proposal to withdraw from the Kuomintang, which today leads the teeming millions of China in their struggle against capitalist imperialism, was similarly a proposal of either madmen or flippant adventurers.

Comrade Zinoviev declares that it is not possible to construct Socialism in one country, and speaks of the degeneration of the Russian Socialist Revolution, a statement which directly implies degeneration in the C.P.S.U. Socialism, says Zinoviev, can be conceived in one country, but it can never be attained in one country, and it is scarcely possible even in a group of highly developed countries of Western Europe. But with the perspectives and objective conditions that the existing degree of stabilisation presents us with, we must work for the building of Socialism in Soviet Russia. And how are we to proceed? According to Comrade Zinoviev and the Opposition bloc, we should proceed as follows: by heavier taxation of the peasantry, thereby reducing agricultural production, (and thus the export surplus and the purchasing power of the peasantry), weakening or breaking the smychka between the workers and the peasants and rendering Socialist accumulation impossible.

This policy is to be accompanied on the international field by a series of gestures, which under the given conditions could only result in our isolation from the struggling proletariat of the West, and the revolutionary workers and peasants of the East. Such a policy is fantastical. It is a policy of desperation.

Zinoviev endeavours to dissociate himself from Trotskyism and the theory of permanent revolution. But from his own speech, particularly his clear and definite statements regarding the construction of Socialism in one country — or even in a group of countries, it is clear that he is sceptical of the possibilities of constructing Socialism, excepting after the world revolution. And there is no logical difference between this standpoint and Comrade Trotsky's theory of permanent revolution, which Comrade Zinoviev himself has so frequently and so vigorously denounced.

On the question of the possibility of Socialism in one country, Comrade Trotsky in his speech retreats behind the definition of Socialism as the abolition of the State. He leaps entirely over the fact that the abolition of the State must itself be a process extending over decades, even after the world revolution; and that in this process itself there will be inequalities of development. And he further evades the fact that completion of this process represents not Socialism, but Communism.

On the question of the internal policy of the C.P.S.U., Trotsky said nothing. But by his endorsement of Zinoviev's speech he clearly aligned himself with him. What should be the policy of the C.P.S.U. What is the Leninist line? Zinoviev quotes Lenin. The quotations he uses now differ from those he used as the champion of Leninism against Trotskyism, and that is significant. He quotes now Lenin's statement to the effect that we have a N.E.P. Russia, we must do all we can to substitute a Socialist Russia. The whole Communist movement agrees with that. But how? Certainly that aim is not to be achieved by the adoption of the proposals of the opposition bloc, it will be achieved by the progressive and parallel increase of Socialist accumulation, by development of harmonious relations between the productive power of State industry and the need of the peasantry, and reciprocal supply of industry and the peasantry through the co-operatives of each other's needs, with the resultant welding together of agriculture and industry into one harmonious Socialist economy. This is a tremendous task. But it is the Leninist policy clearly foreshadowed in Lenin's speeches and writings on N.E.P. and the Co-operatives.

And how shall this task be carried out. The Opposition bloc proposes that we assure ourselves beforehand that it is impossible, that the struggle for Socialism is in vain, and therefore, to hypnotise ourselves into an entirely false analysis of the world situation.

The Leninist policy on the other hand, is the policy of the leading Party of the Communist International: to march forward with the construction of Socialism over one sixth of the surface of the earth, confident that the creative resources of the proletarian dictatorship, supported by the revolutionary workers of the world will assure success. The C.P. of Canada unequivocally repudiates the proposal of the Opposition bloc and stands in complete unity with the C.P.S.U. in their great historical task.

Comrade SIROLA (Finland):

In the name of the Scandinavian delegation I make the following declaration on the discussion in the C.P.S.U.:

The delegation of the Scandinavian Federation of Communist Parties (comprising the Communist Parties of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Finland) desire by this declaration to announce in all brevity their complete support of the "Theses on the Opposition Bloc and the Inner Party Situation" which were adopted by the XV. Conference of the C.P.S.U.

The delegations are of the view that the policy represented and carried out by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, by the Bolshevik majority of its Central Committee, is entirely correct and adapted to helping Socialism in the Soviet Union and contributing to its final triumph throughout the whole world.

The Scandinavian Party delegations, jointly with the delegations of other Communist Parties, were forced at the VII Enlarged Executive to witness the renewed activity and operations of leading personalities in the Russian Opposition. We consider this activity by these elements at the Enlarged Executive as an attempt to create a political platform and thereby extend and broaden the factional struggle in the C.P.S.U. and in the Comintern. This is again objectively inclined — in so far

as they can exert any influence whatever — to disturb not only the unity of the C. P. S. U. and to blast the proletarian dictatorship, but also to menace the unity of the Comintern. By their latest appearance, Comrades **Zinoviev**, **Trotsky** and **Kamenev** have furnished new evidence of their deviation from the firm foundations of Leninism.

In this connection we cannot avoid recollecting that these comrades have broken completely with what they once demanded from other members of the Communist International. In November, 1923 these comrades, under the chairmanship of Comrade **Kamenev**, upon the motion of Comrade **Zinoviev** and with the support of Comrade **Trotsky**, on the occasion of a dispute in the Executive of one of the Scandinavian Parties, decreed the following:

“Taking into consideration that the fundamental interests of the proletariat require absolute Party unity, all comrades are reminded that should future attacks against the unity of the Party occur, or steps be taken that lead to the lowering of the authority of the C. C., all guilty comrades will be expelled from the Comintern.”

We are of the opinion that this decision was correct and necessary in order to call to order certain opposition-factional, undisciplined comrades. But we also demand that Comrades **Zinoviev**, **Trotsky** and **Kamenev** not only remember these important decisions in the making of which they themselves took a prominent part, but that they also bear in mind that these decisions apply equally to themselves.

We are certain that we express the unanimous view of the Scandinavian Communist Parties when we expressly emphasise that all attacks against the unity of the C. P. S. U. must be repudiated, when we decisively reject and condemn the action of the Opposition at the Enlarged Executive.

For my own part I should like to add a few words based on my experience as a Party worker in capitalist countries. The first question upon which one begins to make Communism clear to Party members is that of ideological unity. There are still very many Social Democratic views and survivals to be found among our comrades, especially if they are without any concrete revolutionary experiences. And now these views are again being strengthened by the capitalist stabilisation. It is therefore necessary to emphasise that Marxism and Leninism are a uniform philosophy, a uniform political system, not dogmatic but living, dialectic, concrete, and that all our propaganda must be ideologically uniform, it must be Leninist.

But here we encounter a problem — Comrade **Trotsky**. It is surely no secret for the comrades that he has never given any complete accounting of his past. He came to the Bolshevik Party, to be sure a little earlier than some of us here, at a time when uniformity of revolutionary Party activity was the main thing. Upon his coming over we did not get, nor did we demand, a declaration such as a responsible political personality in such cases owes both to himself and to the Party. To be sure on several occasions and also in his last speech, **Trotsky** admitted that as against **Lenin** on certain questions he had held to a false policy. He has not yet, however, deemed it advisable to subject his whole political past to a detailed criticism. He did not make clear where and in what **Lenin** had been right as against himself. On the contrary, we have certain documents — the preface to “**War and Revolution**”, the “**Lessons of October**”, etc. in which he attempts to justify his old non-Leninist views.

Therefore we must say that a detailed statement by Comrade **Trotsky** concerning his past should have been absolutely requisite. The work of Leninist clarification, the creation of the ideological unity of the Comintern would have been greatly fostered thereby. We should finally make an end to the speculations indulged in by our enemies with the name of **Trotsky** all over the world.

One may remark — and Comrade **Kamenev** made use of this today — that one also carries on such speculations with the names of **Stalin** and **Bukharin** — and that this was attempted also with the name of **Lenin**. These speculations, however, always came to a sad end. The speculators were forced to admit, as did not long ago an American bourgeois newspaper, which expressed itself as follows about the recent bourgeois and Social Democratic anticipation of the “degeneration” of the Bolsheviks: “The more one expects them (the Bolsheviks) to change, the more they remain as of old”. But the speculation with the name

of **Trotsky** goes on from year to year, which proves that he also has remained as of old. And as long as this is the case, as long as Comrade **Trotsky** will not take part in this clarification work concerning Trotskyism, it must be carried on against him. For it is necessary for the creation of a uniform ideology in the Parties of the Comintern.

Now a few words as to Comrade **Zinoviev**. As chairman of the Comintern he had a particularly responsible position. When the first rumours reached abroad a year ago, that Comrade **Zinoviev** stood with the Opposition in the Russian Party, it aroused glad hopes in certain of the Party circles that had been unwilling to carry out the Bolshevisation conditions. They waited for alleviation, „concessions” in one respect, and tried to justify their scepticism by remarking that matters were not so rosy even in the Russian Party.

It was not difficult to refute this. One had only to present the big problems of the Russian revolution to these comrades and demand a decision from them. They were forced to admit that the problems were really great and that a detailed discussion was necessary in the Russian Party in order to arrive at a correct decision, for we are a proletarian Party and the whole mass of the membership must know and understand what the policy of the Party is and how it has been arrived at. Every honest worker understands us when we declare that once we have laid down our battle plans they must be carried out uniformly.

This would have applied also to the last Russian Party discussion if matters had developed in a so-to-say-normal manner.

But already in the last discussion of the C. P. S. U. something happened which was very hard to explain to the Party members. This applies to the question of discipline. Comrade **Lenin** put this for us very sharply, yet nevertheless, it is very difficult to realise it in our Parties. So deep-rooted are the individualist, petty bourgeois Social Democratic habits than even though all comrades bow before the most stringent demands of **Lenin** “in principle”, yet in every country there are altogether too many Party members who look upon the Communist Party as a way-station to which one comes and from which one goes without clearly recognising that one really joins the Communist Party only once and for all time.

What was it that happened? Comrade **Zinoviev**, chairman of the E. C. C. I., took part in a serious breach of discipline, he violated this basic principle of Leninism. I think we must designate it as a mistake on the part of the leadership of the C. P. S. U. and C. I. that they did not immediately effect his removal from his post as chairman. It created confusion in the ranks of the Parties.

If a responsible leader is deeply convinced that the Party leadership, or a whole Party even, is on the wrong road, then he has the right and even the duty of bringing his views to the knowledge of the Party membership, but also to resign immediately from his responsible position so that it becomes clear that he cannot assume the responsibility. But even then he has no right to carry on factional activity. If he does this it means that he is determined to go all the way — to the founding of a new party. In this however, one should not act diplomatically, as the Opposition comrades are doing now, but instead with the full consciousness of responsibility. They have neither stood by their viewpoint nor have they surrendered it with Bolshevik courage. In certain questions they stopped half way, in others they have remained silent or have tried to explain them away. They have continued their factional activity “under cover”, as was exposed here by several competent comrades.

Comrades of the Opposition: we censure you for these breaches of discipline and this lack of principle! For these things the Comintern must condemn you. You have not given us, the younger Communists, a lesson in Bolshevisation, but its opposite. You are not an example for us to follow, you are a warning example. This will bring harm to the cause of Communism. Our enemies always get a breathing spell when mistakes and crises occur in the Communist Party and are not quickly enough liquidated. The International Communist Party will, of course, withstand this crisis and emerge from it strengthened.

The more rapidly a correct conception of discipline becomes clear in the Party, the more will we have guarantees against such surprises as this one.

Some of the politicians who have resigned or, who have been expelled from the C.I., have now tried to make demagogic capital out of this story. They insinuate that it has now become clear as to what the Communist International was, that it was in irresponsible hands, etc. Upon this we must reply that it is not true that Comrade Zinoviev in the C.I. conducted his policy, it was the policy of the Comintern, the policy of the Party. His withdrawal means no principial change in the line and policy of the C.I. It is what it has been, the Party of the proletarian revolution, and it will more and more consolidate itself, ideologically as well as organisationally. (Applause.)

Comrade Rykov (C. P. S. U.):

(Comrade Rykov receives a rousing ovation, all the delegates rising to their feet.)

Comrades, not only have I been unable to write my speech like Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev, but I have not even had time to collect the necessary material and to read everything that has been said at the Plenum. In this respect the Opposition comrades are in a much more advantageous position (Laughter). Therefore, I will ask you to excuse me in advance for any lack of system in my speech.

Shortly before the opening of the Plenum, Comrade Zinoviev told the Bureau of the C. P. S. U. Delegation, that his position as one of the organisers of the Comintern and its former chairman makes it necessary for him to make a "farewell" speech at this Plenum. The Politbureau and our delegation considered that such a speech would be inexpedient; nevertheless Comrade Zinoviev spoke from this tribune. After him spoke Comrade Trotsky, who explained that his speech was necessary as "the question under discussion revolved around so-called Trotskyism as around an axis". Then, after Comrade Trotsky, Kamenev also spoke. He was not an organiser of the Comintern, had not been its chairman and as everybody knows nothing revolves around Comrade Kamenev. (Applause.)

Nevertheless, Comrade Kamenev also found it necessary to speak from this tribune of the international proletariat; what is more, he read a speech that had been written in advance, which I am told, was signed by three persons — Kamenev, Trotsky and Zinoviev. This shows that this was the concerted action of a united faction. (A voice: "Quite so.") In other words we have here a proof that the promise to dissolve the faction, given by the Opposition in its famous document of October 16, has not been fulfilled. (Voices: "Quite right".) This means that the promise, which the Zinoviev-Trotsky-Kamenev faction gave to the Party in the document published, has been publicly violated from the Comintern platform. I think that the Plenum of the Comintern will consider it correct if the Delegation of the C. P. S. U. and the entire Communist Party of the Soviet Union take this fact into consideration in their subsequent policy towards the Opposition within the C. P. S. U.

Comrade Kamenev stated in his speech:

"We never have defended, are not defending and will not defend that which has historically distinguished Trotskyism from Leninism — the permanent revolution, presentation of the peasant question, etc."

In order to show what was Comrade Kamenev's attitude towards Trotskyism still quite recently, I will quote from Comrade Kamenev, but I will warn you in advance that I am not making these and other quotations because I consider myself a follower of the "Alexander school" which considers that the less one says oneself the better. (Laughter.) I think that in the present case it is the best and clearest way of showing how the attitude of Comrade Kamenev and his fellow-thinkers towards Trotskyism has changed.

In Comrade Kamenev's article "The Party and Trotskyism" we find such words as

"Comrade Trotsky has become the channel through which petty bourgeois elements within our Party manifest themselves . . ."

Do you think that this was said years ago in the epoch of "historic Trotskyism"? No, it was said at the end of 1924.

Here is the second quotation: "In his struggle against the

Party he (Trotsky) has already become a symbol in the country for everything that is directed against our Party". That also was said in 1924.

Further:

"It should be clear to every conscious Party member that there is Trotskyism and there is Leninism, and that for us Bolsheviki and for the international proletariat marching towards victory, Leninism is sufficient and we do not need either to substitute or to 'rectify Leninism by Trotskyism'."

In order to get a complete picture, I will cite certain statements which Comrade Zinoviev also made in 1924:

"A rotten nut will not be made better by a thin covering of gild. Trotskyism of pre-war days, which is a species of Menshevism, will not become any better through attempts to gild it with 'Leninism'."

In that quotation Comrade Zinoviev puts the very word "Leninism" in quotation marks in order to make it more sarcastic.

And further:

"he (i. e. Trotsky) is becoming the mouthpiece of everything which is not Bolshevik in the Party. He is actually demanding that the Party be levelled down to everything that is non-Bolshevik (in the real sense of the word) in it . . ."

"Comrade Trotsky wants to get in at one door but finds himself in another. He wants to fight against the excessive 'sectarianism' of the old Bolsheviki, against what seems to him to be 'the narrowness of the old circles', whereas he is actually fighting against the foundations of Bolshevism. And actually, of course without wanting to do so, he renders an indispensable service to the class enemy . . ."

Comrade Kamenev said in his speech today that "they" do not renounce their former criticism of Trotskyism, using thereby the term "historic" Trotskyism without sufficient explanation.

Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev, who during the last few years aroused millions of workers in our country and throughout the whole world against the political platform of Trotsky, Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev who conducted a fierce struggle against us when we opposed the exclusion of Comrade Trotsky from the Politbureau and opposed the removal of Trotsky from participation in Party leadership, Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev each of whom occupied this platform more than an hour, did not tell the Comintern whether they include in the term historic Trotskyism, the characterisation which they gave of Trotskyism, in 1924, and which you may judge by the quotations I have made.

It is monstrous, extravagant, incredible, but it is a fact — the same people who a couple of years ago spoke of Trotskyism in such terms as "a rotten nut", who characterised it as a "species of Menshevism", as being an expression of "everything in the Party that is not Bolshevik" — these same people, hitting behind the term "historic", have now become open defenders of Trotsky and Trotskyism.

There is nothing more comical than the attempt of the Opposition to pose on this platform as political leaders, who have a stable, strictly consistent clear platform and who know whither they are going.

Similar vacillations to those which have marked the attitude of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev on the question of Trotskyism will certainly also arise in the future on all questions of our Party policy. They are people who in this respect are sufficiently experienced in the history of our revolution. They are people who every year or two or even every few months change their views on the most important cardinal questions of the proletarian revolution, who say today what is an absolute contradiction of what they said yesterday.

*) In this and subsequent quotations the italics are mine unless otherwise stated. A. R.

Two years have not yet elapsed since Comrade Zinoviev "turned his face towards the village" and proposed organising fractions of non-Party peasants in all Soviets, connecting these fractions from top to bottom throughout the whole Soviet system and giving this non-Party political peasant organisation a newspaper.

This pose of Comrade Zinoviev did not last for long.

As soon as his side began to be tickled a little he turned his face away from the peasants. At the same time his attitude towards his own plan radically changed. Now he no longer puts it forward.

The same holds good with Comrade Kamenev. At the Moscow Provincial Congress of Soviets (April 1925), Comrade Kamenev stated: "**Only the peasantry which is developing, getting rich and accumulating, can be a sound consumer of those products which will help to keep our factories and works going.** Therefore, we must create conditions which will assist this." (Italics Comrade Kamenev's).

Observe what he says about the "peasantry getting rich and accumulating". In today's speech in this hall, Comrade Kamenev speaking of the Right deviation in our Party, referred to the term "enrich yourself" which was used by Comrade Bukharin. Comrade Bukharin has had sufficient courage to declare openly that he employed this term incorrectly, that this term can be incorrectly interpreted and might cause deviations in the practical conduct of our policy. I ask you where and when Comrade Kamenev, who by this speech gave the Party an orientation towards the enriched and accumulating peasantry, has renounced these statements?

In judging these quotations, it is necessary to study the present ideology of Comrade Kamenev concerning the paths of development of agriculture and the growth of the bourgeois-kulak class amongst the peasantry.

A year and a half ago, at the All-Union Congress of Soviets, Comrade Kamenev stated that we will keep on increasing financial aid to agriculture by State funds. Now the Opposition puts forward a programme for increased pumping of resources from agriculture into industry.

There may be disagreement as to whether we should invest a billion or one billion one hundred million roubles in industrialisation, but it is quite evident that the process of industrialisation of the country, which is connected with great capital work, entails increasing expenditure on industry and transport.

I repeat, comrades, that it is difficult to find any question in our Party policy on which these people, if not in the same speech then at least during the space of a year or a year and a half, have not made absolutely contradictory statements. In order to make it clear to the Plenum of the E. C. C. I. why the leaders of the new Opposition failed so easily, lost their entire political authority, departed from the scene quite unnoticed — "without any wreaths and without any honours", I must allude to yet another extremely essential feature of the political characteristics of these politicians. In the resolution passed by the XIV Party Conference, we find the following paragraph:

"From this (i. e., from the difficulties which Socialist construction encounters in a country encircled by capitalist States), it by no means follows that the construction of a complete Socialist society in such a backward country as Russia is impossible without 'State aid' of countries more developed in technical and economic respects".

Both Comrade Kamenev and Comrade Zinoviev voted for this paragraph.

Further, we read in the same resolution:

"A component part of Trotsky's theory of Permanent Revolution is the assertion that 'the real ascent of Socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe' (Trotsky 1922) — a statement which during the present period dooms the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. to fatalistic passivity". (Italics as in resolution). Finally we read in the same resolution:

"Comrade Trotsky's exaggerated and incorrect estimation of an Anglo-American rapprochement has brought him right up against the necessity of a radical revision of the Leninist theory of imperialism (the question of ultra-imperialism)."

This resolution from the first word to the last was adopted at the XIV Party Conference and supported by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev and, their fellow-thinkers. The present Oppositionists voted for it. (Interjection by Stalin: "Zinoviev made the report on this resolution"). The XIV Conference of our Party took place in April, 1925, only a year and a half ago. Therefore, the members of this Plenum should not be surprised if there is a widespread opinion amongst our Party rank and file, that the majority of the present united Opposition, particularly that part of it expressed by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev represent an opposition devoid of all ideological backbone. These are people who during a short period have several answers for the same question, and the firmness of whose views, as experience has shown, cannot be trusted either in the field of theoretical principles or in the field of current practical policy.

And, apart from the falsity and opportunism of the entire theoretical and practical platform of the Opposition, this fact explains why they failed so ingnomminously at our Party Congresses and also during their attempts to penetrate into the Party masses and open a general discussion.

Therefore, I think it is quite comprehensible that not a single organisation has been found in our Party which would decide to entrust the leadership of our Party to people who change their views on the fundamental problems of our revolution at such short notice.

The members of the Comintern Plenum should not be surprised if the broad masses of Party members take up this attitude towards the Opposition. Every Party possesses a feeling of its own merit.

The million or more workers organised in the C. P. S. U. also have this feeling of their own worth, having passed through the tremendous and brilliant school of the revolutionary struggle. This million workers cannot let themselves be led by the nose and be told one thing today and the opposite tomorrow.

Comrade Kamenev commenced his speech by raising the question as to "whether a Right deviation exists in our Party". He pointed out as sources of "Right Wing tendencies" in our Party, the predominant role of the peasantry in the country's economy, the retarded tempo of the world revolution and the pressure of the entire N. E. P. situation on the Party. Comrade Kamenev then continued by saying:

"I will not enumerate the remaining sources of opportunist tendencies in our Party; even this is sufficient. The existence of these influences on various organs of our Party and the Right deviations undoubtedly observable in the Party from time to time, by no means signifies of course that Thermidor has taken place in our country, i. e., that the power of the proletariat has passed over to some other class; it does not mean that the Party is slipping off the line of class policy, it does not mean that the hopes of ideologists of the new bourgeoisie such as Ustrialov, for bourgeois democracy, have been realised. Such statements and anything similar to them must be categorically rejected. We have nothing in common with them. Whoever insists on such statements places himself in decided contradiction with our Party and its tasks".

When I heard these words from the lips of Comrade Kamenev I thought that the Opposition, through him, was at last making a step forward towards the Party. Such a statement would seem to imply the renunciation of a great deal. For it is none other than Comrade Trotsky who called our State "far from proletarian". It was none other than Comrade Kamenev who cried out about the lower stories of the Soviet system being "flooded out" by bourgeois-kulak elements. None other than the Opposition leaders ambiguously hinted about the "sliding" of the Party from the class line of the proletariat. Voices from the Opposition camp have made themselves heard about the degeneration of the "upper sections" and the leading organs of our Party. All these assertions taken together showed that a reshifting of classes had taken place or at any rate was already beginning to take place. And this fact gave particular sharpness to the struggle which took place within the Party. The statement of Comrade Kamenev that I have just read out apparently ought to mean the renunciation of a considerable part of the unprecedentedly monstrous accusations put forward against our Party and its leading organ. However, in order to draw such a conclusion it is necessary to reject the whole remaining part of Comrade Kamenev's speech, as it is based on a refutation of the

assertion made at the commencement of this speech. One of the typical features of the Opposition comrades is that they "are able" to say both "for" and "against" in the same speech, presenting one conception at the commencement and asserting quite the opposite at the end. Comrade Kamenev's speech is a model in this respect!

I must first of all state that every member of the C. C. of our Party has understood quite well and still understands that the danger of a Right deviation in our Party has existed and will continue to exist for a long time yet. Comrade Kamenev said in his speech that at the XIV Congress instructions were given that the "fire of the ideological struggle should be aimed against the Left". I must say that no supporter of the majority has ever given instructions to this effect. The pretext for the accusations of the Opposition comrades against the C. C. of the Party about directing "fire to the Left" was our policy directed against the relics of "military Communism" in the countryside and the corresponding methods in the leadership of the peasantry. The elements of military Communism in the countryside existed for a long time after they had been outlawed in the towns. None other than Comrade Kamenev in his time frequently made statements in his speeches about the danger of these remnants and the necessity for removing them as quickly as possible. We cannot introduce revolutionary law into the countryside, correctly organise the work of the cooperatives and local Soviets without liquidating the remnants of military Communism in the sphere of rural relations.

We have frequently attempted to establish what the Opposition proposes to do to overcome the danger which in its opinion is hanging over the Party and the country. Comrade Kamenev in today's speech said that the main criterion of success for the struggle of Socialist elements in our country with capitalist elements is the corresponding tempo of industrialisation.

Up to the last Party Congress, the destiny of the economic policy of the Party was to a considerable extent determined by the leadership of representatives of the united Opposition — Kamenev, Sokolnikov, Smilga (A voice: "Piatakov") and Piatakov — and it is the Opposition and its leaders who are most immediately responsible for everything that was done during that period in this sphere. I frequently made statements that we do not waive our own responsibility for the errors committed in the economic leadership. Now I must say that we do not withdraw our responsibility for the chief error of taking too long to remove these comrades from that leadership. The error of the C. C. consisted in its adopting too mild an attitude towards the Opposition as a result of which their leaders were only withdrawn from leading posts at the time when the errors of their leadership created a serious threat of a profound economic crisis.

I assert that since the XIV Party Congress, since the withdrawal of Opposition leaders from leading posts we have emerged with honour from the difficulties into which the Opposition landed us. We have found greater resources for realising the industrialisation of the country, having revised our tax legislation and are introducing a number of other measures.

Comrade Kamenev stated here that the Opposition never insisted on the policy of raising prices. This statement is incorrect. It is well known to everyone that the proposal to raise prices came from Piatakov and Preobrazhensky and was expounded in the most detailed manner in the widely distributed platform of the Opposition, which was officially signed by a certain Malizlin. This platform put forward the thesis of the possibility of getting an extra billion roubles for the industrialisation of the country by means of raising the retail prices on industrial products.

The inner Party discussion has also a fairly long history of its development both as regards the organisation forms of struggle and as to the ideological content. The Opposition expounded its platform, both in the lower nuclei of our Party and also at the provincial and All-Union Conferences and Congresses of the Party and step by step completed the formation of its fractional organisation.

After having suffered severe defeat in all organisations of the C. P. S. U., it is at the present time dragging the discussion into the Plenum of the Comintern. The Opposition has frequently attempted to bring up questions in dispute for renewed discussion after they have been examined by the higher organs of our Party, even during Party Congresses. This has greatly impeded the work of the Party and the Soviets.

From the point of view of ideological content, the discussion has passed through various phases. First there was the dispute as to the possibility of non-capitalist development of the countryside and the significance of cooperation in Socialist construction. Afterwards, a polemic was developed on the question of the Social nature of State industry of the U. S. S. R., there was a discussion as to whether N. E. P. was only a retreat, as the Opposition asserted, or whether it was a form of relations between town and village on the basis of which economic and Socialist construction were taking place at the present time. The apex of the discussion is the question of the construction of Socialism in one country.

As I have said, the Opposition leaders have the habit of giving quite opposite replies to one and the same question. However, the stages of development that the discussion has passed through reveal with perfect clarity the path of steady development of the Opposition to the Right — towards Trotskyism. The most stable Opposition group within our Party has been Trotskyism, which has now rallied to itself all those comrades such as Zinoviev, Kamenev and others, who, not having their own firm political ideology, ultimately came over to Trotskyism through vacillations and contradictions in their attitude towards the chief theoretical and practical problems of our policy.

Comrade Kamenev mentioned with "consternation" the accusation of the Opposition as defeatists. At the last Party Conference I specially devoted a part of my speech to prove the conception that the Opposition ideology was defeatist in two respects: firstly, because of the constant fears that in view of various difficulties on the path of Socialist construction, defeat might take place at any time, and secondly, in the sense that realisation of the Opposition programme would inevitably lead to the defeat of our revolution, as it involves a tremendous increase in the tax burden and rise of prices; what is more, this programme implies an attitude towards the peasantry which would inevitably lead to a rupture of the union of workers and peasants.

The main encounter with the Opposition developed this autumn in the lower Party nuclei. In timing their action for this season the Opposition based their action on the conviction that in the autumn our Union would be engulfed in an economic crisis. Since it placed hopes on the possibility of success just at this moment, it adapted itself to the utilisation of the discontent of the peasants, the workers and of the whole population, which would inevitably arise in connection with the economic crisis foretold by the Opposition.

Comrade Trotsky at the April Plenum of our Central Committee, made the statement that our industry would be faced with the 1926 harvest without any goods reserves, which would mean a reproduction of last year's difficulties on an increased scale. Comrade Kamenev, repeating what Trotsky said, harped on the "dangers" of a good harvest. Comrade Trotsky himself formulated this ideology very well in the words:

"It would be better if the purchasing power of our peasants were less".

From year to year Trotskyism (and now Trotskyism, together and in harmony with Zinoviev and Kamenev) foretells an economic crisis in our country, fearing an accumulation of material advantages, which are the pre-requisite for any construction, including Socialist. Such a view leads these comrades to fear a harvest, and consider it a good thing if there should be a decrease in the purchasing power of the peasantry.

This point of view, while being fundamentally defeatist, is an expression of the same attitude on the part of the victorious proletariat towards the peasantry, as the capitalist Metropolis practices towards the colonies.

The "practical" programme of the Opposition — according to the authoritative statement of Zinoviev, at one of the nuclei — consisted in the following.

"Reduce expenditure by half a billion at the expense of bureaucracy, take the kulaks and N. E. P. men by the throat and we will receive another half a billion. In all we will gain one billion, which we will divide up between industry and wages. Such, briefly is our economic programme".

Anyone who understands the economic situation of our Union and its tax policy, can see how clearly ridiculous is this "programme", and will know that it has been smashed and rejected by the rank and file members of our Party at all nuclei where the Opposition have put it forward.

At the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U., I gave the figures on the taxation of the well-to-do strata of the peasantry. They have reached such dimensions at the present time, that the possibility of their increase needs careful testing by experience, as it might threaten a stoppage in the development of agriculture.

As I was aware of the guarded attitude of the Opposition towards our tax policy, I made a report on the question of the single agricultural tax at the Plenum of the C. C. in the presence of Kamenev, Zinoviev, Trotsky, Sokolnikov, Piatakov and the rest. This law was accepted and endorsed with the participation of the Opposition and what is more, they did not put forward any concrete amendments for increasing the rates of assessment of the middle and well-to-do strata of the peasantry. Soon after this, the Opposition started an agitation arguing that our tax policy favoured the kulak. Firstly, this is actually untrue, and, secondly, the Opposition, while in general supporting this law, reproached us with the fact it should have been issued a year or so earlier. Thus, on this particular question also we have to deal with the double dealings of the Opposition.

The discussion at the present Plenum has mainly been concentrated on the question of the possibility of constructing Socialism in one country. This, of course, is not accidental. It has arisen not because the question of constructing Socialism in our country, especially under the present conditions of international working class struggle, has exclusive theoretical and practical significance, but because the programme of the Opposition has been so discredited in the remaining questions that it would be difficult to defend it at all seriously. Although we are already fed up with the question of the construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. I am nevertheless compelled to dwell on it again. In connection with this question, the Opposition accuses the C. C. of the Party of national-reformism and of forgetting our international obligations. We must categorically state that here their words of accusation alone are insufficient! We must demand from the Opposition, only one single fact, which could prove that our Party had not fulfilled its obligations to the international proletariat. No such fact could be cited!

I must categorically point out the absurd and stupid accusation that our tactic of constructing Socialism in the U. S. S. R. is in any degree connected with lack of faith in the international Socialist revolution. The October Revolution in our country itself and the 10 years existence of the Soviet State have only been possible because we are experiencing the period of the collapse of capitalist society. Our October Revolution is the first link in the general chain of destruction of world capitalism. If it were proved that capitalism were not decaying, but waxing resplendent, none of us would doubt that the continued long existence of the U. S. S. R. and the construction of Socialism in it would be Utopia. We consider our work within the country as a component part of the International revolution and the downfall of capitalism throughout the whole globe.

It is worthy of mention that fundamentally the very question is exceedingly confused. It seems to me that it would not be correct to present it in such an abstract form as that of the construction of Socialism in one country irrespective as to which actual country. Of course, the United States of America, in the event of a proletarian revolution possesses all the premises for the building up of a Socialist society. Many countries can undoubtedly be found whose social-political and economic conditions would not allow of such a possibility. Not to mention such backward countries as Persia for example, or other Eastern countries which, in view of the poor development of industry a proletarian revolution is for the time being impossible. The same applies to those countries which have not sufficient material resources (coal, iron, fuel, corn) and are deprived of the possibility of organising Socialist society under the conditions of capitalist encirclement.

The very meaning of "complete" Socialist society seems to me to be conditional. Capitalism has undergone a number of phases and changes in its development. There is no doubt that Socialist society also will have its own rich history. To say with

absolute accuracy from when we will have complete Socialism, and where "incomplete" Socialism ends, seems to me to be quite impossible and discussions on this question are fruitless.

Comrade Kamenev stated that there is no disagreement between us on the question that we are building Socialism and will build Socialism. This means that in the epoch of decay and collapse of capitalism, the internal forces of our country are sufficient in order to construct Socialism. Well, let us suppose that Kamenev, Zinoviev and Trotsky, and not Stalin, Rykov and Bukharin, set about this building up and succeed in building up 30—40% of this Socialism. I ask, why are the forces which are sufficient for building up Socialism to 30 or 40%, inadequate for building it up a further 10 or 20%? If they can build up 50—60%, why cannot they on the basis of the same forces and the achievements attained in Socialist construction, go on further? No one can explain this. There is no doubt at all that Socialism means the abolition of classes. The construction of Socialism consists in progressive Socialist economic forms ousting the private capitalist forms. Let us suppose that Kamenev replaces private economy by Socialist forms of economy to an extent of 20% throughout a period of several years. Who is to prevent him from going further if he has had the strength to beat private capital in the first stage and obtain successes to the extent of 20—30%? What forces other than his fractional prejudices (laughter, applause) can prevent Kamenev from obtaining further successes in the construction of Socialism?

Comrade Kamenev recalled Comrade Stalin's speech at the XV. Party Conference, in which Comrade Stalin, alluded to Engels' characteristic of the conditions necessary for the Socialist transformation of society and said that we have already realised nine-tenths of this. Now Comrade Zinoviev and Comrade Kamenev are endeavouring to get their own back with this. In Engels' pamphlet he speaks about the approach towards Socialist construction, about the primary stage of organisation of Socialism. Does this assertion of Comrade Stalin mean that we have the technical productive foundation of Socialism already prepared? Naturally, not yet: We have only now commenced the real erection of such a foundation.

But of what was Engels speaking? He spoke of the gradual socialisation of the railways, factories, etc., and their gradual taking over, partly by means of confiscation and partly by buying out the private ownership. Of this we have accomplished at least nine-tenths without any gradualness and without any compensation. But up till now, there has not yet been a sufficiently highly developed heavy industry.

Comrade Trotsky states that as the restoration period comes to an end, our dependency upon Western European capitalism increases and will still more increase. Is that true? It must be admitted that this dependency does exist. But this dependency should not be pictured as if Western European capitalism buys our corn and sells us machinery simply out of generosity towards us, or out of sympathy for the October Revolution, the Communist Party and its Central Committee. If it does these things, it is only because it is to its advantage. And if we do these things, it is only because it is advantageous to us. Of course, besides trading relations two more forms of our relations with Western Europe are also conceivable: firstly, a direct military collision (intervention) and secondly, a complete boycott, which is bound to be a fore-taste of armed intervention, and is a certain substitute for direct military activities.

Meanwhile an exchange takes place. Who gains most from it? If Comrade Trotsky thinks that international capitalism gains most from it, then his proposals should be quite different. It seems to me though, that it is our side that gains in this exchange. Furthermore, with every further step forward we make along the path of industrialisation and construction of Socialism in our country, its dependency on foreign capital will continue to decrease. Under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship and planned economy, the tempo of development in our country will exceed the tempo of development existing in Western European countries. The capitalist world also knows examples of separate countries with backward tempo of development, catching up other capitalist countries. Germany was behind, but she caught up; America was behind, but caught up all other countries; the colonies were behind, but are now developing more rapidly than their respective metropolis. Will this make the colonies more dependent upon the backward part of the capitalist world? Hardly! In our country, however, under

conditions of the planned direction of industry, the monopoly of foreign trade, dependence upon foreign technique will continue to decrease in the subsequent stages of development. If it were the foreign capitalists who gained more in the foreign trade balance, if we were helping the stabilisation of capitalism by our foreign trade, it would then be necessary for us to revise completely our foreign economic relations.

In conclusion, I would like to dwell on one more point of Comrade Kamenev's speech. In asserting that the Party and its C. C. had adopted the path of "nationalist-reformist perspectives", Comrade Kamenev stated at the end of his speech: "With the good will of the majority we could find a common line in practical work". What does this mean? One thing or the other. Either national reformism, and then Comrade Kamenev should resolutely combat it, or else a single line of practical work, and then the accusation of national-reformism can only conceal the political poverty of the entire Opposition. If it is true that the C. C. adopts the platform of "national-reformism" every honest revolutionary should fight against such a C. C. and not seek agreement with it. If it is not true, then the whole of Comrade Kamenev's speech is blackmail. (Applause.) As the proposal for a "single line" in such a situation is based on a comprehension of the Communist Party and its central organs as a federation of various fractional groups of organisations, we have resolutely brushed aside all talk on these grounds and will continue to do so. We are all soldiers of a united Communist Party and cannot conclude any agreements outside of Party congresses and conferences, behind the back of the Party, hiding and hushing up fundamental differences of principle.

Comrade Kamenev complained of the application of the advice of Plato in respect to the Opposition (Laughter). Plato spoke about capable statesmen crowned with laurels and honours. Comrade Kamenev classes himself among capable statesmen and would not be averse to having firstly, laurels and secondly, honours. (Laughter.) I do not know whether Comrade Kamenev will obtain this, but I must remark that the "platonic" style of Comrade Kamenev's speech by no means conceals the platonic grief at the position in which the Opposition finds itself. For him such a position is quite new. I must say that it is only a short time since Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev acted as the zealous executors of Plato's "wise counsels". (A voice: "Comrade Plato.") Comrade Zinoviev for example, suffered defeat in applying this "platonic" tactic when we refused his demand to exclude Trotsky from the Politbureau. And then Comrade Zinoviev wanted to apply these "platonic" methods at a time when Comrade Trotsky had not done a hundredth part of what Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev recently did in their struggle against the unity of the Party. Some comrades present here will probably remember the period when Comrade Zinoviev occupied the post of Chairman of the Leningrad Executive Committee of Soviets in the role of Philosopher Plato, and when he applied the method of administrative-organisational "arguments" to a much greater degree than anywhere else and at any other time. I think that members of the Comintern present here will remember that Comrade Zinoviev also endeavoured to apply these "Platonic" methods too widely in respect to various Sections of the Comintern. (Applause.) Both Comrade Zinoviev and Comrade Kamenev have had to deal with much more disciplined opponents than they themselves prove to be. In the history of our Party we do not remember such a case as for instance, Comrade Zinoviev's journey to his father (Laughter): Perhaps not everyone here knows about it. Let me recall that this case took place at a time when Comrade Kamenev came to a meeting of the Politbureau, and established the text of the document printed on October 16, stating that the Opposition was in favour of peace and against war. But it was noticed that Comrade Zinoviev was missing. Comrade Tomsky asked Comrade Kamenev the reason for Zinoviev's absence and received the reply that Comrade Zinoviev's papa (Laughter) was taken seriously ill and that he had gone to Leningrad to see him. At the same time we received news that Opposition moves were being made in all the main factories of Leningrad, secretly organised and under the direct guidance and most active participation of Comrade Zinoviev.

It was just at the moment that Comrade Kamenev was negotiating with the C. C. about the document that was to crown the cessation of fractional struggle, which in the opinion of the Opposition, threatened the Party with a split, just at this mo-

ment Comrade Kamenev and Comrade Zinoviev and all the Opposition leaders deceived the Party like little boys and conspiratively organised Opposition action in all the big factories of Leningrad.

When Comrade Zinoviev practised his "platonic" we did not know of such a case of double dealings and deception of the Party and the C. C. And Comrade Zinoviev should not complain to us now, if in the present complicated situation we do not reject what Plato recommended in his time, when we deal with the Opposition, which stops at no methods in its struggle against the Party (Loud and prolonged applause. The "International" is sung.)

Comrade THÄLMANN (Germany):

Before taking up the essence of this matter, permit me to make four preliminary remarks:

1. Comrade Trotsky in his speech maintained that Comrade Ercoli and myself, when speaking on the motion of Comrade Riese demanding that representatives of the Russian Opposition be given the floor here, had used a tone here irreconcilable with that of the editorial which appeared in the "Pravda" the day after the speech of Comrade Zinoviev. I want to say here that precisely by the attitude of the three Opposition leaders here at the Plenum, the "Pravda" editorial is justified. The appearance of these oppositional leaders was a factional appearance, and the "Pravda" statement that they have presented an international platform here against the Comintern, is absolutely true.

2. I will try to deal with the serious problems not from the standpoint of citation-cobbling, as Comrade Zinoviev has done, but by approaching them on the basis of the practical revolutionary work of the Soviet Union, Germany and the whole International.

3. The German Party has suffered most severely in its work because of the disruptive activity of the Russian Opposition. In our ranks the fight was fought out hardest, but in that battle also we defeated the Opposition.

4. The assault of Comrade Zinoviev and the others with him, was made against the foundations of the Comintern, to the service of which he was assigned for years by the C. P. S. U., but which he has now completely deserted. All the speeches, those of Comrade Trotsky and especially of Kamenev, and their whole attitude again show that they want to shatter the Leninist foundation of the Comintern. But this foundation stands firm, Trotsky, Kamenev, etc. notwithstanding.

The debate has already shown, and the vote will confirm it, that not the Leninist foundation of the Comintern is to be shattered, but instead the false ideas of the Opposition bloc.

All the Opposition comrades acted in full consciousness against the decision of the C. P. S. U., they continued here in an intensified form their old struggle which, with the famous declaration of October 16, they promised to give up. They appealed to the Comintern against the decisions of the XIV. Party Congress, the July Plenum of the C. C., and the XV Party Conference, to which they submitted in words but which in reality they have never recognised.

They appealed to the Comintern and believed that they could exert their harmful influence here among the delegates who are to decide upon the basic problems of the proletarian dictatorship, in connection with the Russian question. They did not act as individuals, but on the decisions of the whole leading group of the Opposition bloc. Comrade Zinoviev spoke here in the name of Trotsky and in the spirit of Trotskyism, as Trotsky's speech also showed clearly. For the first time Comrade Zinoviev did not address the International Plenum on the authorisation of his Party, as was heretofore the case in the Congresses and Enlarged Executives of the Comintern, but quite openly against his Party, against the C. P. S. U.

The C. P. S. U., which has shown through its representatives and which brings proof in its practical work, that it is defending, assuring, consolidating and affectuating Leninism, the Party which has already defeated the Opposition, is accused by the Opposition, especially by Comrade Kamenev, with falsifying Lenin and with the worst deviations from Leninism. Just as the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. exploited every legal possi-

bility in order to mobilise, through the windows of the Party, the non-Party population against the policy of socialist construction, so also Zinoviev, Trotsky and Kamenev wanted to use the Comintern as an international tribune against the C. P. S. U.

In reality they did not even appeal to the Communist International, to its Bolshevik core troops, to its proletarian forces, but instead they appealed to **Ruth Fischer, Maslow, etc.**, to the disruptive and disintegrative elements in the Comintern, to the various Right and Left factional groups, as Comrade Zinoviev has proven by daring to suggest that Souvarine could be employed as a bourgeois correspondent in China. The French delegation has already adequately shown, through its speaker **Comrade Doriot**, that the very connection of Souvarine with the syndicalist wing in the C. P. S. U., and the methods of calumny and vilification in which Souvarine indulged in France against the Soviet Union, are sufficient to describe the character of this fellow who not only has no political platform, but who to this day attacks the French Party and the whole Comintern in the worst, most despicable, indescribable manner. This shows the character of this Opposition, it shows its lack of principle, it shows that it has no basis and that it was not even in a position to present a positive programme here at the International Plenum.

The German Opposition, since the Open Letter, has also showed its lack of character on all fields. On various questions it has presented no adequate platform on the tasks we have set ourselves, while it has employed still meaner methods against the policy of the Party and the Comintern. The moment the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. launched its attack in the Soviet Union, the German Opposition in the C. P. G. proceeded with an attack on the Russian question. It is interesting that these two attacks took place jointly and simultaneously. The Russian Opposition based its attack on the question of the building of Socialism in one country, the German Opposition against our work for the organising of the proletarian revolution in the West. This circumstance shows that the two chief problems that confront us today, **socialist construction and international revolution**, are closely bound up with one another, that they belong together inseparably. They are not antagonistic, as the opposition of all shadings maintains, but parts of one uniform revolutionary process.

Comrade Kamenev stands up here today, and is brazen enough to talk about the national limitation of the C. P. S. U., about how it formulates its tasks, how it carries out socialist construction; but we see here in the whole development of the C. P. S. U., especially today, that it is doing everything possible to arouse the forces not only in its own country but, as it has proven, also in connection with all international struggles, with all other revolutionary tasks; that it is a real international Party. On the initiative of the C. P. S. U., the support of the British coal strike in which no other country has equalled the Russian trade unions, and the support of the Chinese revolution, are examples of the international character of the C. P. S. U.

These charges of the Opposition, especially those of Comrade Kamenev, already exposed the roots of this ideology. They do not hesitate to deny facts in order to befoul their own Party.

One of the weightiest questions to be solved and clarified here is the statement of the Opposition that the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union is not possible as long as the proletariat of other countries has not seized power.

I will try to prove what is the real essence by means of a citation of Lenin, which Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky also offer, interpret and in part apply falsely. It is one of the best citations from Lenin on the building of Socialism, because in one sentence it contains four stages. Lenin wrote in an article about the "United States" ("Against the Stream"):

"The victory of Socialism is possible in several or even in one single country, but at the same time the victorious proletariat of this country, after expropriating the capitalists and organising socialist production, would have to combat the rest of the capitalist world".

This one citation comprises the **four stages of the proletarian dictatorship**. And since Comrade Trotsky has tried here in his speech to explain this citation differently from the way Lenin meant it in 1915, I shall try to lay out this citation in such detail that not a single delegate, and not even the Opposi-

sition, will be able to question that theoretically the possibility of building Socialism in one country was proven already by Lenin in 1915 in this article.

Comrade Zinoviev likewise tried to vitiate this citation by ridiculing it as a fragment, but this very fragment contains the foundation of Leninist theory on the building of Socialism in one country, and smashes the pessimistic views of the Opposition into fragments. In connection with the citation, Comrade Zinoviev raises the question: Why did our own Party, the Russian Communist Party, until 1925 fail to understand this article written in 1915? Here Comrade Zinoviev certainly fell into an error, the sense of Lenin's thought in 1915 was not only understood by the Bolsheviks, but for the last ten years it has been bred into the blood and bone of the Party. What does this citation say as a whole? The citation contains four important stages.

The **first** is that in which Lenin speaks of the possibility of the victory of Socialism in several or even in a single capitalist country. Can the proletariat in one country seize power? Certainly, says Lenin, the proletariat can seize power, and in October 1917 the Russian proletariat did seize power. The Party and the working class, under the leadership of Lenin, took up arms and defeated bloody czarism, but at that time Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev were deserters from the proletarian revolution.

The **second stage**: Can the proletariat maintain its power against counter-revolutionary attacks? Certainly. From 1917 until 1921, we had a stage in which the Red Army was built; in which the Party laid the foundations for the slow transition to socialist economy, and in which the proletarian dictatorship slowly entrenched itself.

The **third stage** in which we are today, that is the stage of the building of Socialism, in which Lenin in this citation speaks about the organising of socialist production.

And the **fourth analysis** is that in which Lenin points out that the military forces of the Soviet Union will be compelled to fight the whole capitalist world, the analysis which has played a great role in our debates at this Plenum and which, together with the intervention intentions of the whole capitalist world, is really upon the agenda today, and will confront us during the next years also. Viewed internationally, every Section is confronted with the tremendous tasks which the C. P. S. U. is victoriously fulfilling in the first two stages, and which it has set itself as its primary and most serious world wide battle task in the third stage of the proletarian dictatorship.

In 1915, this article appeared. Two years later, in October 1917, the victory of Socialism stood upon the agenda not merely as a citation but in the form of civil war. At that time there were some comrades who were frightened at the vast difficulties of this struggle, but nevertheless the Russian Party and the Russian working class, under the leadership of Lenin, took up arms and overthrew czarism. In all the various stages of the development of the proletarian dictatorship there were serious differences in the Party. These were differences which always showed themselves the moment the struggle involved the seizure and securing of the proletarian victory. Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev were not convinced in October 1917 that the Bolshevik Party was strong enough to carry out victoriously the proletarian dictatorship, they exposed their defeatism, their lack of faith in the proletariat, they showed that they doubted that an agricultural country, under the leadership of the proletariat, was really in a position to win.

In the second stage, in which the Russian Party and the workers, together with the masses of peasants, offered resistance to the counter-revolutionary attacks, new differences developed in the Party against Comrade Lenin and his majority. I think I need not discuss at length Brest-Litovsk, at which the "Left Communists" did not understand Lenin's position that the revolution required a breathing spell in order to entrench itself and to gather fresh forces. Many leading comrades of the Russian Party were of the opinion that the revolutionary war against German imperialism had to be continued under all circumstances. Lenin, however, fought to secure the proletarian revolution.

In the third stage in which we find ourselves today, in the stage of the building of Socialism, we see the culmination of the Opposition struggle against the C. P. S. U. in its appearance at

the XIV. Party Congress, the XV. Party Conference and finally here at the Enlarged Executive.

In these three stages, however, certain other peculiar differences appeared, namely, the ignoring of the necessity of an alliance between workers and peasants. In the first stage some comrades did not comprehend that only through the alliance with the peasantry will we be in a position to defeat the bourgeoisie. In the second stage we find that some did not comprehend that it was necessary for the Party to stand for peace and against any war since the peasants in the army, e. g., at the time of Brest-Litovsk, were beginning to desert. Thanks to Lenin's measures we succeeded in bringing the peasantry to the side of the Party and the proletariat. Also in the third stage there were differences with the Opposition on the question of the peasantry. We see that in the present stage certain Opposition comrades do not sufficiently understand the importance of the peasantry, which they even represent in part as a socially hostile class.

In the present epoch of proletarian revolution, when precisely in Soviet Russia, the land of proletarian dictatorship, we have reached the turning point from reconstruction to new construction, the Opposition bloc is frightened at the difficulties of building, and has no faith in the possibility of victory. The same panic in the face of danger, the same frantic pessimism, as in 1917, the same propaganda with regard to the strength of the class foe and the under-estimation of our own forces. The statements of the Opposition on all fields converge upon: private capital is advancing everywhere, the kulak is constantly gaining in influence, a mountain of difficulties is toppling over upon the Party, the Party is beginning to degenerate, it is beginning to surrender its positions, it is proposing an altered course, etc. This is the trend of thought of this Opposition, its disconsolate defeatist appraisal of the situation in Russia. When the Opposition sizes up the situation in this way it is readily understandable that Comrade Zinoviev tries to offer a citation to prove that Marx had an opinion on the building of Socialism in one country entirely different from that of the present Russian majority. Comrade Zinoviev cites from a letter from Marx to Engels in which the following is said.

"That even a Socialist Europe would be swallowed by the capitalist surroundings if capitalism were still on the ascent in the rest of the world."

Against this we must of course say, that it is no longer on the ascent. But I believe that the following facts must also be drawn in to show the possibility of establishing Socialism in one country, and to prove that this possibility is well founded.

1. The unevenness of the development of capitalism, which is decisively intensified in the monopolist stage;
2. The fact that historically imperialism is a dying capitalism, and on a world scale it is not on the ascent. In this epoch it is also possible to build Socialism in a single country (given adequate material reserves).

To summarise briefly: In the ascendant capitalism (viewed historically) prior to imperialism, only a united Europe, and probably not even this, would have sufficed for the building of Socialism. Today, in Imperialism, when capitalism is reactionary and when it has passed the peak of its development, when it is disintegrating and partially conquered by the proletariat, the building of Socialism is possible also in one country. Marx could not establish this because he did not analyse the epoch of imperialism, but only dealt with certain isolated features of imperialism in England, which at that time was the only imperialist country. The essence of the imperialist epoch consists precisely in that all the most important civilised countries are today imperialistic. One might say that Zinoviev distorts the Leninist theory of imperialism also on this point. In another place in his speech, Trotsky spoke of socialist economy, and as to whether it was possible for one country, isolated in capitalist world economy, to be in a position to build up Socialism — in the face of the development of productive forces in the various capitalist countries as against the Soviet Union. This was the most important point in the speech of Comrade Trotsky. But in his speech he forget entirely to look at the new Russia and to think of the old Russia in connection with capitalist world economy. One may say that on a world scale we today have two countries: America and the Soviet

Union which from an economic standpoint are more independent than all other capitalist countries in the world:

1. Because they have sources of raw material, and
2. Because they have markets.

Of course, there are undoubtedly various differences between the two countries. They have in addition also a geographically favourable position. For example America seeks markets in South America, Canada, and to some extent, in Europe, whereas the Soviet Union has its markets within its own borders, and in Turkestan and other areas, which in the course of time have joined it. The Soviet Union has not only its own market, but it has at its disposal also raw materials as well as grain and food supplies for its population.

If Comrade Trotsky raised the question that if Soviet Russia comes into a closer dependence upon the capitalist world economy, there will arise certain dangers — then we can say against Trotsky that he does not sufficiently recognise and analyse the favourable prerequisites which prevail in Soviet Russia. Prior to the war, capitalist Russia was a part of European imperialism, an integral part of world economy. Comrade Trotsky makes here the greatest opportunist mistakes, he forgets the distinctions between the former czarist Russia and the Soviet Union of today. Prior to the war Russia received a great deal of credit, foreign capital participated very heavily in industry, international treaties were made whose dependence upon Russian imperialism no one any longer doubts, the Russian army was an instrument of imperialism — today the situation is otherwise. We know that today the loans and debts have been cancelled, that invested capital was confiscated and that capitalism was expropriated in the civil war, that the treaties which are made today imply no dependence upon imperialism, but that they are made in defence of the proletarian stronghold.

Further, we have a Red Army in the Soviet Union which is not an instrument of imperialism, but an instrument of the revolutionary proletarian world army, which will defend not only the Russian revolution, but which will march and fight shoulder to shoulder with the proletariat of the whole world (applause). When Comrade Trotsky tried to counterpose the development of the productive forces of the capitalist world as against the Soviet Union, and failed to give sufficient attention to the considerable development of our own industry in the Soviet Union; then, by dealing with the building of Socialism solely in a pessimistic sense, he thereby also arrived at a standpoint in which his hypothesis speaks not only of a half century but even of a whole century of such development.

We by no means deny that there are certain difficulties in Soviet Russia, that even the measures taken towards its own industrialisation and thereby towards liberation from dependence upon the capitalist world market, contain certain inherent dangers, but the growth of industry in the Soviet Union, jointly with the struggles of the workers in capitalist countries and with the national revolutionary movements will inevitably augment the conflicts and contradictions in capitalism, and will intensify the economic and political antagonisms on various fields. Comrade Trotsky's perspective, his doubts in the development of the productive forces in the Soviet Union, is precisely the general disbelief of the Opposition bloc in the tremendous forces of the world proletariat, in the gigantic forces of the Russian revolution and its leader, the C. P. S. U. This theory was advocated not only by Comrade Trotsky but also by Comrade Zinoviev, and today with particular vigour by Comrade Kamenev. The latter in his speech today declared:

"We cannot permit this to pass without protest, because if in the Party and Comintern this were to remain unchallenged (he was speaking here about the possibility of building Socialism), in the course of a certain time it would inevitably lead to that against which we not only protest, but against which we hope to protest jointly with the overwhelming majority of our Party and the Comintern: viz., against the substitution for the international revolutionary perspective by that national-reformist perspective which is proposed to us".

In these worlds of Comrade Kamenev are contained the same defeatism and doubt against the whole devolutionary movement as in the speeches of Comrades Trotsky and Zinoviev. They

do not see the international development, they do not see the movement on a world scale, they do not see the growth in the forces of the world proletariat; to speak here about a national reformist perspective, when at this Plenum itself we are dealing in all earnest with the questions of the Chinese revolution and of the British miners' struggle in connection with the organising of the revolution in all countries — means that the comrades of the Opposition have no correct revolutionary perspectives. Comrades, I believe that we can say that the perspective outlined here on a world scale by Comrades Stalin and Buharin will be adopted unanimously by the delegates. It is not a perspective of capitalist stabilisation, but a perspective of Socialism, and furthermore of socialist construction in the Soviet Union which creates the possibility, in connection with the sharpening of imperialist antagonism, for victorious revolution also in another capitalist country. In the epoch of imperialism and of proletarian revolutions, according to Lenin, our perspective is revolutionary and alive, while the perspective of the Opposition is false, dead, and hostile to the revolution.

The theses of the Opposition is: the building of Socialism is impossible in the Soviet Union until the international proletariat has seized power. Proceeding from this idea, the Opposition propagates: 1. Thermidor, 2. the kulakising of Party policy, 3. capitalist development of the Soviet Union, 4. an inevitably approaching crisis in the economic development of the Soviet Union, etc.

With such a standpoint of the Opposition, the Plenum had a right to expect that they would come here with concrete facts, with concrete figures as to what comprises the injurious policy of the C. P. S. U. and of the Comintern. Instead of this we receive a staggering bulk of citations which in no way apply to the present concrete situation, of which the chief point is not an ascendant capitalism, not the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, but declining capitalism and the building of a new socialist society in Soviet Russia, a situation after nine years of the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry in an epoch of the world revolution. Why did Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky forget to offer ideas of Lenin, Marx and Engels in which they literally whip up the optimism in the revolutionary forces of the working class? They forgot this little detail.

At the IX. All-Russian Congress of Soviets in 1921, Lenin said the following:

"Considering these conditions of backwardness under which we began the revolution, and the present industrial development which we need, but which we do not yet have, shall we lose courage? By no means! We will begin this hard work, because the road we are travelling is a correct one."

This is a citation from which there rings out assurance of the possibility of building Socialism in one country!

Furthermore Engels, in his 1892 preface to "Socialism, from Utopia to Science" says:

"For is it not possible that in the present situation of things, Germany may likewise become the arena of the first great victory of the European proletariat?"

This is what Engels wrote in 1892, when, after the repeal of the Socialist Exceptional Law, the Social Democracy had just become legal! Thus, a perspective for a victorious proletarian revolution by the German proletariat! Why do Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky remain silent on such ideas and offer only citations intended to emasculate the possibility of building Socialism in one country?

Still further: eight months prior to the Paris Commune, Marx in a letter to Engels warned against the dangers of an isolated action by the proletariat of Paris; but once the latter began their fight Marx supported the Commune with all decisiveness, never questioning the possibility of the Socialist revolution in one country. At that time Marx never questioned the possibility of building Socialism, he only saw the tremendous strength of the proletariat by means of which the bourgeoisie was to be defeated! (Applause.)

Comrade Kamenev in his speech to-day again raised various disputed questions that played a role already at the XIV. Party Congress; he attempted to silence the statistical data that proves

the ascent of the Soviet Union, he tried to evade the positive sides and to speak only of the dangers and difficulties on the basis of which, with great demagoguery, he charged the C. P. S. U. with Right deviations.

That the trend of general development is not towards decline, but towards ascent is shown by the following figures: during the last three years wages have risen by about 40%, economy has been restored to the pre-war level, advancing in 1924 by 60%, in 1925 by 42%. In 1923 horseless farms numbered 40% of all farms, in 1926 this figures had sunk to about 26%. These three positive figures show that development is upward, that the forces are developing favourably to Socialist construction, that the alliance of the proletariat with the tremendous majority of peasants is being strengthened. These few figures refute the theory of Comrades Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev, they confute their doubts in the building of Socialism. They have no confidence in the strength of the Russian workers and peasants, and in the C. P. S. U. which leads them, they likewise doubt the whole world-wide living revolutionary development, and the fundamental Leninist firmness of the Communists. Even their own perspective, defended with a Left phraseology, but in contents a Right opportunist policy, shows the contradictory side of their arguments against the perspectives of the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern.

In conclusion, let us look at a couple of moot questions between ourselves and the Opposition on the field of international politics.

On international questions also the Opposition holds a divergent opinion from that of the Comintern and the C. P. S. U. They have not only differences with the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. on such questions as the building of Socialism, but they advocate a position of their own also on serious questions that have arisen in England, in China, and in various Parties. The very essence of the Opposition here also shows more clearly than ever the combination of Left gestures of despair with an essentially Right opportunist policy, whenever serious concrete decisions in the Communist International are involved.

Let us take the question of the Anglo-Russian Committee. There were differences of opinion when at the V. World Congress the question of international trade union unity was raised. I will not deny that the German Delegation did not at once comprehend the tactics in the British perspective. After the Russian Delegation convinced us, we carried out in all earnest the policy of international trade union unity and the application of united front tactics. But can we launch the work of international trade union unity without special organs and organisations? By no means; the Amsterdam Trade Union International exists, the Profintern exists, connecting links are necessary, they must be created. To allow such links to consist entirely of Communists would hurt our movement and do us no good, especially since the powerful Social Democratic Parties of Western Europe are offering great resistance against all revolutionary united front tactics. In order to weaken this powerful West European Social Democracy, this bulwark of Amsterdam, this solid bulwark of imperialism as such, to minimise its mass influence, to disrupt its ranks and thereby shatter the reformist bloc, we must create connecting links and organisations, upon the basis of which we can bring the proletarian masses through a door leading to the Communist Party and the revolutionary front.

If, in the General Strike and especially in the coal strike the reformist leaders on the Anglo-Russian Committee proceeded to betray and sell out the miners to the bourgeoisie — which everyone knew in advance — then we are confronted with the question of whether for this reason we should dissolve the Anglo-Russian Committee; and the whole Communist International knows that the reformists are doing everything possible to accelerate its dissolution? Why this haste among the British reformists? Because the Anglo-Russian Committee, despite the fact that Thomas etc. have already considerably restricted its powers, still has importance because, firstly, it does not weaken, but strengthen the basis of our own position; secondly, it sharpens the antagonisms among the reformists; thirdly, it can develop a certain energy in the coming economic struggles which are spreading among the masses of British workers; and fourthly, that it was in the past and can still be to-day an instrument against British imperialism and its bloody colonial policy and its intervention plans against the Soviet

Union. One of these opposition comrades says that the Anglo-Russian Committee to-day is not a revolutionary instrument, which will earnestly support us the moment that England or any of its capitalist vassal States attacks the Soviet Union; he puts this question too abstractly, not one of us will unconditionally say anything of the kind, not a single member of the C. C. of the Russian Party and not a delegate of the VII. Enlarged Executive. But that it will be an instrument of imperialism the Opposition does not dare to prove. Even if the Anglo-Russian Committee is only a weak instrument, we must nevertheless utilise this weak instrument further, in order to show up before the masses of workers the treason of the reformists, their policy of destroying the unity of the trade union movement by means of the concrete facts, in the further activity of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

Another question, which I believe was but little touched upon in the discussion, is the question of the withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang. Comrade Tan-Ping-shan mentioned this morning that Chang Tso-ling had declared that if the Communists get out of the Kuomintang he is ready to get in. Viewed ideologically this is a very interesting parallel: Chang Tso-ling and Zinoviev are in agreement. (Laughter.) This cannot be denied. Chang Tso-ling was ready to enter the Kuomintang if Comrade Zinoviev had carried through in the Comintern a decision that the Communists get out of the Kuomintang. The whole Chinese problem is so new and so interesting for us, its complex of questions so complicated, that we must manoeuvre there with special caution. The significance of the Anglo-Russian Committee contiguous to the C. P. G. B., as a connecting link between reformism and revolution in England — this same significance and even necessity has the Kuomintang Party, contiguous to the Communist Party of China as an intermediate organisation in support of the revolutionary front. Does not the Opposition realise this? These are intermediate links which we utilise, on the basis of which we broaden, strengthen and activate the revolutionary forces. Insufficient confidence in the Communist Parties and in the revolutionary forces of the proletariat characterises the despair of leading comrades of the Opposition.

Comrade Trotsky's stand towards Lenin prior to the war is known, his opportunistic attitude on C. P. S. U. policy during the stages of proletarian dictatorship has been shown here repeatedly, in recent years he was always on the extreme Right wing of the Comintern, and our German Party found this out especially in the appraisal of October 1923. After the October retreat in Saxony 1923, Trotsky supported Radek and the Brandler-Thalheimer group. From Comrade Trotsky's book "October 1917" it can also be seen how at that time he was with the extreme Right Wing in the German Party. In the draft thesis proposed at that time to the January Commission 1924, by Radek, we find the following:

"The Executive decisively rejects the demands of the leaders of the Berlin organisation which implies that the October retreat of the Party is to be considered as unjustified and even as a betrayal. If in October the Party had declared the uprising, as the Berlin comrades proposed, it would to-day lie prone with a broken neck. During the retreat the Party has made serious mistakes which are the subject of our criticism outlined above. But the retreat itself complied with the objective situation and is ratified by the Executive."

These theses were proposed by Radek, Brandler and others and supported by Trotsky; thus Radek and Trotsky said that the retreat was in line with the objective situation. That the objective situation was an acute revolutionary one, all that was lacking was this revolutionary factor: a Communist Party with a real Leninist leadership and theory, which in the situation at that time would have understood how to lead the workers by partial struggles from month to month more and more to the point of the final conflict, as the Bolshevik Party had done with the Russian proletariat from the February struggles up to October. In these theses there is again shown a complete pessimism and a false appraisal of the forces of the proletariat as compared with those of the bourgeoisie in an objectively revolutionary situation. The Radek draft thesis was rejected and that of the Executive Committee adopted. If Comrade Kamenev even musters the nerve to maintain that

those who energetically support the policy of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. and the 99% of the membership which stands behind it, are carrying on a Right policy, he is thereby only trying to cloak his Trotskyist policy, which clashes with the Leninist policy of the Comintern. October 1923, was e.g. such a serious revolutionary school for the German Party that on the basis of these experiences we will never permit that Right theory to be resurrected in our ranks, and in the future we will stand by that Leninist theory of the State which was ignored by the Party leadership of that time.

Our Party has learned not only from October 1923 and from the recent discussion on the Russian question, but also from the great mistakes made in Germany from 1918 to this day. The history of the German Party in the last seven or eight years begins not from the Open Letter of the Executive, but from the first revolutionary battles in Germany; we have grown tall and strong in the struggle against Right deviations and we are therefore to-day also in a position in the discussion and decision of the Russian question to line up the whole membership of the German Party for battle against the opposition, the more so, since the essence of the opposition platform permits clear recognition that the deviation which is now advocated by Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev is a Social Democratic deviation.

The Opposition bloc is loaded down with: 1. inadequate respect for the role of the peasantry in the country of Socialist construction; 2. the theory of permanent revolution — even though Trotsky in his speech tried to get rid of his former standpoint, nevertheless by his statement it was transparent that he still stands by the basis of the permanent revolution; 3. disbelief in the Socialist perspectives of the XIV. Party Congress; 4. the false appraisal of the driving forces of the Russian Revolution; 5. the theory of two Parties as advocated by Ossovsky; 6. the Sokolnikov course for the liquidation of the foreign trade monopoly; 7. the accusation of national limitation against the C. P. S. U., the leading Party of the Comintern etc.

This motley character of the Opposition bloc was sufficiently exposed in the introductory report of Comrade Stalin. All Sections will be glad that hereby we are for the first time in a position to inform ourselves and discuss in detail the stages of the proletarian dictatorship. When August Bebel wrote about the future State in his "Woman and Socialism", what conception did the working class have on this at that time? To-day we have a picture of the first development of the proletarian dictatorship throughout the whole world:

1. Fight for political power and civil war lasting several years;
2. Simultaneous development of war Communism;
3. The N. E. P. policy and its tasks;
4. The building of Socialism in the present stage.

All these stages with their lessons and their tremendous difficulties stand alive before us in the Communist International.

The very essence of the Opposition in Germany has shown on all these fields that in this also it goes absolutely with the Russian Opposition. At the beginning of our internal Party struggle was not the German opposition just as motley in composition as the Russian? Zinoviev and Trotsky fought each other for years on serious political differences; Trotsky has not changed his viewpoint to this day, but they are travelling together unconditionally. One might illustrate this with a story if a maiden goes to a priest the priest remains a priest and the maiden remains a maiden. But if on the contrary: the priest goes to the maiden, then the priest is no longer a priest and the maiden no longer a maiden. (Laughter.) With Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky — to listen to them here — a similar relationship has been entered into. Trotskyism no longer exists, Kamenev said, but Trotsky does, even with his Trotskyism, as his speech has shown.

The same motley opposition we also find in Germany. I will only enumerate how many groups we already have to record, inside and outside of the Party.

The first expelled group is that of Katz: it disposed of itself among the workers very quickly and without much ado.

The second is the Korsch-Schwarz group, which, outside of the Party, split its own ranks into two groupings. To-day

they constitute two counter-revolutionary groups vigorously fighting among themselves.

The third, or even fourth expelled group of leaders is the **Maslow-Ruth-Fischer-Urbahns group**, which is sufficiently well known to everyone.

The fifth group is the **Wedding Opposition**.

The sixth group is the **Köttner group**. The latter two groups have not yet gone over into open hostility to the Party. In ideology they have a line that must lead to a policy of splitting the Party and the Comintern, and to counter-revolution, because in the main they share Social Democratic arguments against the Soviet Union and against the revolutionary policy.

Katz, Korsch, Schwarz, Maslow, Ruth Fischer, etc. are already outside the ranks of the revolution. In Germany, in the very serious and difficult struggles with these groups of leaders who were not even prepared to recognise the character of the revolutionary Party, its discipline and principles — those avowed Party foes had to be expelled. In these documents, as well as in the "Declaration of the 700 Functionaries", and also in the Memorandum of the Urbahns and Wedding Opposition, we see that in their appraisal of the whole question of building Socialism they have a standpoint essentially not different from that of the Social Democracy. Even if they do not say so quite openly, as the Social Democracy does, in essence they have an identical viewpoint. This is shown in all their documents. According to the notorious Declaration of the 700, it is said, e. g. that in the C. P. G. there prevails an:

"Atmosphere of hypocrisy, fear, uncertainty and disintegration."

In Soviet Russia:

"They are demoralising the working class of the whole world."

"The atmosphere of the Comintern is poisoned."

The consequences of the Open Letter of the E. C. C. I. to the C. P. G. are:

"A complete disorganisation and atomisation of the C. P. G. and the complete restoration of the Right."

The reproach is made to the C. P. S. U. that it advocates the theory:

"That in Russia Socialism can be finally built up within national self-limitation, without the necessity that the proletarian revolution in the advanced countries first assures this victory."

(Joint Memorandum of the Wedding Opposition on the Maslow-Ruth Fischer-Urbahns Group.)

While these citations already show a completely hostile spirit towards the Party and the Comintern, an appraisal that is as much contrary to the fact as in direct service to our class foe, the Social Democratic character of this group is expressed still more definitely in the latest Memorandum presented to this Plenum by the now expelled renegades. Here it is stated:

"The signs of crises in the whole Comintern have become permanent. These crisis phenomena, since 1923, have the character of definite signs of decay and disintegration and not of signs of growth-crises."

From all these sentences there rings a determined will to liquidate, calumniate and combat the Soviet Union, the Comintern and the Communist Party of Germany. These anti-Communist leaders must be fought just like all other Social traitors. If Comrade Kamenev maintained to-day that the bourgeois and Social Democratic press of the whole world are attacking the C. P. S. U. opposition in its articles, this does not hold true for Germany. The "Leipziger Volkszeitung" and other Social Democratic papers are directing special attacks against the present policy of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U., they are conjuring up before the eyes of the workers that here in the Soviet Union a capitalist development is in process, so that on the one hand they defend their own policy and on the other weaken the great impression upon the German working class aroused by the reports of the workers' delegation. We therefore, see in this ideology an identical policy being followed by Social Democracy and opposition. Since the appearance of the Open Letter we had to overcome great difficulties in the struggle against the ultra-Left, and the Party was thereby seriously weakened in its recruiting power, in its ability to act, in the fulfilment

of its revolutionary tasks. Yet to-day I believe that I can say that the workers inside and also outside of the Party are slowly comprehending our correct revolutionary line. To be sure there are many workers who have already broken with the Social Democracy without as yet coming to us, because our Opposition is constantly preaching that the Communist Party is developing towards the Social Democracy that we will join up with the Social Democracy, etc. Many workers do not come to us because they hear these opposition arguments everywhere, in the factories, in the trade unions, etc. That is why it is necessary that if the Communist Party in Germany wants to fulfil its revolutionary tasks, it must finally liquidate these ultra-Left tendencies. The German Party finds itself in a situation similar to that of the Bolshevik fraction in the Russian Social Democratic party in 1909 when Lenin, in his article on the "Liquidation of the Liquidators" wrote: "Our Party cannot go forward without liquidating the liquidators." This task also confronts us to-day. The premise for the fulfilment of this task is a clear recognition of the ideological platform of the ultra-Left. Thereby we must never forget that likewise the struggle against the Right deviations and divergences which are showing themselves already to-day and which will confront us in the coming development in connection with the difficulty of applying the united front tactics in the period of relative stabilisation, especially against the efforts of the Social Democracy. We shall, of course, have great difficulties in the field of extending our activity and power to act, because the theoretical basis of the Party is not yet so strong as to obviate such opportunistic deviations.

But the Party leadership, the greatest portion of the Party membership, is already so strong, so wide-awake, so clear that, side by side with the struggle against the ultra-Left, it can and will also take up seriously the struggle against any Right deviations that may show themselves, against any Right groupings that may eventually appear.

The question which must be answered is the following; are the ultra-Leftists to the Left of Bolshevism, or are they already on the road to counter-revolution? What are involved here are not single questions of Leninism, but the whole complex of Leninist questions, the basic problems of proletarian dictatorship. The decisive questions for the international labour movement is the attitude toward the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. Here is the parting of the ways, here they must part! The attitude towards the Soviet Union is decisive also on the question of in which camp one belongs on questions of German policy: whether the camp of the revolution, or the camp of the counter-revolution. There are only two possibilities: either there is a proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, and then Socialism is being built there and the Soviet Union must therefore be supported, or else the Soviet Union is a capitalist country, in which case a struggle must be waged against it with all means. Comrade Stalin has strikingly made clear that which Comrade Trotsky thought he could polemicise against, that if one takes seriously the opposition's lack of certainty in the possibility of building up Socialism, we must necessarily go over into opposition to the proletarian State; if Soviet Russia were evolving into a capitalist country the Party would be forced to act as an opposition Party: if it took the revolution seriously. From this standpoint also the opposition embodies pure liquidatorism, it sacrifices the maintenance of the proletarian dictatorship. After the victory of the proletarian revolution the struggle against imperialism means the same as the struggle for the assurance of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, because all of the efforts of imperialism are concentrated upon the overthrow of the only proletarian State. Logically the position of Korsch, Schwarz, Maslow and others who go along with them, means a capitulation to the Social Democracy on the question of imperialism. The theory of Leninism is the theory of struggle against imperialism, its agents and henchmen. Anyone who liquidates the struggle against imperialism liquidates the role of the C. P. G., the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern.

Since the ideological line of the opposition must lead to this liquidation, the Plenum of the VII. Enlarged Executive, in view of the disintegration and undermining activity of the Opposition not only in the Russian, but also in the German Party, must as one man repulse these assaults. In the Russian Party the Opposition failed in its attempts, because the whole Party rose against it, and immediately recognised the false road of the Opposition. It is clear to-day that the Russian Opposition leaders had no particular support, that they appeared without an army, they

tried here at the Plenum to influence or even win over certain delegates for a theory that was not in harmony with the theories of Lenin. Unfortunately, the Opposition in the German Party partially succeeded in finding some support among the membership.

At the beginning of his speech Comrade Zinoviev said the following: I submit, I do not want a faction, I do not want any discussion; I do not want to expose the Comintern to danger — but the speeches of these three Opposition comrades show that they were thoroughly unprincipled, and that they are continuing their tactics of factionalism and disintegration also in the Comintern.

Comrades, at the last VI. Enlarged Executive in the discussion of the German question certain opposition comrades appeared, among others Ruth Fischer, Urbahns and Scholem, who to-day are already outside of the Party, and also Comrades Domski and certain others, who fought against the policy of the Comintern. To-day it was they no longer because they are no longer represented here, aside from comrades Riése and Doering from Germany we have to-day, only the Russian Opposition leaders who, from the tribune of the Plenum here, launched an attack against the C. P. S. U. and Comintern in a sharpened form.

The most important task that confronts us is under all circumstances to avoid every factional activity which some may try to introduce into the various Sections. We have seen that the C. P. S. U. not only knew how to smash the factional manoeuvres and activity through the whole membership, and especially the Leningrad and Moscow workers, but I believe, I can also say that by their appearance in this Plenum the Opposition has lost even their last influence in the C. P. S. U. and also in the Comintern. Especially since the C. C. of the C. P. S. U., while not forbidding their appearance, nevertheless considered it desirable that they at least submit to the discipline and decisions accepted by the overwhelming majority of the membership of the C. P. S. U., they nevertheless proceeded to continue their factional attack. If they do not desist from their activity, if they continue their factional work, this must lead to the splitting of the Party and of the Comintern. In the present epoch, in the epoch of imperialism and the rising revolutionary forces, in which

the Soviet Union consolidates itself and increases and intensifies its resistance against capitalist world economy, in which intervention plans against the Soviet Union are strengthened, in which since 1919 we have a Comintern with firm foundation and policy, in which practically all Communist Parties have seven to eight years of experience behind them, it is all the more astonishing that the Opposition comrades have completely lost faith in the strength of the Soviet Union, in the leading Party, the C. P. S. U. and in the Comintern. It is all the more remarkable that this Plenum proceeds as one man to overcome and eliminate the mountain of obstacles which confronts not only the C. P. S. U. in the building of Socialism, but which confronts us also in the capitalist countries going forward in the struggle to widen the gaps in the reformist front and to extend the front of the revolutionary forces.

The most important decision in this connection must be: unity and solid ranks in the various Parties and in the whole of the Communist International (applause). Down with all disruptive factional activity, this is the pre-requisite. But not a unity and solidarity by means of a manoeuvre, as was expressed in the speeches of the various opposition leaders, but unity and solidarity with Bolshevism ruthlessness against the destroyers of unity and solidarity. That must be the decision of this Plenum, and that must be the line and tactics of all Sections. Only then can we be sure that we shall succeed, confident of our power to pave the way for the great tasks which we have set ourselves here. (Stormy applause.)

* * *

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman): We will now receive a declaration from the Hungarian Delegation. Comrade Szanto has the floor.

Comrade SZANTO (C. P. Hungary):

reads the following Declaration in the name of the Hungarian Delegation.

DECLARATION.

The Hungarian Delegation to the VII Enlarged Executive of the Comintern observes in the attitude of Comrades Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev before the Plenum, not only the intention to revive the factional struggle within the C. P. S. U., but also the effort to discredit the leading staff of our Russian brother Party. The questions raised by the Russian Opposition were thoroughly discussed inside the C. P. S. U. and they were decided against the Opposition by the masses of the Russian proletariat. The attempt by Russian oppositional comrades to furnish arguments against the correctness of the present policy of the C. P. S. U. by means of citations from Marx, Engels and Lenin, must be regarded as having failed, for these turn against the Opposition itself.

The definition which Comrade Stalin gives of the building of Socialism coincides completely with that given by Marx, who in "Civil War in France" writes in defence of the economics of the Paris Commune, which really only existed on paper.

"But if co-operative production does not remain empty appearance and sham, if it crowds out the capitalist system, if all the cooperatives together regulate the total national production according to a common plan, thereby taking it under their own direction and making an end to the existing anarchy and periodically recurring convulsions which are the unavoidable fate of capitalist production, what else would this be, gentlemen, than Communism, than 'possible' Communism?"

At the same time Marx ridicules those who demand a paradise for Socialist construction. He writes:

"The working class demands no miracle from the Commune. It is not expected to introduce a ready-made utopia by means of popular vote..."

"Fully conscious of their historical mission, and heroically determined to be worthy of it, the working class can be content to laugh at the smug scoldings of the lackeys of the press as well as at the pedantic condescension of well-meaning bourgeois doctrinaires who preach their ignorant common-places and sectarian hobbies in the oracular tones of scientific infallibility."

So much for Karl Marx. At this moment we unquestionably consider the Socialist construction of the Soviet Union as the most powerful impetus to the world revolution. In the face of this fact an unbelievable factional delusion is necessary in order to bring the building of Socialism in one country into contradiction with the requirements of the world revolution.

The C. P. of Hungary, which is not only a Party fighting for the conquest of power, but one which has already once captured power and wielded it for four and a half months, knows very well how to appraise the significance and importance of the Party unity, and of its leading role. The Hungarian Soviet State had to fail, because among other things, it lacked especially the existence of a unified Bolshevism Party. Four and a half months of Soviet Power in Hungary showed the inevitable consequence of an incorrect appraisal of the relationship between the proletariat and peasantry. We consider the opposition platform, its political and partial slogans, especially those with respect to the peasantry, to be harmful and dangerous to the existence of the Soviet Union.

We condemn most sharply the manner in which the Opposition moves up as a bloc for the assault while in defence each of its members blames the harmful proposals not on himself, but on others.

The Hungarian Delegation once more emphasises the Russian Opposition's lack of principle, as pointed out by the C. C. of the C. P. H. in its first resolution. Comrade Zinoviev, who in his writings taught us the harmfulness of Trotskyism, may have been right when he said that he did not go to Trotsky, but that Trotsky came to him, yet this not, however, to the Zinoviev who once fought Trotskyism, but to the Zinoviev of October.

The Hungarian Delegation condemns most sharply the harmful activity of the Russian Opposition and expresses its solidarity with the C. P. S. U., the leading Party of the Comintern, and with its Leninist C. C.

Moscow December 11, 1926.

The Hungarian Delegation.

* * *

(Close of Session.)

Twenty-Fifth Session.

Moscow, December 13, 1926.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

The 25th session is opened. Comrade Longo has the floor.

Comrade LONGO (Y. C. I.):

Comrades, in the name of the Young Communist International I must declare our full agreement with the report of Comrade Stalin; this agreement applies not only to the questions of principle raised but also to the manner in which the Russian Central Committee and with it the whole Party reacted upon the Opposition's attempts to revise Leninism and to sow confusion and schism into the organised vanguard of the Russian revolution and the world revolution.

From the very beginning, when the Opposition started its factional activity, the youth never wavered, it took a clear stand against the Opposition. It clearly and decisively repudiated every factional attempt of the Opposition; and the most important Sections of the Youth adopted resolutions against the Opposition.

Since the first day the Russian question confronted the Communist International, the youth was united in rallying around the Russian Central Committee. The Youth International is proud to be able to make such a declaration at the Enlarged Executive of the Communist International.

This fact is all the more weighty when one considers all the efforts of the Opposition to penetrate the youth, they wanted to win the youth for themselves in order to play the young against the adult workers. The old Trotskyite methods towards the youth were adopted by the opposition bloc, but I must state here that the Opposition had no more luck with this than in the past. The youth has proven that it stands firm and solid, that it forms one single bloc with the Party, and that no one, no matter who it might be, will be allowed to stir up dissension between the youth and the adults.

There were two exceptions, Comrade Vuyovitch and Michalec, but despite all the authority enjoyed by these two comrades, especially Vuyovitch, and despite all attempts at factional work within the Y. C. I., they have remained isolated.

Comrade Vuyovitch was condemned by the Presidium of the Y. C. I. and later Comrade Michalec likewise; he was condemned by his own League and finally, both were condemned by the Plenum of the Enlarged Executive; they were definitely repudiated because of their factional activity. The Y. C. I. has again emphasised that it will not tolerate being used to carry on factional activity against the Party and against the Communist International.

The Opposition comrades have protested from this tribune that they were not permitted to make adequate explanations. Comrade Trotsky wanted to defend himself in his capacity of creator of Trotskyism.

We reply that it is not necessary for him to continue his attempt to teach us Trotskyism. The C. I. has long known Trotskyism and has already determinedly rejected it for some years. If Zinoviev now for factional reasons has allied himself with Trotsky, we do not believe that this is a reason to reopen the discussion on this question.

We want to protest against the factional manoeuvre employed by the Opposition at this Enlarged Executive. By its attitude here it has addressed a direct appeal to the whole C. I. to take up a struggle against the Russian Party. This is not based exclusively upon their attitude here, Kamenev in his speech quite openly issued such an appeal when he invited the brother parties to "help" the Russian Party correct its deviations. He quite openly directed an appeal to all Parties of the International to take up the struggle against the Russian Party, even against the International. But we are convinced that no comrade will remain silent on this appeal, that all Parties and

the entire Youth will fight the deviations of the Opposition and rally around the Russian Central Committee and the Communist International.

The questions of political principle raised by the Russian discussion, have already been studied by the Youth. We are still far from being able to assure ourselves that on all these questions a complete clarity already prevails today.

We are convinced that after the Executive it will be necessary to develop a large-scale activity for clarification of all questions that involve the building of Socialism, in order to dissipate all doubt and confusion that the activity of the Opposition might arouse among the Youth.

On this questions also we feel that we can express not only our own opinion but also that of the whole Youth. The most active elements have decisively expressed themselves on the essential questions. At our Enlarged Executive the delegates of the Leagues declared in favour of the line adopted by the Central Committee of the Russian Party.

The centre of the differences of opinion lies in the question of whether or not it is possible to build up Socialism in Russia. Upon this question the Opposition answers: "No". It says that it is not possible to build up Socialism in Soviet Russia.

From this point the Opposition directs all its charges against the policy of the Russian Central Committee by accusing the latter of following a kulak policy. With these charges the Opposition seeks to justify its factional activity and demagogic action, with its phantastic proposals and demonstrative and theatrical appearance in nuclei meetings and at this Plenum.

25. Sitzung, Seite 4

Is the Opposition right on this fundamental question? Is it right in its charges against the policy of the Central Committee of the Russian Party? No. Is the Opposition right in its factional activity and its demagogic activity? No.

The Opposition is wrong on all points.

No one thinks, and no one has ever thought, of maintaining that the guarantee of the final victory of socialism, the victory which guarantees 100% against imperialist intervention, is possible in Russia without the aid of the victorious proletarian revolution in several other important countries. But the question does not turn on this. On this point there are no and can be no differences of opinion.

The question is whether we know that it is possible, in Soviet Russia, for the Russian workers supported by the poor peasants and in a close alliance with the middle peasantry:

1. To maintain and consolidate the proletarian dictatorship, the most certain guarantee for a victorious struggle inside Russia against all foes of the proletariat:

2. To enable the socialist forces of socialist economy, by their own development, to defeat completely and for ever the capitalist elements, in order to clear the ground for triumphant Socialism.

Upon this question we reply: Yes, it is possible. First, is the way in which we put the question correct? We believe that it is really right, correct and Leninist.

In the "State and Revolution" there are about ten pages in which Lenin deals in detail with the question of Socialism, the question of the various phases of Socialism. Lenin cites Marx and Engels and writes that one must distinguish between two phases: the first phase, the lower phase of Communism, "usually called Socialism"; and the second phase — the higher phase of Communism.

When we speak about the possibility of building Socialism in Russia at present this means struggle against the capitalist rises as follows: "The transfer of the means of production into the common property of the whole society — Socialism in the original sense of the word" (Lenin — "State and Revolution"). In Russia at present this means struggle against the capitalist elements in Soviet economy.

This lower phase of Communism distinguishes itself from the higher phase by the fact that it still includes:

1. Subjection of mankind to the enslaving conditions of the division of labour;
2. The differences between physical and intellectual work;
3. Impossibility of applying, in the first phase this principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Instead we must confine ourselves to the principle: "For equal work an equal share of products", and there still remains the need for a State.

When the Opposition comrades come here to tell us that by Socialism we must understand the abolition of classes and the suppression of the State, if they deny the socialist character of State industry because there are still wage differences, they prove thereby only their demagoguery and the extent to which they have departed from the Leninist line.

They interchange the two phases, and in their confusion they push aside with general phrases the essential question of present-day policy, the struggle for the complete elimination of capitalist elements in the Soviet Union, viz. the building of Socialism in Soviet Russia.

One may say of the Opposition what was said concerning the bourgeois ideologists in "State and Revolution" where the two phases of Socialism are discussed:

"Basically, when learned professors and following them the easy-going public, and afterwards also Messrs. Tchernov and Tseretelli, speak of the nonsensical utopias and demagogic promises of the Bolsheviks, and about the impossibility of 'establishing' Socialism, they have in mind precisely this second stage, this higher phase of Communism, which has not only never been promised by anyone, but which no one also has ever thought of 'establishing' because it is impossible 'to establish it'." ("State and Revolution", Lenin.)

Comrade Trotsky in his speech tried to refute the thesis of Comrade Stalin by attempting to negate the viewpoint, the starting point of Comrade Stalin, viz. the possibility of building Socialism in a single country, viz. the unevenness of capitalist development.

He wanted to distinguish between the "level" and the "tempo" and he discovered that whereas Canada had taken a leap forward, England had made several steps backward. And for this reason the level of these two capitalisms approached one another. That is all very well, but what purpose does it serve in this question. Absolutely none. And if Trotsky comes and tells us that Canada made a leap forward, and England some steps backward, he only emphasises still more strongly the unevenness of capitalist development, the internal contradictions of capitalism.

But the strongest argument of the Opposition, upon which they are drumming around most of the time, is the dependence of Russian economy upon the world market.

First of all, the Opposition exaggerates this dependence, and thereby exposes a very dangerous petty-bourgeois deviation.

Does the Opposition really believe that this dependence of Russian economy upon the world market would actually surrender power in Russia to the kulaks? Does this dependence today make it impossible for the Russian proletariat and the Soviet State to continue to a victorious conclusion the struggle against the capitalist elements which still exist in Russia unless the world revolution is first victorious in several important European countries?

That is the whole question. The question consists in knowing whether — unless in the next few years the revolution fails to come in several important West European countries — we in Russia will be compelled to shut up our socialist shop and take ourselves off. Or whether it will be possible, without the development of the Western Revolution, to build up Socialism in Soviet Russia under the present conditions, viz. to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat and to completely defeat the capitalist elements. In this consists the entire question, it is a question of perspective, the weightiness of which is decisive to the Russian revolution and the building of Socialism.

But to deny the possibility that Socialism can be built in Russia, to reject the possibility that Socialism can be built in one single country, is equivalent to a liquidatory attitude towards the Russian revolution. To maintain that the Russian proletariat cannot march forward to Socialism unless the revolution is victorious in the other countries, means the sowing of distrust and confusion, means the withdrawing of the broad strata of workers from their active struggle for the dictatorship and the upbuilding in Russia, means the rejection and denial of the possibility of construction in Soviet Russia. And this means doing direct harm to the labour movement of the world, it is identical with a destruction of the entire glorious movement that has arisen among the masses which are partially still under the influence of Social Democratic and counter-revolutionary elements.

This new orientation of broad masses of workers has shown itself in the despatch of numerous workers' delegations to Soviet Russia.

Basically, what is the deeper significance of these delegations in view of the fact that from to day constantly broader strata of workers who only yesterday and for the most part even today were under the counter-revolutionary influence of Social Democracy and petty bourgeoisie, what is the deep significance of these facts that now, after nine years of Soviet power, they are orientating themselves towards Russia and for Russia?

I believe that the deep significance of these facts is that these masses are now beginning to question the propaganda of their leaders according to which Socialism is a utopia and the revolution is at the very least a blunder.

These masses, whose economic position is becoming visibly worse, are confronted with the fact that the Russian revolution has existed for nine years, and that it shows no inclination whatever to disappear, and they are beginning to think that Socialism is no utopia and that revolution is no blunder. These masses are sending their delegations to Russia in order to see with their own eyes what the Russian proletariat has accomplished, in order to find out whether the workers are really masters of their own destiny, whether in Russia Socialism is actually being built up. The very idea of the possibility of building Socialism is what draws the workers' delegations towards Russia.

To the extent that this idea of the masses is confirmed by the reports of their delegations we can observe an increase of their revolutionary activity.

The workers' delegations that have come to Russia all declare that in Russia Socialism is being built up. The Opposition would prefer that something else were being said: that Socialism in Russia is a utopia, that the October revolution, was a blunder just as the Social Democrats say.

But we say with all our might, in agreement with the entire Youth, that we are building Socialism in Russia. Comrades, these are a few of the reasons which move us to reject decisively the Opposition viewpoint on the question of building Socialism in Russia.

Furthermore, we want to say a few words about the tactical consequences of this false viewpoint, and the activity of the Opposition on an international scale. For this purpose one must consider the standpoint of the Opposition not by itself but in connection with the activity of our enemies.

By its activity the Opposition has declared itself ready to take part in the international campaign against the Russian revolution, to become a link in the chain which runs from them, via Ruth Fischer and Maslow, all the way to Katz and Korsch, and from there further to the Social Democracy, to the bourgeoisie and even to Fascism.

The general slogan of the anti-Soviet campaign this year was: Russia is developing into capitalism! Russia is falling into the hands of the kulaks! The slogan of the German Left was: A second revolution in Russia, viz. the bourgeois counter-revolution; and in the meantime Fascism takes advantage of all this and tries to prove that in the world struggle between Fascism and Bolshevism the former will be victorious.

It is true that the Opposition has never openly made such slogans its own, they are peculiar to the Social Democracy.

But what did Kamenev say on this very tribune, about the economy regime, which according to him is being carried out at the expense of the workers, which he calls "abominable"? Is that anything different from what the Social Democrats are saying about the proletarian dictatorship — that it is a dictatorship over the workers, the dictatorship of a clique in the service of the kulaks?

The result of the whole attitude of the Opposition can only be a weakening of the struggle for the social revolution, unless the Opposition changes its stand and unless we fight it with most extreme energy.

The Opposition bloc which claims that it desires to accelerate the world revolution, actually hinders the development of revolutionary forces, because the masses of workers, suffering under the economic oppression of capitalism, after nine years of proletarian dictatorship are rallying around the Communist Party, around the Russian revolution, the world revolution.

The facts prove once more that the Left phrases of the opposition bloc cloak a Right content.

I am coming to a close: it is necessary to reject the Opposition standpoint as hostile to Leninism, to condemn the Opposition because of their activity and their factional attitude. These are also the decisions of the Enlarged Executive of the Communist Youth International.

In one of his first writings against the Party Comrade Trotsky said that the youth was the best barometer of events in the Party and in the labouring masses. We return Comrade Trotsky this compliment, but if he himself still believes this then I must say that the barometer of the youth foretells no better weather for the Opposition than does the barometer of the C. I.

The barometer of the youth and the barometer of the C. I. are one and the same. They are the barometer of the world vanguard of the proletariat. This barometer warns the Opposition to put an end to its factional activity and likewise to desist from all masked or veiled agitation against the Party and against Leninism.

Comrade KOLAROV (Bulgaria):

Comrades, we have heard here the three biggest representatives of the Opposition and it is our impression that the strategy of the Opposition consists in appearing conciliatory or quiet; and in fact these three great speakers have appeared, as the Russians, say, calmer than water and lower than grass.

I remember that Zinoviev in 1923—24 during the struggle against the Opposition at this time, against Trotsky, directed the attention of the entire Communist International to the great danger which the discussion, or rather the attitude of Trotsky, meant to the immediate existence of the revolution and the Soviet Union.

Zinoviev told us that at that moment the Red Army was separated from the working class, and that even the dictatorship of the proletariat itself was in danger. He sounded the alarm signal not only in the Russian Party but also in all the Sections of the International.

He was right! But comrades, did we not hardly two months ago find ourselves in a similar situation? Could not this same danger have been created by the attitude of the New Opposition, which had been joined by Zinoviev? Did he not attempt at the beginning of this year to stir up the proletariat of Leningrad against the Party? Did not Zinoviev exploit and misuse even his authority in the Communist International in order to try to split the Communist International? Did he not even in the Communist International apply the united front of all imaginable elements hostile to the practical policy of the C. I.?

Comrades, if we consider the situation that was created by the attitude of the Opposition in the Russian Party, in the whole International, then we must state that objectively the Opposition strengthened only the counter-revolution.

We all know very well that in the course of the Russian Party's work there are difficulties, big difficulties exist in the work of all Communist Parties in all countries, because we are living in a period of partial, transitory stabilisation in which

all Communist Parties really must have the security of a uniform activity in order to get around this difficult question.

The Opposition came and created disorder in these Parties, it divided them, at least it went so far as to try to divide them, in order to organise the struggle within the Communist Parties.

We could see how all the enemies of the revolution rejoiced over this.

Comrades, objectively the attitude of the Opposition means nothing else than an attack from the rear upon the revolutionary movement of all countries.

And comrades, at the moment when the workers of Soviet Russia were by their action splendidly demonstrating their solidarity with the British miners, at the moment that the workers' delegations of many countries were enthused by the great work accomplished by the Russian workers and were returning to their countries and waging campaigns against the lies of the Social Democrats, at this very moment the Opposition appeared for the purpose of counter-acting the work of the Russian proletariat and hindering the propaganda of the workers' delegations.

Well, Comrades, this tactic of the Opposition encountered the almost unanimous resistance of the Russian working-class and of the entire International. The Opposition shattered itself against the internal stability of the Russian Party and of the International. When the New Opposition realised this stabilisation, which appears to be by no means a partial or transitory one, it changed its tactics. It beat a retreat, it issued its declaration of surrender and fidelity. But, comrades, it did not do this voluntarily. It only halted down and disguised its colours, in order to wait for a more favourable moment. The Opposition is arming for this moment, it is anticipating it, in order to develop anew its attacks. We have proof of this in the tone of Comrade Trotsky's speech. That is the reason why we believe that the Russian Communist Party and the whole International must have guarantees against the new attacks on the part of the New Opposition.

I now turn to the second question: the question of the miraculous political conversion of Zinoviev. This question is by no means unimportant. Zinoviev was chairman of our Executive, he was the comrade entrusted by the Russian Party with the mandate for the direct leadership of the work of the International. He was the writer of all fundamental political resolutions since the death of Lenin, and therefore his turnings have a considerable political significance. Zinoviev wanted to erect a wall between himself and Comrade Trotsky's past and Trotsky himself told us here that before crossing the threshold of the Bolshevik Party he had wiped his shoes of all dust, of all foreign dust. Is that true? I do not think so. And the history of Trotskyism since the revolution proves it. But I do not care to occupy myself with this question. What is involved here is not Comrades Trotsky's past, but Trotskyism as manifested since the revolution. Now comrades, we all know very well that since 1923 Comrade Zinoviev was one of the bitterest foes of Trotskyism. He was the most implacable fighter against Trotskyism. He incited the whole political struggle against Trotskyism. He himself wrote the theses of the Bolshevisation of the International, and one of the elements of Bolshevisation was this very struggle against Trotskyism. He himself wrote a handbook of Leninism of which he devoted three-fourths to the fight against Trotskyism.

And comrades, what is involved here is nothing less than the whole basic question of the world revolution. What is involved are the differences in the question of the driving forces of the world revolution; and on this question Zinoviev was an irreconcilable foe of Trotsky and Trotskyism.

And now Zinoviev travels in the company of Trotsky. Yet, one may ask, was it Trotsky who went to Zinoviev or was it the other way round?

Trotsky declared that he stands by all his statements, and that he holds to the criticism which he has levelled against the Russian Party in the past.

Trotsky wants to retract only one thing, namely, his estimate of Zinoviev's behaviour during the October Revolution.

This is a concession of an entirely personal nature, which he grants Zinoviev as a concession of the opposition bloc, but his attacks against the Central Committee of the Soviet Party

he stands by. Apparently it is Zinoviev who has hauled down his Leninist banner all the way, and who has arrayed himself behind the banner of Trotskyism. And, comrades, the meaning of this fact is that he has sworn off from his whole work in the Communist International, his whole work for the Bolshevisation of the Communist Parties. We may say that everything which for the last three years he said against Trotsky, now applies directly against himself.

I am convinced that to the attempts of Zinoviev to revise Leninism in the name of Lenin our Plenum will reply un-animously:

"Comrade Zinoviev has forgotten only one detail: that not only the C. P. S. U. but the whole Communist International can distinguish between Leninism and Trotskyism, even though the latter is mixed with Zinovievism."

In conclusion I should like to touch upon a third question: the question of building Socialism in Soviet Russia in relation to the world revolution, since the Opposition raises and considers this question in that relationship.

First of all a few words about the methods applied by Zinoviev. His method is that of citations. One cites Marx and Engels for us, one cites Lenin for us, and by means of these three founders of the revolutionary movement, with the support of these three great revolutionists, it is attempted to prove to us that it is impossible to build up Socialism in a single country, viz. in Soviet Russia.

Comrades, can one prove with citations from Lenin that Lenin is no Leninist, that Marx is no Marxist? Yet this method is not the best. What we must say is that there can be but one single presentation of these great revolutionists and their works, and that is the presentation which they themselves give in their own works — the revolutionary sense, the sense of the courage, the energy, that strengthen the will of the masses in their struggle for the final victory.

Comrades, during the October Revolution, there confronted the Russian Party, the Bolshevik Party, the following question:

Shall we advance to the great attack or not? Will the Bolsheviks be able to maintain power? The Bolshevik Party with Lenin answered affirmatively. At this moment was the question of the world revolution the question decisive for the affirmative reply which Lenin gave upon the problem that then confronted the Russian proletariat? No comrades.

If you read once more the article by Lenin you will find therein an analysis of the Russian proletariat's own forces, the forces of the Russian revolution. Proceeding from the correct estimate of the forces of the Russian revolution Lenin replied: "Yes, the Bolsheviks will maintain power."

This is only one possible presentation of the works of Comrade Lenin. This presentation drives the masses of workers forward to revolution, doubles their energy, solidifies their faith, gives them assurance in the struggle.

The Russian Party now finds itself in a difficult position. It is confronted with the problem of building Socialism. The masses expect from the Bolshevik Party a clear categorical reply to the question: "Is it really possible to build Socialism in Soviet Russia?"

Comrades, this is a question of life and death for the revolution in Soviet Russia, and the Russian Party replies affirmatively: "Certainly, we shall build Socialism with our own forces. The Russian proletariat is in a position to build up Socialism, and to maintain it to the end."

The Opposition expresses doubts as to this affirmative reply. It has a false non-revolutionary presentation which can be accepted by neither the Bolshevik Party nor the International.

The only really revolutionary, really scientific presentation is that which has been given by Comrade Stalin in the name of the Russian Party. Only this presentation augments the power of the revolution, drives it forward, strengthens the faith of the masses, their will to struggle and gives them the certainty of victory.

Trotsky tried here to give us a different theory. And this theory consists of the following:

"The more that Russian economy becomes stronger, the more it develops", he says, "the more our dependence upon world capitalism also grows", and further:

"On the contrary, the more that we, the U. S. S. R., become independent the slower will we develop".

This is the basis of his theory. What does this mean? Trotsky gives all good chances to capitalism and all bad chances to Russian economy, to Soviet Russia.

Obviously there is a mutual dependence between international capitalism and Soviet economy. And this applies not only that Soviet economy suffers from this mutual dependence, or feels the influence of international capitalism, but that international capitalism also feels the influence of Soviet economy. And to the extent in which the Socialist elements in Soviet economy grow the influence of Soviet economy upon internationalism will increase.

And, comrades, what is the meaning of this theory of the Opposition? That the more we make progress, the more our economy develops, the greater will be our dependence upon international capitalism?

It means nothing else but a theory of capitulation before international capitalism.

By appealing to the world revolution Trotsky presents this situation: "The world revolution? Yes, if it comes, it will save everything!" Positively, that is certain, that is absolutely correct, but comrades, what is involved here is not this truism which we all know. What is involved here is the strengthening of the activity, the struggle of the Russian proletariat and world proletariat during the entire period of the development of the world revolution to its complete victory, to the final conquest of the revolution. That is what is involved!

The Opposition speculates on two things. Within the Russian Party it speculates upon the practical difficulties in the work of building Socialism, it speculates upon the comprehensible dissatisfaction of the less class-conscious strata of the working class. Outside of Russia, in the international, Trotsky speculated upon the feeling of internationalism, upon the international consciousness of the Communist Parties. He appealed to them and said: "Do not you believe in the world revolution? Why do you object to the world revolution coming to the rescue in Russia?"

Comrades, in Trotsky's theory internationalism is only a phrase. It has exactly the same meaning in the theory of the Second International. The masses of workers in the West cannot distinguish the economic from the political side of the revolution and this is quite natural. In fact, comrades, if Trotsky declares to the Western Parties, to the world proletariat, that one must fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat which is able to seize power and defeat its bourgeoisie, that is correct. But if one adds that the proletariat will not be able to build up Socialism after it has conquered the bourgeoisie and established the proletarian dictatorship, then the question arises: will the Western Proletariat, the German, French, British proletariat be encouraged? Does this theory really drive the workers to revolution? By no means!

The German, French and British workers occupy themselves not only with the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat, they also can see the day after the revolution: the work of Socialist construction, because what is involved is not only the Soviet Government, but the socialist economic structure which is the aim of all their endeavours. And if one tells the Western proletariat, that their own forces are insufficient for the building of Socialism, then it is clear that they will do nothing for the revolution, for the dictatorship of the proletariat in each of the single countries.

So you see, comrades, that sentences which sound so revolutionary in the new Trotskyist theory of the Opposition, sentences which call to the world revolution, in reality become a hindrance to the development of actual revolutionary activity on the part of the masses of workers. This theory thereby actually becomes a counter-revolutionary, Social Democratic one which I believe the entire Communist International will un-animously repudiate.

The Menshevik character of this Trotsky theory is beyond doubt, and in this seventh year of its existence our International will be prepared to tell the New Opposition, now launching an attack upon the basis of the theories of Marx and Engels — the International will be prepared to tell Comrade Zinoviev:

"Yes, the Russian proletariat intends to build Socialism in its country, the U. S. S. R., it will reach its goal, it will actually build up Socialism; and the C. I. will do everything possible to help make easier this work through the world revolution in which it is engaged. The final success is certain."

Comrade LOZOVSKY (C. P. S. U.):

By the appearance of the opposition there were raised before the Communist International a series of problems that must be discussed and studied in detail. If the speeches of Zinoviev and Trotsky aimed at raising certain theoretical questions, the speech of Kamenev was a sort of political platform in which things were called by their proper names. The speech of Zinoviev was followed by that of Trotsky, which to some extent raised the veil which covered the theoretical views of the Opposition. Thereupon Kamenev followed and laid before us a finished product — an opposition platform intended for export. The problem of the possibility of building Socialism in one country was the starting point of the argument of our Opposition, the central theme to which they devoted their whole energy.

Concerning the Building of Socialism in one Country and the Participation of the U. S. S. R. in the System of World Capitalism.

This question was for the first time raised practically in 1925. At this Plenum Zinoviev asked why this problem is raised today for the first time, why it never came up in the past. The answer is simple. Up to 1925 inside of our Party there was no one who disputed anything in this direction.

Let us try to sum up the chief points of the problem: 1. everywhere it is unanimously recognised that the proletariat, even in a single country, must make a beginning with the social revolution. 2. Likewise there is unanimity that the final victory of Socialism, viz. the abolition of classes, is dependent upon the victory of the proletariat in the most important capitalist countries.

The differences of opinion therefore lie at some point between the beginning of the revolution and the victory of Socialism.

Our discussion with the Opposition did not originate in the question of the final building of Socialism in one country but in the question of whether we are today carrying on socialist constructive work, and whether we must continue to carry it on. The discussion extended itself to the character of our State industry, and of our whole economy. At present all the opposition speakers have concentrated their entire eloquence upon the problem of the final building of Socialism in one country, and in this way they are trying to obliterate tracks of their retreat from their original positions.

What do the Opposition representatives say on this question? Their views on this point are extremely nebulous and diffused. If the Opposition agrees that the proletariat in one country must begin, if it declares today that we are working at socialist construction and that we must carry on with it, if they — to judge from numerous declarations — know that the final building of Socialism (abolition of classes, etc.) springs from a proletarian victory in a number of important countries — then one is justified in asking what the whole discussion is really about.

Trotsky said in his speech that we in the U. S. S. R. are building Socialism and that we must also continue this building. Further, he declared, that the more we develop and extend our economy the "closer" will be its dependence upon world economy, upon capitalism and its technique, etc.

But if this is actually as Trotsky says, how can he at the same time maintain that we are building Socialism and that we must continue this constructive work also in the future? What is involved therefore is not the ascertaining of

whether we will finally and with our own forces build up a classless society, but whether today we are actually marching towards this goal, or whether we are at present performing socialist constructive work or whether our whole work will lead only to the strengthening of the grip of world capitalism on the U. S. S. R. Then why obscure this question in a fog? It would be much better to say it frankly that the economic development in the U. S. S. R. is dangerous to us because it leads to a dependence of the U. S. S. R. upon world capitalism. The theory that the U. S. S. R. is more and more becoming a part of world economy is based upon two premises; 1. that world capitalism as a whole is moving on an ascendant curve; 2. that there is really no building of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. Only from these two standpoints is it possible to conceive of the theory that Trotsky presented in his speech.

The Opposition obscures the question because it knows very well that under the cloak of the dispute about socialist construction in one country the discussion really turns around something altogether different. The building of Socialism is for the Opposition only a mask, a pseudonym to which it resorts in determining its political goal. What is this goal? The Opposition wants to prove to us that the C. P. S. U. is deserting the proletarian standpoint and deviating to that of another class. From the Opposition statement that there is such a deviation logically everything else follows: 1. The ignoring of the world revolution; 2. national limitation in place of international revolution; 3. deviation in the direction of the kulaks; 4. deviation in the direction of the Social Democracy, etc. These follow necessarily from the statement that our Party, the C. P. S. U., has become untrue to its class standpoint, that its policy is beginning to shift from the proletarian interests and the proletarian revolution (Kamenev). In this lies the centre of gravity of the question. It would therefore have been desirable if, instead of long winded citations the Opposition had furnished us facts to show in what this diversion of the Party really consists.

Concerning the Reformist National Perspective.

What is the political kernel of the fact that the Opposition lays such great weight upon the problem of Socialist construction in one country? The whole sense of the lengthy opposition speeches runs in the direction of an attempt to prove that in our Party there is theory and practice which isolates our revolution from the world revolution, and permits the interests of the latter to be pushed to the rear on behalf of the "national" interests, which are brought to the foreground.

When, where and by whom was such a standpoint advocated? Show us at least a single Party decision, a single responsible action in which the interests of the U. S. S. R. were not bound up with those of the international proletariat. Who committed such a breach, who "substituted reformist national perspective for the international revolutionary perspective?" If Kamenev took his terminology at all seriously, why did he not offer examples to prove that the Party trod or is trading this path? Why did he restrict himself to an entirely unfounded accusation? If he seriously believes in his own words, he must demand from the C. I. the expulsion of those responsible for this deviation of the C. P. S. U. in a national reformist direction. And if the Party supported the guilty ones Kamenev should have had the courage to demand that the C. I. expel the C. P. S. U. from its ranks. But he proposed nothing of the kind. Why? Because he himself does not believe what he said here.

The story therefore began with abstract arguments about the theory of socialist construction in one country, about the Party not slipping from its class viewpoint, and it wound up with the "national reformist perspectives". This is what our Opposition calls clarifying the problem, and giving the Communist International and its Sections a picture of the "actual" differences between it and our Party.

Who is Slipping and Whither?

We have seen that Kamenev concentrated his whole attention upon the Right deviations in the C. P. S. U. and in this manner he supports the declaration of Zinoviev concerning the Rightward swing of the Comintern, probably also under the influence of the C. P. S. U. We have heard in what these

Right deviations of the Party consist, and Kamenev has declared here that all of the reproaches of the Opposition do not mean, however, that the Party has slipped away from the political class line. But if the Party is not slipping from its line, it is nevertheless deviating towards the Right although it is standing by its own standpoint. But what is the old standpoint? According to the competent declaration of Zinoviev ("The Party is not slipping from its political class policy"), it is also Leninist. It therefore follows from this that according to Kamenev one can proceed from national-reformist perspectives without thereby deserting the political class policy of the proletariat. Kamenev does us a splendid service thereby!

Since Kamenev cannot make up his own mind to tell us frankly and freely who is slipping and in which direction, we must do so in his place. As witnesses in this case we shall cite the White emigration. The White emigration is attentively following the internal struggles in the C. P. S. U. In 1926 a Menshevik symposium entitled "Problems of the Revolution" appeared in Berlin. It contains contributions from Right as well as Left Mensheviks. Harvy, representing the Right wing, puts the following question: "What must be our attitude towards the Bolsheviks: Reformist, oppositional or principally revolutionary?" This "principal revolutionary" writes the following about the Opposition in the C. P. S. U.:

"Independent of the will and contrary to the intentions of its leaders the Opposition plays the role of a rallying point for the dissatisfaction not only in the Party but also in the country itself."

This glorious role of the Opposition is noted by the entire emigrant press. An additional fact: Miliukov in the middle of August began a series of articles in his periodical "Latest News" under the general title "In Defence of the Opposition". The issue of November 30th contained an article which the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. dealt with. There it states:

"It is certain that the great majority of anti-Bolshevik elements in Russia deep in their hearts applaud the declarations of the Opposition, which correspond to and relentlessly expose the true situation in Soviet Russia. From this viewpoint the Opposition has brought to expression the views of the overwhelming majority of the population which is robbed of every chance to express its thoughts openly."

This citation requires no further comment. It is clear enough. But we shall cite the same periodical of November 12th in which the Opposition programme is subjected to a critical analysis. There it is stated:

"The programme of the latter (the Opposition) contains a powerful critical side. The wealth of argument that proves that the present policy of Soviet Russia is leading neither towards Socialism nor Europe towards the world revolution is absolutely inexhaustible, and the opposition repeats verbatim everything which for years was written by the emigrant press."

The former Marxist and present White Guardist, A. Isgoev, writes:

"From the standpoint of Marxism the victory of Socialism in one country is simply nonsense." (See the "Rul".)

If together with this statement one considers also the bitter struggle of the international Social Democracy against the C. P. S. U. and against the Communist International, immediately after the defeat of the Opposition, there can be no doubt as to who enjoys the sympathy of international reformism.

The international Social Democracy and the White emigration consider the Opposition as a tool for the weakening of the proletarian dictatorship. That is the reason why the "Latest news" emphasised that all Russian anti-Bolshevik elements "deep in their hearts applaud the declarations of the Opposition". When we consider the contents of the criticism and the chief points upon which the Opposition lays weight, we see that they are all points which delight international reformism, which repudiate our socialist construction work and the revolution itself.

Who becomes guilty of a national reformist perspective and a Social Democratic deviation? The Party or the Opposition? It is sufficient to recall to mind the Trotsky theory about the participation of the U. S. S. R. in capitalism, as well

as the pure reformist arguments of Kamenev in order to give to these questions the same reply as was uttered by the XV. Party Conference of the C. P. S. U.

The Anglo-Russian Unity Committee.

We know that the crisis in the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee in the course of the recent months were a favourite theme of the revolutionary effusions of the Opposition. This "Right deviation" was included in Kamenev's enumeration of mistakes. It may be summarised briefly in that the C. P. S. U. and the C. I. did not consider it necessary to break up the Anglo-Russian Committee even though they were entirely clear about the treacherous attitude of the Right or Left members of the General Council. Today, after seven months of discussion, it is possible to draw a definite balance.

What was involved in the discussion. Not that the General Council had betrayed the strike, nor that the C. P. as well as the revolutionary trade unions, particularly the Central Council of the Russian Unions have the duty to expose the treason of the Right and so-called Left leaders, but instead whether we should make it easier for the General Council to evade its responsibilities towards International trade union movement. Our Party is of the opinion that it is not our job to let our foes off free, but on the contrary that we must unmask the traitors without thereby splitting the Anglo-Russian bloc. We stood upon the standpoint that the theory and practice of splits and irritation could only lead to the refusal of Communists and reformists to belong to a joint trade union organisation. Their starting point in the whole discussion was the manner of rapprochement between the masses of workers of the U. S. S. R. and of England. No one any longer doubts today that the General Council is anxious to hinder the contact between the labour movements of Great Britain and Russia, that it has revised the constitution of the Anglo-Russian Committee. The question arises however, why it does not break up the committee? Because it is of any use? No! The General Council does not disrupt the Anglo-Russian Committee, it does not openly move against it, because it is afraid of its own workers, because it knows that thereby it would arouse the greatest dissatisfaction and indignation among broad masses of British workers.

The Opposition will probably hardly deny that the ties between the British and Soviet Russian proletariat are today strengthened. But no supporter of the Opposition can explain the reason for this strengthening. But this is quite easy: The ties between the British and the Soviet Russian proletariat can be explained on three grounds: 1. because the working class of the U. S. S. R. effectively supported the miners in their struggle; 2. because the Soviet Russian trade unions sharply criticised the General Council and branded the treason as well as the spirit of surrender of both Right and Left leaders; 3. because the Soviet Trade Unions, instead of disrupting the Anglo-Russian Committee, are to this day still striving to draw still closer the ties between the toiling masses of Great Britain and Russia.

If this is so — why does the opposition again and again talk about a crisis in the Anglo-Russian Committee? Why is it endeavouring to charge this to the account of the Right deviations? It does this solely to round out its programme, to bring out its revolutionary spirit and to counterpose the "international revolutionary perspectives" against the "national reformist" ones. But the Opposition is by far not as revolutionary as it wants to make us believe.

The Right and Ultra-Left Deviations in the C. I.

Zinoviev in his speech outlined a false attitude towards the ultra-Left and Right deviations in the C. I. From his remarks it appears that this is a result of the C. P. S. U. slipping towards the Right. In support of his standpoint he had recourse to Lenin, who constantly emphasised the necessity of the struggle against opportunism. It is true that Lenin always indicated this necessity. But Zinoviev forgets to say which opportunism was involved with Lenin: whether inside the C. I. or outside. Zinoviev also forgot to say that just as soon as deviations within the C. I. were involved Lenin directed his attacks, in accordance with the given situation, either against the right or against the left opportunists. But this does not help Zinoviev at all. He acts as if he did not comprehend the difference between the ultra-Left of 1919-21 and those of 1926. The present German

ultra-Left — do they in any way resemble those of 1920? By no means. The present day ultra-Left is leaving us, therefore we must apply an entirely different tactic towards it. Zinoviev raised this question chiefly in connection with the situation in Germany. While he mentioned no names, the subject matter is clear enough. "You are expelling Maslow, Ruth Fischer and Scholem, whereas Meyer and Ewert are drawn into work, while Brandler, Thalheimer etc. appear on the horizon." Zinoviev is trying to frighten us. Yet is there a single person who would doubt today that the C. I. has nothing further to do with adventurers such as Maslow and Ruth Fischer, whereas on the other hand it should and must utilise comrades such as Brandler and Thalheimer etc.?

Where does Zinoviev get the idea that Leninism requires consideration for ultra-Left adventures and painstaking weighing of blows towards the Right and towards the Left? Where does he get the idea that Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Scholem & Co. have anything whatever to do with radicalism or with ultra-radicalism? Do we not see that under the cloak of the ultra-Left an outspoken counter-revolutionary nucleus has crystallised in Germany? Do we not see that the Comintern is interested in destroying all counter-revolutionary hearths, no matter what mask they may hide behind? If Zinoviev considers it possible under certain conditions to readmit Souvarine, why are Comrades Brandler, Thalheimer and Meyer still something terrible in his eyes? Perhaps because Brandler never once raised his voice against the C. I., against the C. P. S. U., against the Soviet Union, whereas this was Souvarine's favourite manoeuvre. In my opinion Zinoviev put the question absolutely wrongly. He knows better than anyone what Maslow-Scholem, Katz-Schwartz, Ruth Fischer & Co. have carried on in the C. P. G. And it will be impossible for Zinoviev to deny the fact that the C. P. G. is beginning to grow and develop, after it has liberated itself from these adventurers. He knows the situation in Germany too well to be able to deny this.

Theory and Practice of the Permanent... Opposition.

Where is the Opposition led to by the continuation of its struggle? If what Kamenev declared here is true, that with us national-reformist perspectives have been substituted for international revolutionary perspectives, the logical conclusion must be drawn. What kind of a Communist International would it be if it tolerated anything of this kind in its midst? If one believes with Zinoviev, who declared that the fire must be directed towards the Right — why did he not propose measures in the Comintern against the C. P. S. U.? All partial questions are relegated to the rear by this chief problem. Either a national-reformist perspective prevails in our Party, and then we must turn our whole armament against it, or else all this was just phrase-mongering.

Kamenev is too serious a politician to fail to understand the meaning of his words. Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev have taken part in many political struggles and we can demand from them an accounting on the charges they have raised against our Party.

If I want to reply, here at the Plenum of the E. C. C. I., to the question: What does the Opposition want, what are its aims? Then I declare: It has transformed the theory of the permanent revolution into a theory of permanent opposition, it is seeking differences of opinion where there are none, but it does not see those differences that really exist: it does not observe that the development of events and the Party have grown over the heads of some leaders. Between our Party and certain leaders a divorce has taken place. In such cases one cannot crowd the Party backwards, but one must follow it step by step and submit to its decisions. The permanent opposition in our Party has never resulted to the benefit of the Opposition. Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky know this very well.

Comrade CLARA ZETKIN:

Comrades; the speech of Comrade Kamenev has furnished some definite content to the appearance here of the leaders of the C. P. S. U. Opposition, which, prior to his remarks, was completely lacking. These leaders have the undisputed right to advocate their viewpoint before the Enlarged Executive. What applies to Comrade Riese certainly applies also to these leaders. However, it must be remarked that the right to defend a viewpoint here is defined and limited by the tasks and vital needs of the Communist Parties and of the Comintern as a whole.

But aside from this right, in my opinion, these Opposition leaders had a duty to fulfil towards the Communist International, namely, to render an accounting and to try to justify the principal and tactical reasons why they stirred up the C. P. S. U. and the Communist International so deeply that the C. P. S. U. found itself forced to take the sharpest measures against comrades who had rendered unforgettable services in the victory of the Revolution of 1917 and the years following, particularly against Trotsky, whose fame as the defender of the Soviet State in the civil war and against the Entente troops is undying, against Zinoviev who as the delegate of the Russian Party was for years the chairman of the Communist International since its foundation, and whom we undoubtedly must credit with big services as well as serious mistakes.

If at this moment the mistakes overshadow the services, this is due to a situation for which Comrade Zinoviev himself shares the responsibility to a great extent; for the Opposition advanced for the struggle against the Party majority in a most ruthless manner, even to the forming of a faction, and also because Comrade Zinoviev, as chairman of the Comintern, has exerted decisively great influence in all of its Sections. I maintain that it was highly necessary for the leaders of the Opposition to render an accounting to this Plenum.

In his time Comrade Zinoviev set into motion all Sections of the Comintern in the struggle against Comrade Trotsky, whom he declared to be an opponent of Leninism. Now he appears before the Comintern, in an alliance with him, and at the C. C. Plenum of the C. P. S. U. and before its Central Control Commission, he said concerning his altered position towards Comrade Trotsky, that his struggle against Trotsky was one of the two biggest political mistakes of his life. Comrade Zinoviev, hitherto chairman of the Comintern, did not content himself with the, to us inexplicable, bloc with Trotsky. He attached to his bloc Right and Left elements which have strayed far from the principles of Communism, so far that they now stand outside our community. He allied himself with the ultra-Left leader cliques in Germany, from Korsch to Weber, those cliques whose centre is formed by Maslow and Frau Fischer, who were expelled not only because of their breaches of discipline but because of their struggle against the Comintern, their attacks not only against the Communist Party of Germany, but against the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, against the Soviet Union itself. In any event this was a result which only confirmed what all of those fully conversant with conditions have known for years: that these elements, Maslow, Fischer, Scholem, were not bound up with the proletariat by a fundamental firmly-rooted conviction, but far more by the shimmer of demagogic radical phrases. The ultras from the Left Comrade Zinoviev supplemented by the ultra from the Right, Boris Souvarine, who abuses and curses the Soviet Union and the C. I. in the jargon of the lowest bourgeois press.

And furthermore we all know that Comrade Zinoviev was the strongest, or at least one of the strongest, driving forces of that incitement that led to the result that Comrade Radek was driven into the desert of removal from Comintern work, in the company of Comrades Brandler and Thalheimer, because of his position on problems of Communist policy in the countries of the West. Radek, in solidarity with the Opposition on the Russian question, has opened up a wide dividing chasm between himself and his friends Brandler and Thalheimer. But Father Zinoviev compassionately takes the prodigal son back into his arms and presses him to his heart.

Are not these phenomena that must have their effect also in the attitude towards the tasks and policy of the C. I.? Phenomena that should at least have required an explanatory declaration?

Comrade Zinoviev suddenly appears as the most fiery champion of Party democracy against the Party apparatus. Ah comrades, how long ago is it that Comrade Zinoviev himself spurned Party democracy in principle, and handled the Party apparatus here in the Soviet Union, and in all Sections of the C. I., with the greatest ruthlessness, in order to remove from the Executives every element which in his own opinion did not strike him as a pliant instrument. Did he not allow the Scholem-Maslow-Fischer trio to misuse the view of the majority of the Executive: that the German Left had saved the Party, as a slogan by means of which they removed from the Party everyone to whom they applied the label "Right". Thereby many valuable forces were

either removed from the Party or at least paralysed in their Party activity. Under the regime of this trinity everyone was stamped "Right" who was suspected of writing good German or of understanding even only the A. B. C. of Revolutionary Marxism, which for these three always remained a seven-sealed book. The effect of this state of affairs was that the Party was disrupted by factionalism. Under great difficulties it is now striving earnestly and persistently from above and from below, to achieve complete mobility, organisational and ideological unity and firmness, and this under difficulties that the attempted sabotage of the ultra-Left leaders has increased, particularly for the Party Executive which is trying to carry out the political line of the Comintern.

Comrades! In November 1925, but little more than a year ago, Comrade Trotsky furnished a preface for the German readers of his pamphlet, "Capitalism or Socialism". There he said that economic development in the Soviet Union was undoubtedly on the upgrade, that it was going towards Socialism with vigorous strides. According to his statements to the question: "Who and for whom?", formulated by Lenin with classic ingenuity, one could reply only: Socialism would defeat capitalism, and not vice versa. Of course Comrade Trotsky pointed out the dangers which might threaten the victorious course of development towards Socialism, but he nevertheless concluded with assurance that there is no basis for a pessimistic perspective. Today Comrade Trotsky stands before us, arm in arm with the Opposition in the C. P. S. U., with whom abroad are affiliated ultra-Left and ultra-Right leaders who not only deny the possibility of realising Socialism in the Soviet Union unless the world revolution speedily comes to its aid, but even more, who in soulful harmony with the bourgeois vilify and calumniate socialist construction in the Soviet Union with the words and ideas identical to those used by reformist Social Democrats like Kautsky, Wels, Otto Bauer and others.

I believe that these facts — and they are facts — should have moved the Opposition leaders to try to justify their attitude and activity face to face with the representatives of the Comintern. This they would have done only if they had exhaustively and with good grounds analysed here the questions which were the starting point and centre of the conflict in the C. P. S. U. This they did not do. They thereby waived their right of defence and they also failed in their responsible duty. Instead, what did they do? Comrades Zinoviev and Trotsky barely touched the disputed questions, they merely made a magnificent theoretical gesture. Comrade Zinoviev especially emptied his bottomless bag of citations over the heads of this meeting.

Comrade Kamenev in any event took a somewhat different attitude. At least he talked about the disputed questions, but what he said about them was by no means an adequate explanation and justification of the Opposition standpoint. No, what he said here was essentially nothing else than a bare cataloguing of these questions, and even this cataloguing was neither systematic nor complete. Without the slightest proof the position of the majority was designated and condemned by him in advance as "Right". Why as "Right"? The word "Right" belongs among the fashionable words that are greatly admired among those who want to evade proving the correctness or incorrectness of a position. "For where ideas are lacking a word at the proper time will serve." And just such a word is this word "Right". Comrade Kamenev failed to prove that the view and policy of the majority of the C. P. S. U. are a deviation from the Leninist line, to say nothing of a Right deviation. He did not reveal the essence of the differences between the majority and the opposition. And furthermore he did not allow the degree of the vigour with which this difference finally exploded in factionalism to come out into the open. We heard nothing at all about the serious reproach which poisons discussion, that the policy of the "Stalin faction" was directing economic developments towards capitalism instead of socialism. All we heard was the gentle warning to accelerate the tempo of industrialisation.

We heard nothing more of the argument that, in contrast to the enrichment of the Kulaks and N. E. P. men, the class position of the proletariat is not being raised correspondingly, that the conditions of labour even in the Soviet enterprises were not being sufficiently improved. Instead of this only a reminder that one must endeavour to raise the share of the proletariat in the national income, and accordingly first of all raise as much

as possible the real wages of the workers. Nothing more about the degeneration of the Party and of the Soviet State, but only the appeal to the Party to be on guard to preserve the Lenin heritage inviolate in every manner, in theory and practice, to maintain unweakened the proletarian dictatorship and to exert it with all firmness. According to the picture which Comrade Kamenev gave of the differences in the C. P. S. U., the Opposition is the earnest friendly warner of the Party, which calls the attention of the majority to dangers and difficulties, and nothing more. In short, the Opposition appeared not as what it was in reality: a grim relentless foe of Party unity, a Party disrupter, which weakened Party feeling by forming factions, and which might have continued its work to its logical conclusion: the splitting of the Party and the formation of two Parties — had not the workers in the factories, the Party as a whole, called out: "Halt, thus far and no further!"

Comrades, the explanation of Comrade Kamenev, in comparison with the heated factional struggle, resembles the dried up and faded petals of a rose which a respectable petty-bourgeois old maiden aunt has treasured in remembrance of the stormy passions of her youth. Only very incidentally was there any talk about the illegitimate child of this passion — factionalism.

All in all the appearance of the Opposition leaders represents, as a whole, only an effort to extend the conflict beyond the boundaries of the C. P. S. U., in order that it may flare up anew in the Comintern. Were this attempt successful, there would be furnished in the Russian conflict also a platform for all of the ultras — Right and Left — including those who have left the Communist International as well as those who continue to rampage within it. It would be a platform for all those little cliques of leaders who fervently seized upon the Russian question in order, thereby to conceal their complete lack of political capacity to even correctly visualise and formulate the problems and tasks of the Communist Party in their own country, to say nothing of solving them.

In my opinion this attempt has thus far had one definite result. It has ripped apart the sanctimoniousness which the ultra-Left legend had woven around the Opposition leaders as martyrs to freedom of thought, as martyrs for the correct Leninist line — martyrs to freedom of thought who were muzzled by the unholy Stalin faction. After the appearance of the Opposition here this legend is no longer any use. It is done for.

Comrade Kamenev declared that a summary of all the differences, principal as well as tactical, between the Opposition and the Party majority, is contained in the position on the question of whether the victory of Socialism in one country only is possible, and the perspective involved in the reply to this question: an international Socialist world revolution versus a national reformist development.

Comrades, in my opinion, when the Opposition indicates the importance of this question for an understanding of the contradictions and for a correct position towards them, this is nothing else than a feint, a diversion manoeuvre — to put it politely. For this might also be characterised as a policy of dishonesty and hypocrisy. How do matters stand? The Opposition went into the woods — of course to fight the kulak danger. In order to accelerate the tempo of industrialisation and increase the productivity of labour, the Opposition instructed its people to make contact with dissatisfied Party comrades and discontented workers, to gather them and form them into a guard troop for the Opposition. In order to combat the stabilisation of world capitalism, the Russian Opposition allied itself with the already characterised ultra-Left in all of the national Sections of the Comintern. How does the Opposition explain away all this? Let us not talk about these details, just look at this inspiring spectacle: Our best leaders pore over the holy scriptures and from them bring forth proof as to whether one country alone is able to realise Socialism, without the support of the State power of other countries in which the proletariat has likewise captured power!

Very well, comrades. No one can honour the works of our masters higher than I, but I hold it a gross offense if one looks upon them as a cookery book, as a collection of cooking recipes for the Communist political kitchen, on weekdays, Sundays and holidays. The most valuable things that we find in the works of our masters are not only the already firmly

crystallised historical maxims. No, it is primarily also the working method, the road of research by which we, like they, arrive at a correct position on the problems bound up with our goal, the world revolution in the various countries. Comrades, when I heard the collection of citations presented here, especially by Comrade Zinoviev, but also by Comrades Irotsky and Kamenev, I could not help feeling that I was not at a meeting of revolutionary fighters but in a theological school of bible students and Palmudists. I also thought of the demeanour of the medieval scholastics. On the question "How many teeth has this horse?" these learned men did not simply reply: "Open the nag's mouth and count his teeth." No, they looked into Aristotle and read there how many teeth a horse has.

Comrades, I protest against this manner, against this method of attempting to answer questions through naked citations, these questions that are of elementary importance for our revolutionary tasks. Perhaps you think I protest against this too energetically. But I do so because I see a great danger in this method. In the case before us an undialectical, paper abstraction is substituted for the fighting, working, confident reality. What is to be answered here is by no means the abstract question: is Socialism possible in one country alone, without having the revolution in several highly developed capitalist countries at its side in the form of Soviet State allies? No, what is to be answered here is the tremendous life and death question placed upon the agenda of history by the victory of the Russian proletariat in the Red October. That question is written down on the agenda with the blood of countless martyrs, who have assured the existence of the Soviet state in combat with the counter-revolution inside and outside of the country. Upon the agenda of history there stands the maintenance and continuation of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, begun under the proletarian dictatorship, that great historical work of tireless effort and heroic courage, of self-sacrifice on the part of millions upon millions of toilers, who, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are determined to realise Socialism. Are we still at all concerned about discussing theoretically the justification of the existence of Socialism in the Soviet Union? No, this question has already been answered affirmatively for us by the proletariat, by the Communist Party. What is involved here is not a discussion, but a mobilisation of all our forces for the building of Socialism, an employment of our highest faculties so that the beginnings of Socialism will unfold into full bloom.

I believe that I can pledge my old head on this: that if Marx and Engels were still alive today they would repudiate the question: Is Socialism possible in one country alone? They would point in admiration to the achievements of the Russian proletariat, to the existence, the development of the Soviet Union. They would say: Here the proof of the possibility of Socialist construction stands before us in the work, in the struggle of millions.

And Comrade Lenin? I believe that for him it is even less proper than for any other to have isolated citations, torn from their context, offered here as eternally binding laws. Lenin, this greatest genius of all the revolutionary practical politicians, was extremely cautious in the formulating of general laws. He was always extremely reserved in expressing formulas on the course of historical development. The theoretical views which he expressed were always based on thorough research and study of quite definite concrete facts, and they were formulated with regard to a very definite concrete purpose. Lenin was never a prisoner of his own formulas, he did not even permit himself to be bound by his own formulations of past times. In the living development of theory and practice he was at all times ready to revise himself, and he never subordinated the forces of living creative life to the power of dead syllables.

Comrades, the Opposition has consciously contented itself — in my opinion at least, although I cannot solve any psychological riddles — in my opinion it has contented itself with raising the question of the relations between the proletarian world revolution and Socialist construction in the Soviet Union only academically and not concretely. This means: not in dialectic connection with those tasks and problems which arise on the basis of the historically given conditions for the realisation of Socialism in the Soviet Union.

For this reason, comrades, the reply can only be just as abstract as was the question. Secondly, the completion of Socialism is possible only through the world revolution. Why? Capitalism has created the world market with its profit economics, with its increased productivity but also with its anarchy, a world order which has more or less subjugated the entire globe. It can be overthrown only by a higher form of society, by the Socialist world order, which displaces the world disorder with the planfulness of Socialist economy not operated for profit.

But this reply says absolutely nothing about the "how", about the road and the tempo of historical development; it says nothing about the most varied conditions of the proletarian world revolution in the different countries. This reply in practice says nothing on the possibility or the impossibility of the victory of Socialism here in the Soviet Union. And it is my opinion that this question cannot be answered by citations from works written in other times and under conditions different from those which confront us today. This question can be answered only by the facts, relationship and figures on economic development, on the evolution of productive forces, on the whole economic, political and cultural life that is taking new form under the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. On the basis of historical materialism, our position on the problems before us must be determined by figures, by facts and not by citations.

In this connection I would recall to those who like myself, had the good fortune to hear our dear Comrade Lenin at the IV. World Congress when he spoke on the Russian revolution, the scene there — the joy, the assurance of victory, the certainty of the result of development which glowed in his words when he pointed out that a surplus of 20 million gold roubles had already been achieved — in his eyes a symbol, a pledge for the victory of Socialism. Let me tell those who now dispute, in the face of far greater achievements, the progressive development of Socialism, that if Lenin were alive he would intervene with his clear perception, with his fervid energy, on behalf of the so-called kulak faction in this struggle of opinions. Certainly he would not be found in the Opposition camp, however rich the lip-service he receives there. He would be in the ranks of those who, while seriously realising the tasks, difficulties and dangers before us, continue to work actively in the building of Socialism.

Comrade Trotsky, at any event, tried to put the question of the victory of Socialism in the Soviet Union somewhat more concretely. He pointed out the connections which exist between the economic life of the Soviet Union and the market of the surrounding capitalist world, and the influence upon Soviet economic development determined thereby. Comrade Bukharin has said everything necessary from a Marxist standpoint, in reply to Trotsky's presentations. I should like to underline just one thing: It is true that the Socialist economy of the Soviet Union must seek a *modus vivendi* with the surrounding capitalist countries. But this contains not only dangers and obstacles, but, by introducing means of production into the country it is also fostering the Socialist construction and makes the Soviet Union economically more self-sufficient. Just like the political, the economic united front of capitalist countries against the Soviet Union will again and again be torn asunder because of the capitalistic greed for profits. The capitalist gentry may be ever such great Bolshevik-eaters, yet when business is involved they follow the proverb of the old Dutch merchant traders: "Mynher will do business with the devil, as long as the devil is good pay". Capitalists will seek economic connections with Soviet Russia. As concessionaries they are subject to the laws of the State of the proletarian dictatorship, they cannot do as they please, as they do under the written and unwritten laws of profit-chasing in their own countries. They must bow before one fact: it is extremely distasteful to them because it makes them realise that not the bourgeoisie but the proletariat is the ruling State power here. This fact is the State foreign trade monopoly.

But I admit frankly: even if the Soviet Union were completely cut off from the world market, I nevertheless believe in the progressive victorious development and Socialist construction in the Soviet Union with our own forces. Disregarding certain other circumstances, economic development has two factors in its favour here: factors which were of great importance in booming production in the United States, namely, the vast extent and resources of the country — and the many-

sidedness connected therewith, the natural resources, raw materials, which are decisive for the development of industry and agriculture. To be sure these factors could develop so rapidly and powerfully in the economy of the United States because means of production flowed in from capitalistically further advanced Europe. The isolated Soviet economy cannot count upon this inflow. Nevertheless I am convinced that on its revolution-created and historically assured foundation, our economy can develop into Socialism. Only slowly, under the greatest difficulties, and at the cost of severest sacrifices, but nevertheless it moves forwards, towards the goal, until finally the proletarian revolution in one country or another catches up. The weightiest, most decisive force for this is the goal-conscious-self-sacrificing, heroic will of millions upon millions who, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are in fact determined to realise Socialism not only in economy, not only in the State, but in all arrangements, measures and relationships of society. And if this force remains alive, if the creative work carried on by it is not paralysed, not lessened, then this force will triumph over all hindrances, over all difficulties. That is my firm conviction, for my part you can call it a confession of faith.

The Opposition lacks the unshakable certainty that even under the present given conditions the Soviet Union can maintain itself as a State which is building Socialism. Oh yes, the Opposition leaders murmur with their lips: we are building, we are building! Yes, but they are hedging round the possibility of successful, victorious construction with a hundreds ifs and buts, with an array of question marks and doubts, with an army of exclamation points in which resignation, worry, fears are expressed. In this is revealed a fatalistic attitude in appraising the proletarian world revolution and the effect of stabilisation upon it. The Opposition considers the world revolution menaced if one openly says, what is so, namely, that in this period a stabilisation of bourgeois class rule is to be recorded. How long it will last, we do not know, how firm it is we also do not know. But we have manifold reason to doubt its existence for any longer period. The Oppositionists assume that the present stabilisation of world capitalism is a fateful obstacle to the progress of the proletarian revolution in capitalist countries. Their attitude towards stabilisation reminds me of the attitude of the citizen king, Louis Philippe of France. He said: "Revolution, what, revolution? I know my good Parisians. If it rains they will not go out upon the streets to build barricades and start a revolution." Similarly the Oppositionists declare: While it is true that the stabilisation does not rain gold upon the proletariat, nevertheless a thin strata will catch a few cooling, healing drops, and will line up behind the bourgeois state, whereas the great majority of the proletariat will be so exploited that their will to freedom will die. Therefore the Oppositionists are afraid that the revolution will not take place.

On the contrary, I am of the opinion that no stabilisation can save capitalist society from its downfall. Proletarian, Communist mass Parties will crystallise, under whose leadership the proletariat will put an end to capitalism, despite the stabilisation. But the fatalistic position by which, seized by doubts of our success, the Oppositionists flee from the sphere of hard energetic work in the building of Socialism into that of day dreams about the proletarian world revolution which is to solve all problems and tasks and eliminate all difficulties with one blow, in my opinion ignores in the last analysis the decisive world historical factor for the defeat of capitalism and the victory of Socialism. This is the factor by means of which — as Engels said — we can make history, we must make it: The will of the great proletarian masses, the revolutionary struggle, the revolutionary initiative of such masses, under the leadership of a firm, united, goal-conscious, bold Communist Party.

The fatalism with which the Opposition stares upon the world revolution is a corollary to the fatalistic conception of Kautsky and consorts who once preached that economic revolution, quite mechanically, quite automatically some fine day would have to transform itself into the Social revolution, and who today herald the development of world capitalism as leading automatically and mechanically to the victory of Socialism, peacefully and painlessly, without any revolutionary struggles. The fatalism of the Opposition, which makes the securance of Socialist construction in the Soviet Union dependent upon the speedy outbreak of revolutions, in various capitalist countries, inevitably leads to a revision of the revolutionary attitude, con-

scious or unconscious, either expressed or implied, or perhaps only tacitly admitted to themselves. It is a retreat beginning with the forced conception of the impossibility of Socialism in the Soviet Union and concluding with the denial of the proletarian essence of the Soviet State, the historical significance of the Red October. Their conclusion is therefore, the Menshevik position, that the Red October brought into the world a forced birth incapable of living. The last word in this trend is the resigned and pedantic conception of Plekhanov, who after the glorious proletarian uprising in 1905 wrote: "They should not have resorted to arms."

If the Opposition itself does not draw and express all these conclusions, then others will do so. Especially our foes of all shadings, will resort to this as a starting point in their chain of thought. It cannot remain without effect upon the masses. One of the greatest dangers to the victory of Socialism in Soviet Russia, to the progress of the proletarian world revolution in other countries, I view in the fatalistic position which is unable to appreciate the subjective factor of historical development. From this fatalistic position springs not only doubt, but also pessimism, and finally passivity. Thereby the militancy and will to victory is paralysed not only in the Russian Party and in the Parties of the C. I., but even more in the constructing masses in the Soviet Union, and in the workers abroad who are gathering for the struggle.

Of course there is an intimate connection between the proletarian world revolution and Socialist construction in the Soviet Union. Socialist construction in the Soviet Union in its final completion will be assured only by the world revolution. But the progressing Socialist construction in the Soviet Union is one of the strongest forces driving towards the victory of the proletarian revolution. This must not be forgotten. This connection will be disturbed, its inherent creative force will be paralysed if the unity and firmness of the Communist Party is violated. For what is the significance of the unity and firmness of the Communist Party in its will to build and to win? It means the overcoming of doubt in the possibility of building Socialism also in the masses, million strong, it means the overcoming of weariness and discouragement in the work of the millions by whose activity Socialism must be built. And every stoppage, every shrinking from Socialist building in the Soviet Union will react paralytically upon the revolutionary militancy and fighting power of the proletariat abroad. Comrades, I must say I feel that it is more than a mistake, more than a shortcoming when the Opposition, by shaking the unity and firmness of the Leninist Party and thereby simultaneously weakening the joy of action and building power of the masses, interferes with the struggle for Socialist development. It is more than a mistake, more than a shortcoming, I feel that it is a sin against the movement, a crime against the revolution.

As an old revolutionary fighter I can tell you that we were bound up with the Russian revolution already long before the victory of Red October. We old revolutionists who have again and again drawn from the Red October, from the upbuilding of the Soviet Union, new forces, new assurances, new energy for the continuation of this struggle, we all who look up to the leaders and heroes of the Russian revolution with unbounded love and admiration — it is very hard on us to be compelled to utter such serious, such harsh words of condemnation. Such words express our deep pain that that has become possible which we never considered possible in the development of the Leninist Party: a factional fight which threatened to split the Party. But side by side with this deep pain there is the joy, the pride in the unity, solidity and firmness with which not only the tremendous majority of the Party, but also the masses of workers in the factories have repudiated the doings of the Opposition. And I am convinced that this unity and firmness of the Russian Communist Party, and of the Russian proletariat, will find a worthy counterpart in the unity and firmness with which the Communist International and all of its Sections will reject the conceptions and struggles of the Opposition as an injury to the Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, as a hindrance to the world revolution.

Comrades, I am convinced that this unity and firmness of ideology and organisation, both here and beyond the borders of the Soviet Union, will contribute markedly to aid the millions of toilers in the Soviet Union to point to the progress of their tremendous Socialist constructive work with justified pride, and that they may triumphantly call to their brothers and sisters

abroad: we have ventured, we have won! Then the historical day will not be far off in which the united world proletariat can point to the shattered capitalism, like Siegfried, who in the old Nordic Saga killed the dragon, Fafner, which guarded the golden treasures of the Nibelung, the simile of the enslaving power of gold. Having become victorious, by clear recognition, steel will, revolutionary self-sacrifice and militant determination, the unified world proletariat will triumph like Siegfried:

"I brought it to pass,
My heart aroused me,
My hand helped me,
And Gram, my sword."

(Stormy, long-continued applause.)

Comrade KATAYAMA (Japan):

Comrades, I agree fully with the report of Comrade Stalin. His analysis of the new Opposition is very correct. The present Opposition is a world phenomenon. I shall say a few words on the theoretical grounds, as to why the new Opposition arose.

In the first place, it arose on account of the retardation of the revolutionary wave. Those who have no firm revolutionary conviction often waver, as did Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev on the eve of the October Revolution.

In the second place, the influence of petty-bourgeois ideology. When at ebb-tide, the revolutionary movement subsides, there crops up many a danger; opportunists come out and mislead the masses and disturb the rank and file of the revolutionary front.

In the third place, the Russian Revolution has entered the reconstruction stage of the Soviet Union. There are, of course, many difficulties in the work of building up the Socialist Republic. The question is whether it is possible to build up Socialism in one country, especially in Russia.

Comrade Zinoviev said that Engels and Lenin declare that the law of unequal development applies to capitalism in general and not specifically to imperialism. Such a statement separating capitalism from imperialism is wrong. Imperialism in its economic aspect is the last stage of capitalism. We see very unequal development of capitalism in different countries. The great world war was a result of this contradiction of capitalism. The contradictions and conflicts of imperialism are deepening and widening all over the world. As Lenin said "Imperialism is the eve of proletarian social revolution". It is the very task of the Communist Party to take advantage of this antagonism to develop the revolutionary movement.

Take the position of Comrade Zinoviev on the Anglo-Russian Committee. We all know the English opportunist leaders. By this opportunism they will lead the workers to the bourgeoisie. These leaders are traitors and we all know that. Lenin said that we must fight against traitors. But comrades, this is one-sided. When the Comintern formulated the united front, we were ready to shake hands with opportunist labour leaders because they have followers, workers, behind them. However, these very English labour leaders who betrayed the workers' cause are still trusted by the English workers. Right after the General Strike, at the Trade Union Congress they were all re-elected to their old positions. We must shake hands with the traitorous labour leaders, the opportunist labour leaders, for, over the heads of these opportunist leaders, we desire to reach the English workers. That is the reason the Russian Trade Unions did not want to break off with the Anglo-Russian Committee, for it is true that while the labour leaders are going towards capitalism, the workers are looking toward Soviet Russia. In short, the present Opposition lacks confidence in the proletariat and above all in the Soviet Union.

Now as to the attitude of the Opposition regarding the question of stabilisation. When we look at the Opposition from the practical side, we see it is influenced by the capitalist stabilisation. When the revolutionary movement is in ebb-tide Opposition people are at a loss, they are influenced by the capitalist stabilisation rather than by the stabilisation of the Soviet Union. So they are discouraged and fall into pessimism. Everything looks gloomy. It is a lack of dialectical understanding of the revolution, of the process of capitalist collapse. To them Russian stabilisation is nothing but Kulakism, a narrow nationalism. We

must energetically combat and crush opportunist deviation. We must not neglect for a moment the ideological struggle against the Right and Left deviations. The most significant feature of the present Opposition is their formation of a bloc. Right, Left, and even counter-revolutionary elements are taken into their bloc for the fight against the majority. This is an unprincipled violation of Party discipline. It is the worst type of opportunism. They do anything and everything for the cause of their own opposition, even to the preaching of the liquidation of the Party and the Comintern. This calls for the severest suppression.

Comrade Zinoviev abused his position as head of the Communist International. He believes himself still the ideological leader of the Communist movement of the world. We must fight against him and his group. I need not say that he went to Comrade Trotsky, leaving Leninism.

Firstly, the Comintern leadership, the E. C. C. I., is the general staff of the world proletariat and of the world Leninist Party. Its task is to revolutionise the world. It must therefore have a correct political line so that the Parties will not fall into either Right or Left deviations.

The E. C. C. I. must become a uniform, international leadership. For this purpose, the Comintern must be well organised. Thirdly, we need the strictest discipline in the Comintern and in all its Sections. As to the leading role of the Communist Party of Russia, in order to accomplish the varied tasks of the Comintern, it is absolutely necessary that we recognise the leadership of the Russian Communist Party. Through the help of the Russian C. P. and the other Sections of the Comintern closer contact must be established with the general staff and also between the Sections themselves.

Now in regard to the young Parties. I must call your attention, comrades, especially to those young Parties in the Far East, in China, Japan, Korea and Java. The Communist International must at once establish direct connection and must send experienced comrades to direct and lead the Party along the Leninist line.

Serious attention must be given to the task of educating the Party members along Leninist lines. In order to educate them in Leninist teaching it is necessary to look after who shall educate. You know the Kuomintang is a revolutionary party in China, but it is not a Communist Party. The Sun-Yat-Sen University is a place where the young members of the Kuomintang are educated. It should not be left in the hands of comrades like Comrade Radek and his followers to teach these young comrades. Only under the correct leadership of the E. C. C. I., will the Comintern be able to stop the factional fight in its ranks and succeed in the great tasks before it. The Comintern has many serious tasks before it and it must carry out the resolutions and manifestoes passed by the Plenum Congresses.

Comrade BODEMANN (Switzerland):

On behalf of the delegations of the three small Parties of Belgium, Holland and Switzerland, I am authorised to make the following declaration on the appearance of the leaders of the Opposition bloc:

"The above-mentioned Parties stand unanimously behind the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. and ratify the decisions of the XV. Conference of the C. P. S. U. By the lack of faith which the Opposition reveals with regard to Socialist construction in the Soviet Union it tries to hinder not only the Russian proletariat from building Socialism, but it also helps the Social Democratic leaders to continue successfully among the working class their counter-revolutionary propaganda against the Soviet Union.

In the present period of partial and wavering stabilisation of capitalism, our weightiest task is the deepening of Communist influence in the proletarian masses. By its pessimism and unprincipled attitude the Opposition strengthens those elements in the Comintern who question the possibility of a victory of the working class under the leadership of the Comintern, who do not comprehend the importance of the day to day revolutionary work in the trade unions and factories, who despair of winning the masses, and who reject the tactics of the united front.

The almost unsurpassable breaches of discipline of the Opposition, and its factional activities, were a call to all anti-Soviet elements to take up the struggle against the proletarian dictatorship. The attitude of the most prominent Opposition leaders, like Zinoviev and Kamenev, who only a short time ago

defended with all determination the unity of the Communist Party as the foundation of bolshevism, is looked upon by all undisciplined and deviating elements of the Comintern as a permit for a struggle against the Party.

After the XV. Party Conference unanimously rejected the views of the Opposition and condemned their action, the appearance of the Oppositional leaders here contains the danger that they will continue their factional activity on the basis of a broad platform on an international scale. By its offensive at the VII. Enlarged Executive the Opposition bloc tries to disorganise the work of the Comintern and of the various Parties.

The attitude of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev shows that these comrades have sacrificed the principles of Leninism in their alliance with Comrade Trotsky. By continuing its factional activity, the Opposition bloc tries to undermine and destroy the unity of the C. P. S. U., the primary prerequisite for Socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and the unity of the Comintern which is likewise the weightiest premise for the successful struggle against the bourgeoisie and its agents, the Social Democracy.

We are convinced that, just as the broad masses of the C. P. S. U. membership rejected the views of the Opposition, the members of our Parties, who daily express their confidence in the Soviet Union and its leader, the C. P. S. U., will likewise unanimously reject the attacks of the C. P. S. U. Opposition.

Comrade BOSHKOVITCH (Chairman):

Comrade Remmele has the floor for the reading of some telegrams.

Comrade REMMELE:

Comrades, two telegrams have been received by the Enlarged Executive from the membership of the C. P. S. U., which I wish to bring to your attention. The first telegram is from Kineschma and reads as follows:

"Upon receipt of a report on the most recent action of the leaders of the Opposition bloc at the VII. Enlarged Executive of the C. I., the VII. Plenum of the C. P. S. U. District Executive of Kineschma (Ivanovo-Voznessensk Gubernia) states that the leaders of the united Opposition, despite the decision of the bureau of the C. P. S. U. Delegation to the Enlarged Executive of the C. I. on the political undesirability of their appearance and despite also their own pledge at the XV. Party Conference to refrain from factional struggle, they have again resumed their factional activity directed against the C. P. S. U. and the Comintern, by their appearance at the Enlarged Executive they have mobilised all petty bourgeois groupings within the Communist Parties.

The Plenum believes that this united Opposition, by its factional attack, has flagrantly violated its promises as well as the binding resolutions of the XV. Party Conference, and has thereby repeated its attempt to split the unity of the Comintern, already previously condemned by all Sections of the Comintern. We are convinced that the Enlarged Executive of the C. I. will reject in the sharpest manner and finally repudiate the attempts of the Opposition once more to raise questions already decided, and that it will not tolerate this most flagrant violation of the unity of the Leninist ranks. In passing such a resolution the Enlarged Executive of the C. I. will be certain of the unanimous support of the Leninist C. P. S. U.

Long live the Comintern — the Leninist leader of the International proletariat — the united Communist world Party!

Long live the C. P. S. U., the faithful guardian of the Comintern!

Long live the unity of the Leninist ranks of the whole world."

The Presidium.

The second telegram is from Tyuman, and reads:

"The V. District Party Conference of Tyuman repudiates most decisively the appearance of the Opposition leaders at the Enlarged Executive of the Comintern and sees therein an open violation of the pledges entered into towards the Party, and an attempt at factional warfare on an international scale. The District Party Conference expresses the firm hope that the Comintern will most decisively repudiate the Opposition's new attempt to undermine unity.

Long live the Comintern!

Long live the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.!

Long live Leninist unity!

The Presidium.

Comrade PRUCHNIAK (Poland):

Comrades! At this Plenum of the E. C. C. I. we have seen happenings such as never before took place in the work of former Plenums and Congresses of the C. I. One after another the C. P. S. U. Opposition leaders mounted the speakers' platform not to declare their solidarity with the decisions of the Party Congress and Conferences, not to announce their submission to the Comintern, but in order with all their eloquence to try to convince the workers of the Soviet Union and of the West that that which the Russian workers began in October 1917 cannot be carried to its conclusion, that it is doomed to failure. The comrades have preached a gospel of surrender here.

This gospel is not new. It forms the contents of the entire reformist literature of Western Europe, we hear it at all reformist meetings, it is inoculated into the working class by the reformists day after day. It has nothing in common with Communism and Leninism, it means theoretically a slide into the Social Democratic viewpoint.

From an organisational viewpoint, what is the significance of the attitude of the Opposition leaders? It means not only a violation of the pledges made by the Opposition leaders to the C. P. S. U. but also a continuation of factional activity in its ranks, it is a call to unite, addressed to all those expelled from the Comintern, to all the groups hostile to the Comintern. Ruth Fischer, Maslow, Scholem and others who were expelled from the C. P. are already heeding this call. They openly avow their complete solidarity with the Opposition leaders. This unity is an utterly unprincipled bloc. Its agents in Poland are the Donski group. In the summer of 1925 none other than Zinoviev characterised him as a "small calibre feuilletonist" whose opposition to the Comintern borders close on betrayal. Comrade Donski is in the main loyal to his former viewpoint, which does not however, prevent his serving as chief agent of the Opposition in Poland.

What is the meaning of the Opposition attitude politically? In Western Europe we see a capitalist offensive against the working class, a fascist regime holds sway over half of Europe, and the dangers of a military intervention against the U. S. S. R. are becoming more and more acute. The working class of Western Europe is waging a desperate defensive struggle against this offensive, serious tasks stand before it and the working class of the Soviet Union. At this moment when it is necessary to mobilise all forces of the working class, when the working class has need for a firm will to fight and to win, at this moment the Opposition appears and preaches lack of faith, as we have heard here. This is a spiritual disarmament of the working class of the Soviet Union and of the West, in the face of hard struggles which confront it.

The Opposition leaders are doing all this allegedly in "defence of Leninism" and its traditions. In the place of the living Leninism, in the place of the living revolutionary activity, the growing Leninist cause — the Soviet Union, the Bolshevik Party, the organised millions of the working class, their tremendous cultural growth, in the place of the growth of all its creative forces, of its Communist Parties of Western Europe, the oppositional leaders offer us a dead collection of variegated citations. The working class has no need of such a "Leninism".

Comrade Trotsky turns to the Plenum with the declaration: I know that you will adopt a resolution unanimously, condemning the Opposition for Social Democratic deviations, but nevertheless we shall be right. This is no casual expression of Comrade Trotsky, because he has always considered himself as standing above the Party, above its decisions.

The working class will continue to march, as heretofore under the banners of its Party, the C. P. S. U., the Communist International. And it will clear out of its way those leaders who arise against the Party.

The Polish Delegation joins completely in the unanimous rejection and condemnation of the attitude of the united Opposition at this Plenum.

(Close of the Session.)

Twenty-Sixth Session.

Report of the Political Commission.

Moscow, December 13, 1926.

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman):

The 26th Session is opened. The first item on the agenda is the report of the Political Commission.

Comrade KUUSINEN:

I am to report on supplements and changes made by the Political Commission in the draft thesis of Comrade Bukharin. Participation in the work of the Commission was very lively, a good many proposals were made, not so much as changes as by way of supplement, for the purpose of formulating the theses in more exhaustive detail. The Commission, however, was of the view that these theses should not be greatly extended, so that they would not lose readability.

The Sub-Commission as a rule adopted the chief ideas from the various proposals submitted. All formulations accepted by the Sub-Commission were decided upon in complete agreement with Comrade Bukharin. The political line of the theses has remained the same as in the original draft, only certain clarification of formula and some additions were undertaken.

In the first chapter dealing with the economics of world capitalism, we find that aside from the United States which was characterised as the country of still powerful and developing capitalism, there were mentioned Japan and partly also the British dominions "where capitalist development is proceeding, while at a retarded rate, but for all that on a rising curve". The present over-production crisis is characterised as it was already in the original draft of Comrade Bukharin, namely that this crisis is caused fundamentally not so much by the increased capacity of the productive apparatus, as far more by the shrinkage of the purchasing power of the masses of the population; but the commission added at this place a remark that in some countries we may simultaneously observe to a greater or less extent also an increased capacity of the productive apparatus.

At the end of the first chapter, the commission desires to emphasise specially that in the present period, which is characterised as an inter-revolutionary period "between the crest of one revolutionary wave and another to which the process of historical development is inevitably leading, the Communist Parties must be prepared for the probably more rapid approach of a second uprise of the revolution."

The second chapter, where we speak about the re-grouping of the powers and the basic line of international politics, the Commission has augmented this somewhat: first by a passage about Anglo-American rivalry and its effect, about Franco-German rapprochement, and in this connection we have also pointed out the special importance of the South-American countries — with their great power to absorb industrial products, their need for capital, and their tremendous raw material reserves — for the further development of American domination. As a disorganising element in the development of the predominance of the United States, we mention the national revolutionary movement of Mexico.

Furthermore in Section 6 where we speak of Thoiry, we point out the sharpening of the antagonism between Italy and France, above all on questions of the Mediterranean, and of Northern Africa, the Balkan countries and Asia Minor. Simultaneous with the re-grouping of the Big Powers, we point out that the Little Entente is disintegrating. Particularly Poland which exchanged its French orientation for a British one, is again beginning to incline towards France. But French influence in the Balkans is being squeezed out by British and Italian imperialism. In addition, conflicts between individual Balkan States are apt to create the danger of a new war from this angle.

Among the antagonisms between imperialist powers, we record that the contradiction between Britain and America is the one that plays the most important role.

In the third chapter, where we speak of the "re-grouping of class forces and the principal lines of home politics", we remark first, with regard to Germany that — as was said in the original draft — the resistance of the working class against

the capitalist offensive is expressing itself in a Leftward swing which is embracing large masses, as yet without active defensive fighting, yet

"the beginning of the intensification of the class struggle in Germany is already having effect".

We say about the further development of England that the further decline of England, which is bound up with the disintegration of the British Empire, appears highly probable.

Concerning the economic and political situation in France we have adopted an extensive passage which states that the victory of the big bourgeoisie, which was expressed by the victory of Poincaré, is carrying on a policy "on the basis of the Experts Plan and the temporary measures for the stabilisation of the currency... by raising the rate of exchange, balancing the budget, amortising the floating debt of the Government and regulating the money market."

"The pressure upon the working class is only just commencing simultaneously with the policy of deflation. The question of acute struggles here is a question of the relatively not distant future."

Here it is remarked further that thus far in the recent political turnover, the working class was not in a position to organise either its own forces or those of the petty-bourgeoisie, and to combine them for a general resistance.

As to the current situation in Italy the Commission has emphasised especially the following:

"However, in consequence of the impoverishment of the masses — the constant result of capitalist stabilisation — and the inevitable transfer of fascism to the camp of the big bourgeoisie, a new regrouping is taking place among the masses of the petty-bourgeoisie, the small peasantry and the deceived section of the proletariat — which will necessarily result in acute social conflicts. All this creates a serious menace to the position of Fascism".

A special paragraph was supplemented in the case of Scandinavia.

In the fourth chapter, on the methods of capitalist rationalisation, only one supplement was adopted and this on the situation in the United States of America. Here we say:

"Even in the United States, the classic land of 'Americanisation', the harmful effects upon the working class and the contradictory character of the whole system of 'Americanisation' is being felt. Recently the real wages of the working class have ceased to rise, working hours have practically ceased to decline and at the same time it is observed that the workers are becoming more and more worn out in the process of production.

In the fifth chapter (on certain present-day questions of principle) in connection with where we speak of the question of German imperialism, we have added to the original text dealing with the situation which prevailed in Germany in 1923 an explanation as to how it is to be understood: that, because of the peculiarity of the situation at that time, the question of national defence stood otherwise for the Communists than it does in the present situation when Germany stands before us as an imperialist State.

An important change has been made in the passage concerning our attitude towards capitalist rationalisation. Firstly, we have made such a change in the formulation that we speak not only about the struggle against the consequences of capitalist rationalisation, but that we express this more generally: "2. To combat every attempt to depress the conditions of the working class as a result of capitalist pseudo-rationalisation". In addition, this slogan has been combined with that of the general: "1. To combat capitalist stabilisation". Thereby our negative attitude towards capitalist rationalisation has been stated with sufficient accuracy. But also, in the same connection, we point to our chief slogan: "Fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Socialist organisation of production" and thereafter the propagandist slogan is formulated: "5. To oppose capitalist rationalisation by Socialist rationalisation", and this of course only after seizing power and not in capitalist society. Because of the importance of

this passage, I will once more read the slogans we have decided upon:

"The tasks of the Communists lies on an altogether different plane, and may be summarised as follows:

1. To combat capitalist stabilisation.
2. To combat every attempt to depress the conditions of the working class as a result of capitalist pseudo-rationalisation.
3. To fight to raise the standard of living of the working class.
4. To fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Socialist organisation of production.
5. To oppose capitalist rationalisation by Socialist rationalisation.

At the same time the Communists must combat 'economic democracy' based on class cooperation and strive to secure, by irreconcilable class struggle against the employers, an extension of the powers of the factory committees right up to workers' control of production and distribution. This militant task of the class struggle must be the reply of the Communist Parties to capitalist rationalisation."

Several important supplements have been added also to the sixth chapter concerning the capitalist offensive and the changes in the position of the working class. The most important is the statement that the process of the radicalisation of the working class and of the toilers generally in the backward countries which are being agrarianised, is made extremely difficult by terror on the part of the bourgeoisie and landowners (bestial terror in Yugo-Slavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Roumania, Poland, etc.). Here also these tendencies make themselves felt in the radicalisation of the peasantry, the class trade union movement, the disintegration of the Social Democracy, the worker and peasant blocs, the growth of the national revolutionary movements, etc. "In colonial and semi-colonial countries in which there are revolutionary movements (China, India, Indonesia, Syria, and the coast of North Africa) this 'radicalisation' bears an altogether different character, i. e., the character of drawing into active struggle the hitherto indifferent, oppressed and ignorant masses."

In the seventh chapter on the principal tasks of the Comintern at the present time, several supplements have been accepted, of which the most important are contained in the beginning of the chapter. Already in the original draft thesis, it was stated:

"At the present time one of the most important international tasks of the Comintern is to support the most important centres of the international revolutionary movement: the class struggles of the British workers, the Chinese revolution, and the U. S. S. R."

To this the Commission has added that

"at the same time the Comintern must not lose sight of the fact that in Germany — the country in which the bourgeoisie has achieved more successes in its stabilisation efforts than the bourgeoisie of other countries — in spite of this relative stabilisation and on the very basis of the class struggles which will unfold and grow to a much greater extent in the future, a direct revolutionary situation will arise."

A supplement was also accepted to § 33, in which we deal with the struggle against the war menace. Here the Commission proposes the following:

"an essential task is to bring to the front in everyday agitation a campaign against the menace of fresh imperialist wars. At the same time it must be explained to the proletariat how imminent is the danger of war and the necessity to be prepared to convert the imperialist war into civil war."

A new passage was accepted on the national question. There we point out chiefly that in those States which contain various nationalities the bourgeoisie of the oppressing nation adopts methods of extreme tyranny, exploitation and downright plunder of the national minorities, all of which intensifies the national revolutionary movement. The Commission says further:

"The Communist Parties must oppose all forms of national oppression, they must advance the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination, including the right to secede and to form independent States, and point to the complete solution of the national problem in the U. S. S. R."

Finally, in this chapter, the Commission has considered it correct to indicate that in the struggle for the broad masses, in fighting the II. and Amsterdam Internationals, one must emphasise as clearly as possible the role and the aim of our

Communist movement. For this purpose, the following passage was proposed:

"In fighting to emancipate the masses from the corrupting influence of the Second International and of Amsterdam, the Communist Parties must demand as against the policy of coalition — most determined class struggle and the overthrow of capitalist governments; as against dictatorship of the capitalists — the dictatorship of the proletariat; as against the lying talk about the new peaceful phase of capitalism — the exposure of the menace of war and the preparation of the masses for the task of converting such war into civil war; as against Pan-Europe — the Socialist United States of Europe; as against the League of Nations — the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics"

In the eighth chapter on the Communist Parties and the trade unions only a minor supplementary statement of fact was added (in characterising the betrayal of the General Council of the British trade unions during the strike).

In the ninth chapter on the most important results of the work, mistakes and tasks of the Sections of the C. I., many supplements were accepted, which, however, I do not think I need report in detail here. The most important refer to the C. P. of France and of Germany. The Sections on the Communist movement in Scandinavia, the Workers (Communist) Party of America, and the Mexican Communist Party are new. These supplements have of course been worked out in agreement with the delegations from the respective Parties and they were adopted unanimously in the Sub-Commission. With regard to the formulation of the tasks of the Workers' Party of America, and possibly also in certain other points, there may still be certain editorial changes. The Presidium should be authorised to make these editorial changes in the theses later.

In conclusion, I should like to call your attention to the fact that at the end of the theses the passage dealing with the Russian Opposition was replaced by a clearer formulation; it now reads as follows:

"The Enlarged Plenum of the E. C. C. I. wholly supports the policy of the Central Committee of the U. S. S. R. It places on record that despite its declaration of October 16th, the Opposition intends to continue its factional struggle. For that reason, the E. C. C. I. considers it necessary to continue the ideological struggle against the essentially anti-Leninist views of the Opposition, and to combat all further efforts to continue the factional struggle."

In this connection, there was also a passage in the draft theses on the ratification of the expulsion of Maslow, Ruth Fischer, Urbahn etc. from the C. P. G. This question is not to be settled today in this connection because tomorrow the Commission dealing especially with this question will report, and the matter can be disposed of then.

Many practical tasks which are important in themselves for the further development of our Party work have been barely touched on in these theses, and this for the reason that in these matters it is necessary to give the Parties not general instructions, but to make them as concrete as possible, so that they will be of use to the Party. After this Plenum it will also be the task of the Executive and Presidium to get into touch with the various Sections and to formulate concrete instructions on these practical questions of further Party work.

As you see, the supplements and changes proposed to the draft of Comrade Bukharin are not of a really basic nature, they are only inclined to put these theses into a more extensive and clear form. The line of the first draft has in no way been changed. The chief slogans are now somewhat more clearly brought out and these theses are now qualified to serve as a firm basis for the work of our Sections until the next Congress.

In the name of the Commission I therefore recommend that these theses be adopted in the form presented.

Comrade KOLAROV (Chairman):

Those delegates who want to make any declarations on these theses, are requested to do so in writing, whereto they will be added to the record.

We now come to a vote on the political theses...

The political theses are adopted unanimously, with one abstention.

(Continuation of 26th Session: Concluding speech of Comrade Stalin on the Question of the C. P. S. U., follows in the next Special Number.)