

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 6 No. 78

25th November 1926

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

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

Discussion on Comrade Stalin's Report.

Comrade Bucharin:

(Verbatim Report.)

Comrades! The Speeches of the representatives of the Opposition Bloc, who have spoken here, call for some remarks. On me personally, the following circumstance especially has made a terrible impression. One after another, Comrade Kamenev, Comrade Trotzky and Comrade Zinoviev get up and behave simply as though nothing special had happened (cries of: "Everything is quiet!"), as though there had simply been some slight differences of opinion. According to Kamenev even these differences of opinion are now reduced to a minimum; the Opposition leaders made their statement about one fact or another, and there is an end of it! We should on the contrary recall what has happened, what is the system of views the comrades referred to maintain and the harm which this system of views within our Party has done in the Comintern. They have said nothing of the chief point, of the fundamental point, of what in the end decides the question. In my opinion however, we ought above all to draw attention to this.

Past and present statements of the Opposition.

Everyone knows that our Party was accused of having started on the path of "Thermidor". Has a single word been said about it now? No, nothing was said! Have they withdrawn the statement that we are going through an "epoch of Thermidor"? They have not said a word about it, as though it had never been.

Has a word been said about the Cavaignacs? Has anything been said about our throttling the proletariat? Was this said or not? It was said! It was said by Radek, it was said by Sapronov, Preobrazhensky hinted at it, the rumour is going round in wide circles of the party. Have the representatives of the Op-

position behaved as though they felt guilty, have they branded this phraseology which, from the standpoint of the party is revolting and criminal? (Applause.) Not a sound, not a word!

Did Comrade Trotzky say that representatives of our party were grave-diggers of the revolution; did he or did he not say it? He did say it (cries of: "Shame!"). Now they say nothing about it. It is apparently quite harmless to say that the Central Committee — Stalin and others — are grave-diggers of the revolution. All this seems to be a mere trifle! But all this — even about the grave-diggers — was said at the nucleus of the "Aviopribor". (Cries of: "They must be called to order!")

Was it or was it not said that our party is running off the lines of the proletarian revolution? It was said. But here they behave as though nothing had happened!

Was it or not said at the Conference of the Plenum of the Central Committee that the policy of our party was deviating from the interests of the broad working masses? It was said by Comrade Kamenev, it was said and written, but he gets up on the platform and makes no sound, says no word about it, as though nothing had happened.

Was it or was it not said by Comrade Trotzky that "our State is far removed from being a proletarian State"? It was said. It was only afterwards that Comrade Trotzky tried to improve things by a rectification, by altering the shorthand report in order to deceive the party; after all that he gets up here and does not repent, says nothing of having made a frightful mistake — all this is apparently a trifle.

Was it or was it not said that we are experiencing a bureaucratic degeneration in which a caste of people has formed and detached themselves from the masses, whilst the lower stories

The speech of Comrade Molotov and the concluding speech of Comrade Stalin appear on pages 1343 and 1350 respectively. The speeches of the leaders of the Opposition, Comrades Kamenev, Trotzky and Zinoviev, will be published in the next Special Number which will be issued tomorrow.

of our apparatus of State are flooded with peasant elements, the peasants afterwards being turned into Kulaks? And after that, Kamenev said that anyone who mixes up the Kulaks with the peasants is a criminal. In this way he finds fault with himself.

Was all this said? It was said! And afterwards these people get up and say nothing about it. Was it or was it not said that our party is steering for the Kulaks? It was said! In this respect also silence was observed. Was anything said about our party regime in the statement at the Plenum of the Central Committee? Did Comrade Trotzky assert on the basis of this very platform that the party apparatus and the leading circles of the party had seized the whole party by the throat? He did say so! But after the whole party had seized our Opposition by the throat, they shut their eyes to it just as though absolutely nothing had happened. (Applause.)

The Opposition distributed an extremely revolting pamphlet under the title "The Labour Question", in which, among other things, a terminology is used, which is in no way distinguished from that of the Mensheviks and in which it is said that the methods of arbitrary rule of prewar times are now being re-introduced into our factories etc. etc. They wrote that! And now they pass over it.

At the sessions of the Politbureau, it has repeatedly been said in connection with the discussions of the British question, that we are approaching the 2nd International, that we are carrying on a policy of the 2nd International. Now they say absolutely nothing about it.

This is one side of the question. On the other hand, it seems to me that Comrade Larin was perfectly right when he maintained in his yesterday's speech that the comrades referred to had spoken like literary men and not like politicians. What is your political line? Where is your political line? Then Comrade Zinoviev gets up and makes an attempt to talk about a milliard. You have all seen how pitiful and hollow this was. It is all the same to Zinoviev whether it is 300 million, 700 million or a milliard. There is no difference. The whole party has grown to such an extent that we have to be continually calculating with a pencil in our hand; every figure is reckoned out as exactly as possible, and at the same time one of the responsible leaders of the Opposition gets up and says: "Well, if it is not a milliard, it is 700 million." For him the figures make no difference.

The second question is that of prices. Every comrade understands very well that now the chief source of friction between the workers and peasants is the question of prices. What other questions are there in this connection? It is comprehensible even to anybody who is not particularly well trained in economics that the question of prices is the chief source of friction between the working class and the peasantry, with which all economic problems are directly connected, which weigh on our politics. But what did each of them say about it? We have heard rumours that Kamenev did not agree with Piatakov, that Piatakov did not agree with Kamenev nor with Trotzky, that Trotzky did not agree with Zinoviev etc., but these are all rumours and we cannot concern ourselves with them. But we do know that increase of retail prices is a blow for the working class, as the working class suffers more than anyone from the increase of prices. We know that this line of action is a direct help for the Kulaks, for, when prices are high, the Kulak can buy, not however the poor peasant.

Whither is this line carrying them. What have they said about it? That the party should consider this cardinal question? Trifles, all these are trifles, they have defended an improvement according to classes. When these main questions are put urgently, they maintain silence. Why have they not got up to speak on the economic questions? Because economic policy is their weakest point, although they are making every kind of a fuss about questions of economics. As a matter of fact, they have got themselves into a perfect blind alley in the main question of prices. They keep silence here because their line of issue is the line of Trotzkyism which — I do not know whether it has been forced on them or accepted by them, in agreement or in semi-agreement — but anyhow it is the line of the whole Opposition. And the party has every right to place this main argument in the whole economic platform of the Opposition. Nothing has been said about this, absolutely nothing. It is just the same with regard to the question of withdrawing means from the domain of trade, just the same with regard to all the main questions of our economic policy.

THE "THEORY" OF SPEECHES WHICH "SLIPPED OUT".

In order to give all these matters some form of justification, it "pleased" Comrade Kamenev yesterday to propound a very amusing theory which I have never heard before at a party conference. He said: It matters little what Zinoviev said, it matters little what this or that member of the Communist Academy said, it matters little what Preobrashensky said. It sometimes happens with us that a word slips out, that a sentence slips out, that even a speech slips out. It may be said that it is a remarkable political leader of the Opposition who is of so agile a nature that even a speech slips out of him! (Cries of: "Not making a speech!" Laughter.)

I can only say that we could continue this evidence. A whole book slipped out of Comrade Zinoviev for instance (applause, laughter). Then however, for the sake of the bloc with Trotzky, Comrade Zinoviev tore out of this book which had slipped out of him (in Russian the words "to slip out" and "to tear out" come from the same root) a certain number of pages which were directed against Trotzky (laughter).

The theory of "slipping out" is altogether a peculiar theory of the tactics of the Opposition. These are all nothing but trifles, but is it possible that anyone could justify himself through them? In this way it is possible to defend oneself against anything; if even a speech can slip out, it is possible for anything to slip out. The question cannot possibly be put that way. It is impossible to accept the assumption that the word "Cavaignac" slipped out, that the word "Thermidor" slipped out, that the word "grave-diggers" slipped out, that the deviation towards the Kulaks" slipped out. Has not too much slipped out? (Tempestuous, continued applause, laughter.) And even if all this had slipped out, in such a situation the whole sum of what has slipped out forms a complete political line, and the axis of this political line is an estimate of our situation which suggests that we are degenerating economically and politically.

THE CAUSES OF THE CAPITULATION OF THE OPPOSITION.

This is why the party was bound to put the main question of the revolution and to ask firmly and decidedly all the workers organised in our party as well as those workers who back us and go with our party: Yes or no? Are in error or not? Are we following the lines which are in keeping with our class?

This is why we brought up the main questions of the revolution. Just for this reason! And this is by no means our fault but the fault of those who made an attack on the party under the slogan of "Thermidor", who accused our party of "Thermidor degeneration". Thus, this political attitude, this line taken by them was practically identical with a pronounced fractional fight.

When yesterday Comrade Trotzky completed the picture by stating that, if everything had been as it should be, we should have been obliged to resort to the method of building up a new party and so on, his statement is quite true. But, allow me to ask, have they not made efforts to form a new party within the framework of our party? Did they not only renounce the attack after the party had downed them? Did they not send Ossovsky who proposed this system to two or several parties?

They did send him! Did not Kamenev and Trotzky vote against Ossovsky being excluded? They did vote against it! Did they not sacrifice the organisatory teaching of Leninism in favour of the freedom of fractions and groups? They sacrificed it in accordance with a quite definite logic. Did they then not understand that in doing so they were deviating from the organisatory principles of Leninism? They understood it perfectly! But they justified it by alleging that they were building up a party as it should be against the "Thermidor party", and that, in order to build up this party, they had to disintegrate the old party. This is why they began to speak of the freedom of the fractions and groups; from this point of view it is quite natural that they had to destroy all the norms within the party. They joined together and aimed their blows at the party.

When they had no success with this number, when these tactics, which took their origin absolutely in their political orientation, were rejected (what Trotzky said yesterday that we all more or less struck out when the means and aims justified it, is wrong), after the workers had led them along the orthodox path, when the workers had shown that they acted as a rampart

to our party — then only did they beat a retreat. And even then an attempt was made; this was Comrade Zinoviev's visit to Leningrad, as we all know to the "sick papa", who turned out to be a worker at the Putilov works! It was undertaken as a last attempt to feel the pulse of the mood of the masses. And when in Leningrad they realised that all stood round the party like a rampart, only then did they begin to reflect: Perhaps they are not so degenerated as it seemed to us.

It was right that they did thus return to a good conscience but then they ought to have come here and said that it was the workers who had made them think in this way. But they not only did not say this, but, as is evident from the speeches of the representatives of the Opposition — both Kamenev's and Zinoviev's and especially Trotzky's — they still maintain exactly the same standpoint as previously (cries of: "Hear! Hear!") and this is the purport of their speeches.

At present they maintain that they only beat a retreat because they wanted to avoid a catastrophe. What catastrophe do they mean, perhaps a split in the party?! Three persons will secede from the party, that would have been the whole split (laughter). At the present time there can be no split, because the whole party is completely united, and all these reflections which are made with regard to a catastrophe, to the end of all things, all this groaning and moaning is the fruit of the devastated imagination of Comrade Zinoviev, because they see that the ground is slipping from beneath their feet. That is a catastrophe, but it is a catastrophe of political leaders and not a catastrophe of our party. (Applause.)

WHO "RELIES" UPON WHOM IN THE OPPOSITION BLOC?

We now see, comrades, with what attitude and what thoughts the comrades of the Opposition come before us. I must say that in recent times they — particularly Comrade Trotzky, who is known for his self-assertion — advocate the remarkable idea that they carry in their bags the most important ideological luggage, whilst the Central Committee is in this respect poor in spirit, as the Gospel says. (Applause.) What is then this ideological luggage which the Opposition produces as something from which the party should learn?

Comrades, I pass directly to what Comrade Trotzky has expounded. Only one preliminary remark! At present all this has ceased to be a tragedy and has, to a large extent, turned into a farce. (Cries of: "Hear! Hear!") If Comrade Kamenev gets up here and, in reply to a straight question as to the relations between him and Trotzkyism, says: I, Kamenev, join at present with Trotzky as Lenin joined with Trotzky and leaned on him, we can only reply with homeric laughter. Just see, what a fine Lenin we have found. You see and we all see very well that Comrade Kamenev and Comrade Zinoviev lean on Trotzky in a very peculiar way. (Prolonged laughter, Applause.) They "lean" on Trotzky in such a way that Trotzky is completely "astride" them. (Laughter, applause.) And then, with a somewhat hoarse voice, Comrade Kamenev cries from the depths of Trotzky's ideological hegemony: I lean on Trotzky. (Laughter.) Just like Lenin. (Laughter.) A remarkable statement! Well, is not this a farce? Is it not a comedy? Of course it is a comedy, nothing more nor less than a comedy, in which nobody has any faith.

THE PRESENT SIGNIFICANCE OF THE THEORY OF THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION.

With your permission, comrades, I will now pass to Comrade Trotzky's views. For many years the party has discussed the question of the permanent revolution in this or that form; but all this happened in 1923 with the immediate help and support and even at the instigation of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev. Everyone knows that all our political and economic questions of a fundamental and decisive nature are based on the question of the relations of the class forces in our country. Now Comrade Trotzky comes along and says: but the question of the permanent revolution has nothing to do with this. Did not the theory of the permanent revolution in the first place take a certain estimate of the class forces in our country for granted, and did not Comrade Trotzky write in his letter to Comrade Ominsky that his estimate had on the whole been confirmed, and were Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev wrong

when they connected the discussion of the question of the permanent revolution with the discussion of the questions of our economic policy, of reform of currency, of policy with regard to prices etc..?

If they were wrong, they might be so kind as to get up and say: We were wrong, the permanent revolution has nothing to do with all these questions. They have kept silence on this question! These are their "high principles", this is their "grand theoretical and ideological luggage"! Comrade Trotzky, however, says straight out: This has nothing to do with our disputes! But it is very directly connected with them!

They might complain and say to the C. C.: Do you analyse all these great fundamental questions? This attitude would have been in place had they not brought up their accusation of Thermidor. When however they accuse us of Thermidorism, then, pardon me, we cannot discuss the matter.

With regard to Comrade Trotzky, Lenin himself said that he takes what he likes from one and the other without it being clear what he takes, and tries to take what should not be taken. Comrade Trotzky said yesterday: "The theory of the permanent revolution with all its features right and wrong". Allow me to ask what we are to understand under "wrong". To whom has Comrade Trotzky communicated this? When did we hear from Trotzky what he considers right and what wrong? Never, never once have we heard it. If only Trotzky had ever condescended to say what he thinks right and what wrong! In his most recent works he says that Bolshevism has learnt something new, that Bolshevism, according to Trotzky, has arrived at Trotzkyism, at the theory of the permanent revolution — and we know nothing more. We, however, are not under an obligation to know when Comrade Trotzky will tell us anything more.

What he told us yesterday is very interesting! He struck up a song to the effect that a boom of socialist economy in our country is only possible if the State gets help from outside. I consider this an extremely important assertion. For indeed, Comrades Trotzky, Kamenev and a number of others represent the affair in such a way — and here they are right — as to make it seem that we must advance at a more and more rapid and furious pace; in the resolution of the C. C. it is said that we must catch up the world economy and the level of world economy but must then out-distance it.

Allow me however to ask: If a boom in socialist economy is impossible without State help from outside, how then, dear friends, will you catch up Europe and other countries without this State help? Get up then and say: "Until the international revolution is victorious, nothing can be said as to the pace alluded to in the resolution of the C. C. Try it, say it, prove it! And what will the workers say to that? We say that it is possible, so that in the resolution we do not write empty rubbish, nothing on the lines of Zinoviev's productions — 700 millions, one milliard — no nonsense, but we write this because we consider that such a pace of development is possible. We are of the opinion that the internal forces and the internal material sources of our country admit of this pace. I shall not discuss this matter in detail, I only bring up the question.

And yet you say that the question of the permanent revolution has nothing to do with this matter; oh yes, indeed, it has very much to do with it!

ON THE INTERNAL FORCES OF OUR REVOLUTION.

Now, Comrades, I turn to a second question. This is the question about which Comrade Trotzky spoke (he spoke more happily than the others, he spoke with the greatest élan, not, it is true, inspired by the socialist economy but by his own spirit). Comrade Trotzky's most important argument was directed against our evidence brought forward in the question of the construction of socialism in one country. We maintain that it is necessary to make a logical distinction between the question of determining our internal forces (here it is a case of formulating the question as to the character of our revolution differently) and the question of intervention. Comrade Trotzky got up here, made great fun of the matter and said that our writing about it is the best materialisation of the "metaphysical spirit", that the question cannot be put in that way, that intervention can absolutely not be separated from internal affairs, and altogether, that internal and external things are interwoven.

Well and good, we will speak of this interweaving later; but I would like to make a single quotation from Lenin. Lenin said the following in his article "Economics and Politics in the Epoch of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat". He begins by saying that the matter of collecting corn is proceeding in some way or other, that we have improved a little etc. Comrades, I ask you to listen with particular attention to this most remarkable quotation:

Lenin writes:

"However much the bourgeoisie in all countries and their immediate and secret accomplices (the "socialists" of the 2nd International) may lie and calumniate us, there can be no doubt that, from the standpoint of the chief economic problem, the victory of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the victory of Communism over Capitalism, is assured in our country. This is the reason why the bourgeoisie of the whole world is raging against Bolshevism and organising campaigns, conspiracies etc. against the Bolsheviks, because they understand very well that our victory with the reconstruction of social economics is inevitable unless they suppress us by military force; and they will not find it easy to suppress us." (The italics are mine, N. B.)

Does Lenin here separate intervention from the internal building up of our economic conditions? Undoubtedly he separates them. How does he put the question? Line for line, exactly as we put it. Unless the bourgeoisie succeeds in suppressing us by military force, the question of socialist construction from the point of view of the internal relations of the economic forces in our country, can be solved positively to a successful end. This is a definite and clear way of putting the question. Let Comrade Trotzky come up on the platform and say: "Lenin is a well-known metaphysician, for it is impossible to separate intervention from the question of internal construction, it is impossible to separate economic resources from the danger of war" etc. All this is as unlike Lenin as chalk is from cheese. This was Trotzky's main idea, this was the centre point of his reflections, this was the chief arrow he shot at the representatives of the standpoint of the C. C., but the arrow proved to be a Parthian arrow, it fell back on Trotzky, because anyone who advocates the theory of the permanent revolution should not refer to Lenin. The theory of the permanent revolution is not a Leninist theory.

Comrade Trotzky spoke of there being a quotation from Lenin with regard to the active co-operation of the proletariat of other countries with the workers of our country, that the final victory of socialism in our country is impossible without this co-operation. This is quite right, but it is not the matter under discussion. Answer the following question: Is it possible in view of the internal economic resources of our country, in view of the given dynamics of the forces, to carry the construction of socialism through to the end, unless we are prevented by intervention, or is it not? This is how Lenin put the question. Do you support this quotation from Lenin or do you not? Do you claim solidarity with him or not? Yes or no? We want a straight answer.

I must say, comrades, that even the quotation referred to recently by Comrade Zinoviev speaks entirely against them. When Lenin says that we have everything that is necessary, and that in sufficient measure, for the construction of socialism, if only international complications do not interfere, Lenin is distinguishing between the external and the internal factors and he separates them in his analysis.

Trotzky has thought out as an example that, if one walks in the street naked in January, it is difficult to detach oneself from the weather conditions; I agree, it is indeed difficult. If, however, there are individuals or members of the party — whether belonging to the Opposition or not — who bring up the subject as to whether the person who has to go naked has feet or not and if they begin to doubt the existence of his feet, the question can be put: As this person has no feet, he cannot walk about whatever the weather may be. You see therefore that the analogy which claims to be a joke, is not to the point. The question is: If this young man had feet, he would not have been robbed of his feet, his deviation towards the Kulaks would not have caused his feet to be sawn off. If the question is put this way, we are completely justified in detaching ourselves from the weather from time to time in order to discuss the still more important question of the feet. But if, in spite of that, the feet are connected with the weather, we must distinguish between the feet on the one hand and the weather on the other hand. (Applause.)

Comrade Trotzky creates a similar fog when he introduces the following marvellous cogitation: Well then, war is war, they are just frightened; intervention is war, but is the continuation of politics with other means, politics however are concentrated economics. What differences of opinion have we here? Is it not all the same whether there is war or not? See, what a humorous dialectician he is! The substitution he has made is absolutely inadmissible. It is one thing that everything here is connected with everything else, but another matter is the question as to the identity of these things. From the way Comrade Trotzky puts the question, the direct conclusion might be drawn that it is all the same whether we carry on trade with or make war against foreign Powers! (Laughter, applause.)

Of course, when foreign Powers trade with us, they try to injure us in every possible way. When they carry on war, they continue the same policy, but with other and more violent means. The position is exactly the same with regard to our home and foreign trade and our wars, when we carry them on. But from this we may not draw the topsy-turvy conclusion drawn by Comrade Trotzky, who is not fond of talking of metaphysics and who believes that, because there is nothing metaphysical, everything can be thrown into one pot, as Trotzky, Zinoviev, Shliapnikov and Medvediev have done in one united Bloc. Even there certain things must be distinguished from one another.

It seems to me that there are three kinds of questions to be solved when discussing the problem of building up socialism in a single country. The first is the question of the internal resources and of the internal relation of forces, that is, in essentials, the question as to the character of our revolution; the second is the question of intervention and the danger of armed suppression by the bourgeoisie and finally, the third question, is that of the pressure of world economics on us. I think that these questions should be answered as follows: Our internal relations of forces and our internal resources suffice completely for building up a socialist society. Only a victorious international revolution can be a guarantee against intervention and against wars. The pressure of world economics is a tremendous difficulty for us, but by no means an insuperable difficulty. This is how the question must be put and this is the answer to the questions which have been put here.

There is another piece of evidence of Comrade Trotzky who maintains that the question will cease to exist as soon as the international revolution triumphs. In connection with this, he represents things as though we held the view that the victory of the international revolution will not be possible within the next ten years. This is a calumnious way of putting the question on the part of Comrade Trotzky, a calumnious misrepresentation of our views.

Who was it that said that we exclude the possibility of an international revolution for decades, and when did he say it? Where was it said? Who said it?

If anyone has already said it, it is Maslow, the former communist, who is now working hand in hand with Zinoviev. He said it, but we have never said it, never and nowhere. Not a single sentence, not a single quotation, not a single sound has been uttered by us to this effect. It can of course be said that in the course of life all sorts of questions fall away, including questions which are the subject of differences of opinion. This is quite true. But to decline discussing questions in the present because they will fall away in the future — no one but Trotzky could be cunning enough to put the question in that way.

Comrade Trotzky has said that he wrote, what he wrote in 1922, from the point of view of 1905, but this only shows that he is juggling and wants to wriggle out of it. This is a conjuring trick, but we want to determine the prospects of our development and to answer the question: Can we build up socialism or not, can we start from the presumption that we can count on a victory? This question is by no means superfluous. For, if, in view of the internal relation of forces in our country, it were impossible to carry on socialism to an economic victory, it is quite natural that we should live as long as we make continual concessions, as long as we beat a retreat if there is any delay in the world revolution. It is then natural that, if there is a delay in the world revolution we should live if, from a certain point onwards, we begin to degenerate by a change in our class system. Thus, in spite of everything, things come to light according to all the rules of art.

This easily explains that all these "Thermidors" and "Cavaignacs" the "running off the rails" and other things have been put in circulation because people said that this process was far advanced. They say that there are no objective internal preliminary conditions for the construction of socialism, that the international revolution is not coming, that we are in power, that the Nep is only a retreat, that the resolutions of the 14th Party Conference are only a retreat, which was undertaken in the 8th year of the proletarian dictatorship, in the 8th year of the proletarian dictatorship we are starting a retreat on the most important fronts. It is impossible to retreat the whole time, to throw out ballast as from a balloon. Some time or other degeneration will begin. That is why this affair began with Thermidor, with the Cavaignacs etc. So that everything is linked up with each other.

I wonder how it is possible that intellectually developed persons do not understand why, in these circumstances, the question regarding the internal forces of the revolution has to be put. Because, if you answer this question in the negative, dear friends, the Cavaignacs will jump out like a Jack-in-the-box. That is how the question must be put! With you everything is linked up. Do not play the simple Simon, do not behave as people who cannot see the connection between things. We do not believe it! You have already allied yourselves! But you have made a mistake in your calculations, although you have linked up. Therefore you must not complain that the party puts the question of the internal forces of our revolution, i. e. the question as to the character of our revolution.

What is Comrade Trotsky now doing towards the further justification of his theory? In my opinion, he is playing an absolutely revolting game with Lenin. It is the same game as at the time when Comrade Trotsky maintained that Bolshevism had learnt something new and had put on the clothing of Trotskyism. The party cannot permit this game to be played. Here people must say straight out with what things they agree and with what things they do not agree. It is perfectly inadmissible to concern oneself with the school of military camouflage at this Conference. Only see what Trotsky is doing. Trotsky came here and asked: What did Lenin write before the revolution of 1905, what did Lenin say at the Congress of Stockholm? Lenin wrote and said that after the victorious revolution, even if the land were nationalised, the middle peasant would inevitably become counter-revolutionary and that this counter-revolutionary element would bring us into a delicate situation. Then however Trotsky continues: Well then, do not Lenin's prophecies (I will show later that here Lenin is only a pseudonym for Trotsky) coincide with my prophecies? And the fights with Machno and Kronstadt and this and that?

Of what did Lenin speak at the Stockholm Congress before the revolution of 1905? About the bourgeois revolution. Is that so or not? It is so. What was taken for granted at that time? That, unless help came from the socialist proletariat, a temporary government which carried through the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, would inevitably fall, thanks to the internal relation of forces. Why? Because, in view of the capitalist instincts for private property, which are held up by nothing but have, on the contrary, been given the widest scope, the peasantry would, after the destruction of feudalism, wholeheartedly tread the path of the development of capitalism. Under the conditions of this capitalist development, the progressive revolutionary part played by the peasantry would come to nothing, the proletariat of the bourgeois democratic State would not be able to maintain the alliance with the mass of small property owners who develop in a capitalist milieu. No other way was expected.

Was Lenin's prophecy wrong in these circumstances? It was absolutely right. Did at that time the question of a further advance become prominent, at any rate so markedly? If we did hint at it, it was in the Stockholm speech etc. only a case of the bourgeois revolution. And, when Lenin spoke of a change in the peasantry, he was only thinking of the bourgeois type of the development of this peasantry. Now Trotsky comes and says: These prophecies of Lenin's have come true and, since I said almost exactly the same with regard to the socialist revolution, this means that my prophecies also are partly justified. What kind of a tendency is this? It is a tendency which is theoretically quite undignified. (Stalin: "Conjuring tricks!"). For, let us now consider what has come true and what has not. We will leave Lenin on one side. He has nothing to do with it. Lenin brought up quite different questions and only the cunning

fingers of Comrade Trotsky drew out this thread and tied it up with the problem which we are now examining; we, however, shall cut this thread, because it is entirely artificial.

What does Trotsky say? Let him speak in his own name but not in the name of Lenin. And do not let him appear under the pseudonym of Lenin. This would be much better, more honest theoretically and more useful for the party. Trotsky said as follows: The proletariat will seize the power; since the peasantry is numerically in the majority and will inevitably be counter-revolutionary, the proletariat will not be able to maintain this power without State help from the international proletariat. He not only said this in 1905, he repeated it in 1922. This would have had to be confirmed in the course of our revolution, and he says with regard to it, that it has been partly confirmed. I think that the opposite has been confirmed. For Lenin was quite right when he said that the civil war had consolidated the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry, but this was a special form of alliance, a military form.

There were vacillations among the middle peasants. This is true. There were vacillations also among the poor peasants. And indeed, in specially difficult times there were even vacillations within the proletariat. It is enough to recall the time before the days of Kronstadt. Is it, however, allowable to mix up the fundamental lines of the development of the forces of the classes in our country with the vacillations in the moods of the individual classes which existed in our country? The general line of our development is that we have persuaded the peasantry to ally itself with us. If Trotsky says that conflict and consequently ruin is inevitable, things have turned out quite differently with us, something else has come true. The alliance with the peasantry has become a reality. Afterwards, Trotsky gets up and says: Everything, much has come true. This is again an attempt to bring forward Trotsky's theory under the mask of Lenin, although it has not come true in the least.

ON THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC DEVIATION OF THE OPPOSITION.

A small remark with regard to the following questions. Yesterday Comrade Trotsky got frightfully excited because he was compared with Otto Bauer. "Excuse me, how can I be compared with Bauer?" (Stalin: "Was not Bauer indignant about it?"). I am not in touch with him. (Laughter.) Now Trotsky says: "How can anyone compare me with Bauer, since I have written against Kautsky and against Bauer and have carried out this or that useful piece of work under instructions from the party." This is true. Trotsky has written against Kautsky, he has written against Bauer; if Trotsky had written nothing against Kautsky and Bauer, there would be nothing to distinguish him from Kautsky and Bauer, then we should have nothing to say to Comrade Trotsky.

Why then has Comrade Trotsky backed out of answering the question as to how his views differ from Bauer's words which are quoted in the resolution? (Cry of: This does not apply to him). Perhaps this does not touch the spot like the theory of the permanent revolution, but it is nevertheless both in form and in its nature a Trotskyist theory. Does not Otto Bauer say that in a country with such a backward peasantry as has Russia, the proletariat alone will not be able to hold the power, that its downfall is inevitable.

Just the same as Trotsky says!

But Trotsky has played clever tricks, he took a sentence about the culture of the peasants and said: "Excuse me, but what bad taste to describe the peasant culture in this way!" The downfall he simply ignores. The fact is that Otto Bauer says that, in the measure in which the class-consciousness of the peasantry grows, this same peasantry will develop its own culture, in that it is partly educated by the proletarian dictatorship. This is a political idea; what has peasant culture to do with it? But what has Comrade Trotsky said with regard to the downfall? Not a single word. Not a single word against the cardinal political idea. As though it simply had not existed there.

Thus we see here a typical backing out; he took this same peasant culture and began to barricade himself behind the word. As for the political idea which it contains, it has nothing to do with us, we know nothing about it; let Pushkin settle with it. (Laughter.)

There is still another argument: "You say that we show signs of a social democratic deviation. How is this? We demand higher wages for the workers, we demand exemption from taxation for

40% of the poor peasants and we refuse to join the Amsterdam International. Just see what good fellows we are!" I ask you: What would happen if our development were to proceed on Ossovsky's lines — from which the communist God preserve us — and if we were to have a purely parliamentary bourgeois fraction at the World Congress? (Stalin: "A Menshevist one"). I do not even speak of a Menshevist one, but even if we had a bourgeois fraction, what do you imagine, do you not think it would display the greatest affection for the workers? Of course they would be in favour of a seven hours' day, they would say that the workers in our country live in poverty and misery, that their position must be improved etc. Why would they say all this? Because they would have to support themselves on the masses in order to cut us out. Afterwards, however, they would infringe the seven hours' day. Let us look at the Menshevist Press; does it not write that the workers get very little, that an agitation must be carried on, that strikes must be carried through with this slogan? To this Comrade Trotzky says: What is there social democratic about that? All this simply means that they have not understood the chief mechanism of the development of political forces. What is there about this which is in its nature essentially social democratic? What is actually social democratic about it is that the comrades are of the opinion that the inner forces of our revolution are so inadequate that a Thermidor is more or less inevitably linked up with it.

But Comrade Trotzky has introduced still another argument. He says: If we speak of our being ruined, explain to us why we suggest plundering the peasantry? Nobody will answer us: That in itself is a terrible argument!

It is not in the least terrible. It is only your way of putting the question which assumes a terribly "raging" logic. But we are not obliged to accept it. We have seen how logical you are in all the systems of ideas you construct. Why then do you suggest plundering the peasantry? Doubtless because with you it is a gesture of despair. You believe that our situation will get worse and worse, that our difficulties will grow from year to year. You take for granted that we shall only get out of them by superhuman pressure.

This is the psychology of gestures of despair, of superhuman pressure, of impulses of will which are so characteristic of Comrade Trotzky.

We, however, are in favour of a quieter course, of a calmer, more convinced policy, which yields better results. It seems to me, that Comrade Trotzky's speech shows that Trotzky has not shaken off a single one of his chief ideas, (Stalin: Quite right!), that he has kept every item of his so-called ideological luggage, on which he wants to paste a Leninist label, though with very bad paste. The comrades may be offended that we are obliged to explain this phraseology to the party, that we have to carry on an ideological fight, that we are obliged to do this because we are faced by the Trotzkyan conception. Trotzky will not learn, Trotzky refuses to think out the question to its end he only wants to avoid the main problem by wrapping his Trotzkyism in a Leninist flag.

ON THE CAPITULATIONISM OF THE OPPOSITION AND THE MISREPRESENTATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE PARTY.

I pass on now to the second hero of the Opposition, to Comrade Kamenev. Comrade Kamenev believed that at the beginning of his speech he could deaden our senses — or achieve an enormous success by crying out: "Before whom are we laying down our arms? Are we laying down our arms before the Nep man? Are we laying down our arms before the capitalist world? Are we laying down our arms before social democracy?" etc. "How can you assume this?" But now I ask you: When Lenin called your attitude in the October days, screaming pessimism, before whom did you lay down your arms then? Of course you did not lay them down straight away in order to do something which suited the bourgeoisie, but you had estimated the internal forces as though everything were wrong with the workers and everything good with the bourgeoisie. When now the bourgeoisie gets up and says: Just look, in the old capitalist society the workers are paid so much; or when Smirnov under the pseudonym of Meislin writes in the "Bolshevik" that we are actually forming a reserve army which exceeds the example given us by the bourgeoisie; or, when our successes and our achievements are belittled by the Opposition and when it considers that everything is bad with the workers and everything good with the

bourgeoisie, all this is screaming pessimism. When you concern yourselves with the disintegrating prophecies of Thermidor, of degeneration etc. and collect all this worthless trash, you are capitulating objectively to the bourgeoisie, however strange it may seem (Cries of: Hear! Hear!).

Comrade Kamenev thought he was playing a special trump card when he said that since the time of the February revolution we have never faced the question as to the estimation of our revolution, and that Bucharin alone had brought up this question in the resolution of the Moscow district bureau. He read you this very resolution which was read once more by Zinoviev, thanks to a terrible unanimity in the ranks of the Opposition. I must say that everyone knows perfectly well that I was the first of the whole group of the Left Communists to confess my Left Communist errors; nevertheless I cannot pass over Comrade Kamenev's remark for, in view of his office, he should know the history of the party. This resolution was not written by me but by Comrade Stukov, who has now drifted into the ranks of the present Opposition. Why, to put it mildly, this falsification of the document? We cannot stand this. When Comrade Trotzky does it by attributing Trotzkyism to Lenin, Kamenev repeats the conjuring trick, although he knows perfectly well that it is not true. Comrade Stukov has spoken on this matter, and Comrade Kamenev, I repeat it, is by his function bound to know the history of the party. It seems to me that it was hardly necessary to resort to a misrepresentation. And if Comrade Kamenev now emphasises the idea that we have not once since April made an attempt to analyse the class forces differently, I say to him here: Dear Comrade Kamenev, you have simply swallowed your October mistakes. Was your October luggage, were your October mistakes quite ephemeral?

You certainly based them on something or other. Or was this simply the babbling of some youthful dreamer to whom it occurred for some reason or other to oppose insurrection? Why do you recount to us all sorts of sins and conceal what happened after April when you made efforts to revise the line of the estimation of our revolution? Pardon me, but surely all your October mistakes were due to this, all of them were based on this estimation. You, however, say that this was not the case. We know, dear friends, that as far as you are concerned, a tradition has developed in this respect. In his book "Leninism", Comrade Zinoviev says that his whole October errors amounted to nothing more nor less than that he continued on Leninist lines for about two days longer. Kamenev on the other hand is supporting his twin brother. He declares that there was absolutely nothing, that there were no explanations of any kind. But after all, we have our senses about us and are not so easily caught with this chaff.

I now pass to some of the main statements of Comrade Kamenev's speech and will endeavour to show that even now, even in yesterday's speech, Comrade Kamenev repeats his wrong attitude of October and April. (Cries of: True!). We have brought up the question of building up socialism in our country. Is this true or is it not? It is true, Comrade Kamenev gets up on this platform, blames Comrade Stalin and says: "See what is written in the "Social Democrat", even in the theses about our revolution; it is written there that there is a bourgeois democratic revolution in our country." He stops at this. But if Comrade Kamenev makes politically a full-stop there, it means that he is turning Lenin from a proletarian revolutionary who looks for support to the socialist revolution, into a radical bourgeois democrat. (Cries of: "Hear! Hear!"). This means nothing more nor less than beginning, even from this platform — though with very insufficient means, it is true — to conceal the October error which Comrade Kamenev has swallowed so unsuccessfully. I am afraid that the October bone will stick in Comrade Kamenev's throat and that we shall not allow him to swallow it completely.

How did Lenin actually put the question in these theses? He put the question as to the point of issue of the revolution, as to the first stage of this revolution, by hints which are found in these theses with regard to the further advance, but by very feeble hints. Was this right? It was right. At that phase of development it was absolutely right, but, I repeat, Comrade Kamenev is putting a political fullstop here when we discuss the question of the possibility of building up socialism in our country. This is monstrous. And afterwards he gets up here and says: "I believe that we ought to interpret Lenin correctly". This is ridiculous.

Comrade Kamenev has obviously caught the infection to this tendency from Trotzky. Just as Trotzky dances round Lenin and

tries to present himself under the pseudonym of Lenin, Kamenev is also beginning to justify his April and October tricks with Leninist theses. I maintain that, if a full-stop is put after this bourgeois stage of our revolution, now when we are discussing the question of socialist construction in our country, it reveals a social democratic deviation. Socialdemocratic ears are peeping from behind your phraseology. (Laughter.)

THE ECONOMIC "PHILOSOPHY" OF COMRADE KAMENEV.

I will now take economics. I will not speak of that which we have already discussed so many times. Comrade Kamenev, however, has made a remarkable economic statement: "See, if your estimate is right, if the Kulak is small in our country, and this is true; if the Nep man is small in our country, which is the case; and if there is but little accumulation of private capital in our country, with what means are we then to build up socialism?" — This is literally what he said, you have all heard it. But allow me to ask what results from it. This must be investigated; a matter like this must on no account be passed over, for this is the centre-point of the whole economic platform, as I will prove.

If we presume that we can only build up socialism by fiscal extortions from the Nep man and from the Kulak, we are taking for granted such a large measure of accumulation of private capital that almost our whole village would be on capitalist lines and the same would be true, to a large extent, of our trade. This is denying the possibility of the socialist revolution in the village, this is denying Lenin's cooperative plan, this is imagining that both in the village and in the town we shall have to pass through a tremendous and highly developed phase of State capitalism. Then, be so kind as to say this — or withdraw your statement.

We are by no means basing our ideas on any fiscal theory of the construction of socialism, if we build up socialism with the help of the taxation of the Nep man and the Kulak, from whom of course we shall collect enormous sums. This is one of the elements of our accumulation, one of the channels through which we shall collect from the economic elements which are hostile to us, but it is by no means the most important. And our intentions are by no means to promote this accumulation indefinitely, to such a degree as to construct socialism out of it. When you begin to put the question in this way, fear takes possession of your soul and both social democratic ears peep out again.

All this however is connected with another question, with the question of taking the means for trade from the sphere of circulation, about which Comrade Larin spoke. How can anyone say that the private traders must be enabled to lean both their elbows on the table and afterwards shear them with taxation? Then, it is true, we shall have to forget what Lenin taught: "Learn to carry on trade". That is nothing, Lenin may have been mistaken; let us do it in this way: fleece the traders, fleece the Kulaks and then both can lean their elbows on the table." This is another way of looking at things! It is not ours; it is not that of the party and, allow me to say, it is not a communist one. (Hear! Hear!)

This is the economic completion of Comrade Kamenev's political attitude with regard to what he says as to the bourgeois democratic phase of our revolution, where he puts a full-stop and observes silence as to the question of advancing further. Is not this political attitude in connection with his economic propositions? I think it is. They do not contradict one another in the least, on the contrary, they complete one another. For, were things in such a desperate state as regards the growth of the socialist elements, had it been necessary to take our direction in accordance with a situation in which capitalism must develop, and if socialism were then built up on this development, then of course the line taken by our party would have been quite a different one and our political line would have been one that could not be described as communist.

Finally, a third remark about Comrade Kamenev's speech. This is the question as to how far the "remarkable" prophecies of the Opposition have come true. Comrade Kamenev said here without turning a hair: "The difficulties have proved to be considerably greater than we had anticipated. Things ceased to develop. We proved to be in the right." Here, Comrade Kamenev can certainly not be said to have capitulated; on the contrary, he showed great courage.

It seems to me, however, that this is a very sad kind of courage for, call to mind comrades, what was said last year by Comrade Kamenev as to what was most important with regard to economic difficulties. At that time he formulated his views as follows: The chief danger we have to fear is from the peasants making accumulation, from the Kulaks making accumulation, the Kulaks have started a strike in the production of corn in opposition to us. Did he say this? He did. Do not forget this. Let us call this Comrade Kamenev's thesis No. 1. Well then, in thesis No. 1 Comrade Kamenev says: The Kulak has taken up a stand which has proved him to be so strong that he has entered on a corn producing strike and has upset all our plans.

On the other hand we have Comrade Kamenev's thesis No. 2, which has cropped up in recent times. The Kulak has now become much more powerful, he has accumulated much greater forces, the danger with which the Kulak threatens us has become much more serious. This is the second thesis.

I ask you: Is the production of corn this year worse than it was? The result would have to be that it was worse, but it is actually better. We ask: Since the Kulak has become so formidable, why has he not played us some nasty trick? The fact of our collection of corn, the fact of the reconstruction of our Budget, the fact that we have spent more than a milliard on the industry of our country, tears the whole philosophy of economic construction, which was preached by the Opposition last year, into shreds. Nothing of it will remain, because everyone understands that it is not the restriction of the production of corn which is to blame, but the stupid policy of those who were at that time responsible for the collection of corn. (Applause.)

If we had at that time accepted the whole philosophy and had consented to use much greater pressure and to beat them with all kinds of scorpions etc., we should actually have got into difficulties this year, from which we should not have been able to escape.

I propose to read to all those present the speech of a member of the Opposition, of Comrade Andrejev, who made a report to the active functionaries of the Moscow district of Chamovniki as to why he had left the Opposition: "I left the Opposition, when the Opposition leaders said that they had met with reactionary behaviour on the part of the masses of workers, and secondly that the economic situation turned out to be not as bad as they had expected." This is what he said. When this honest worker heard such jokes being made, he said: "Aha, you speculated on that!" and he left the Opposition. Now, however, Comrade Kamenev says that everything was completely justified. Just as what Comrade Trotzky prophesied with regard to the peasantry came true, in just the same measure has this come true, that is to say — exactly the opposite has happened. And that, because the policy carried on by the party was the right one. This is the true state of affairs!

These, comrades, are the remarks which I wished to make with regard to Comrade Kamenev. I will only, as a last word, point out how Comrade Kamenev deflects the question — and I believe that in this way they are trying to wriggle out of it — he deflects the question in such a way as to say that, after all, the C. C. acted according to the views of the Opposition and that the Opposition has thus fulfilled its "historical mission". If we had spoken in such a language as now, if we had paid the wage they demanded, if we carried through industrialisation when it was necessary then everything would have turned out right.

Everyone understands what this is all about. What was the position in April when there was the dispute about the question of wages? A frightful tension of credit, a tottering Tchervonetz, a shrinking of all undertakings. There was a terrible tension and we had to get out of this difficult situation, to restrict credits etc. as we were not getting money from anywhere. When the situation became different, when, thanks to our policy, the Tchervonetz began to rise and industry began to extricate itself from its serious situation, when the situation improved along the whole front, we said: Now we can increase wages. What is there wonderful about this? Does it mean that the C. C. went over to the Opposition? Such a suggestion is ridiculous! When, however, within a certain period, we were able to allocate four times as much to industry, they came and said: Did we not say that it was possible to allocate four times as much to industry, what is there wonderful about it? They were able to give as much and they gave it. Politics are not carried on in a vacuum. They demand certain conditions, and tremendous cynicism is

necessary to be able to say that one had prophesied this at such and such a time. "At that time", you did not say exactly the same, comrades!

That which they did say about all the Thermidors etc., will be remembered, that is what you might tell the party about, it is in the consciousness of this guilt, that you might come before the party and say: forgive us, comrades, that we have sinned both against the spirit and against the letter and also against the true nature of Leninism! (Applause.)

THE DOUBLE POLICY OF COMRADE ZINOVIEV.

I should like to say only a few words with regard to Comrade Zinoviev. It seems to me that Comrade Zinoviev's speech had at the beginning the following character: it was quite possible to interpret Comrade Zinoviev as giving the slogan to Urbahns and others, who already had one foot outside the party: "Wait and see! Things are not yet so bad. We still maintain our positions! You have misunderstood us! Keep your flag flying, in the end things will not be so bad after all" etc.

This, it seems to me, was his attitude to Urbahns and others. This attitude is completely wrong. It would be impossible to speak in this way now. It would have been necessary to condemn decidedly everything which was under discussion in these groups.

Here I return for a moment to what Comrade Kamenev said. Comrade Kamenev said the same thing: "Does it mean a weakening of the will of the proletariat, if we point out defects? Do we weaken the will of the proletariat when we say a number of bitter truths? All this, however, is mere words. This is not the question. The question is what is done by this or that political group. The question will be decided by experience, and experience has already shown what is of importance. What is important is that all those who rage against Soviet Russia and against the Comintern have gathered round the opinions of the Opposition.

Who was it that rejoiced when our Opposition raised its head? Korsch and the rest of them! They said that we had degenerated. Could they support themselves on what our Opposition said? They could, because the expressions "Thermidor" and others took their origin here, from "our" Opposition! (Cries of: True!) What did they say with regard to our present policy? That we are opposing the workers. This was said by Ruth Fischer, by Maslov and also by Urbahns and others. Further, the Opposition speaks about Thermidor; Korsch and Schwarz, however, went so far as to say: "There ought to be an armed revolt against Soviet Russia." Such an attitude was actually taken.

Now that a malodorous bouquet of everything corrupt and counter revolutionary has gathered round the calumnious phrases of the Opposition, they get up here and say: We have strengthened the faith of the working class in the construction of socialism. Is not this ridiculous? Experience teaches something quite different, and it was not in vain that the bourgeoisie pressed you so passionately to its heart, dear comrades, not in vain! That is what experience has shown. And Comrade Zinoviev, who knows all this, says: Keep up your courage, things are not so bad!

Such words should not have been spoken. He ought to have said with all firmness: Do not dare to calumniate Soviet Russia! Do not dare to continue on that reactionary course which you are pursuing! Do not dare to cry that there is a Thermidor in our country! Do not dare to cry that there is degeneration amongst us. Tell me honestly: Was Trotzky wrong when he said that the State "was not quite proletarian?" Why have you not the elementary courage to get up and say that this was a mistake? Why? You are ashamed to say that you were in the wrong! That is what is the matter! Comrade Zinoviev said nothing of the kind! He chiefly spoke of how good was their position and of how well Lenin treated the Opposition in that he did not exclude them all when he only got two votes altogether at a trade union meeting. Lenin knew what he was doing; how can you exclude everyone when you have only got two votes? (Laughter.) When, however, you have all the votes in your favour and only two are against you and they are crying "Thermidor", then may I think of it. (Cries of: Very true! Applause, laughter. Stalin: Very good, Bucharin, very good. "The thing is not to speak but to stab.")

Now comrades, I must say something with regard to all these quasi-theoretical exercises of Comrade Zinoviev's — "right through the Nep" ... "fluid and smooth". Who has said something about "fluid and smooth"? This "fluid" existed in the imagination of Comrade Zinoviev who always liked to make use of distorted and wrong quotations. For instance he made use of a quotation from the "ABC of Communism" in such a way that he himself sat between two stools because the secretaries left out the part which was most dangerous to him. You can read this in the "Bolshevik", where I have written about it. This then is a fruit of the zeal of Comrade Zinoviev's secretaries. (Laughter.) And when he now gets up here and says with regard to stabilisation: "This is our platform — partial, unstable..." "the English strike has made evident..." etc., this is our platform also.

But have you not said that there is no such thing as partial stabilisation? Did that slip out too? Well then say: It slipped out, but I am wrong. But you keep silent about it. Comrade Kamenev hushes up the mistake about October, but you say nothing about stabilisation. You are using all efforts to enlighten the party with remarkably fine theories. You say that there has been a deviation which expressed itself in weakness towards even the well-off sections of the peasantry and that you fought against it furiously. I must say that a few small barriers which held up the development of the farming of the wealthy peasants, were removed at the 14th Party Conference. This was the case in the question of tenancy, of wage labour etc. Allow me to remind you: Did Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev vote for these measures or not? They did vote for them. And now Comrade Zinoviev gets up and says: "Lenin said that we must restrict the Nep." It is, however, suggested to develop it to a certain extent.

Allow me to ask, do you in any way connect that with what was done at the 14th Conference? Then you say, as you have already said with regard to a resolution at the 14th Conference, that this was a compromise resolution; we, however, have only learnt this to-day. Do you then also say with regard to the little economic barriers that this was a compromise resolution? Did we not ask you at the 14th Party Conference whether you wished to do away with the resolutions of the 14th Party Conference? You answered: No, we do not wish to. We are entirely in favour of them. Why then do you carry on an unworthy, ambiguous policy? (Cries of: "Demagogy again!")

Then you remembered the word "extension". I will only say that this word was said by Trotzky, but we struck it out of one of his articles. I personally asked Comrade Trotzky to strike it out, and this word was struck out of Comrade Trotzky's article, but it remained in that of Comrade Krupskaja. And now you want to put the blame on some young comrade, forgetting that exactly the same was put in circulation by Comrade Trotzky and Comrade Krupskaja. This is simply too dull for words! It is a matter of complete indifference what is in these papers from which Zinoviev has given quotations to-day and from which by now, soup could be made. (Laughter.) At every meeting you say exactly the same thing, is it not possible to say something new? Honoured and first-rate orators, dear comrades, do dish us up something fresh! (Applause, laughter.)

OUR REVOLUTION AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION.

Now and in conclusion a few words about the compromise and about all sorts of other things to which Comrade Zinoviev has referred. Stalin quoted a very strong formula of Engels' which is wrong in this setting; and Stalin was right when he criticised this formula. But Stalin did not in the least mean to say that Marx and Engels had not expressed themselves in other ways also. In this formula of Engels', which Stalin criticised, there is the supposition that the revolution is an act complete in itself. There is nothing surprising about this, for it was written in the forties and was an immature work. Of course the social democrats and others opposed this, but Marx has a number of other formula, for instance that the working class needs 15, 20 or 50 years of civil war and internecine battles in order to be able to transform its own nature.

What Comrade Zinoviev said: "Germany will begin, France will carry it through to an end", speaks of a great, long-drawn-out epoch. And this is quite right. Now, however, Comrade Zinoviev tries to represent our position as though we were opposing the international revolution to the revolution in our country.

This, however will deceive no one. Our revolution is an integral part of the great process of international revolution to which belong the colonial wars, the national revolutions, the proletarian insurrections, the incomplete proletarian revolutions, the victorious proletarian revolutions and all the revolutions which will ever be, for we have entered on an epoch of wars and revolutions. Our revolution is part of the international revolution and our final victory will of course be the victory of World Communism. Who would be so foolish as to dispute this?

Here we are by our nature international revolutionaries, and this question is put so pointedly that we must in theory admit that we admit an attack of a victorious revolution on the capitalist countries. Have we not said this twenty thousand times? Who doubts it? Do our practical politics prove that we take this standpoint? No, they confirm our old standpoint. No one offers more moral support to revolutionary China than we do, no one has helped the British miners more than have the trade unions of the Soviet Union; no one can deny that the communist party of the Soviet Union is, and will be a support to the World Revolution. Everyone knows this and it is ridiculous to quarrel about it! Comrade Zinoviev's attempt to oppose our revolution to the international revolution, seems to me to be a complete failure.

For us our revolution is an integral part of the general, international, revolutionary process which advances in zig-zags, which does not advance in such a way that all the columns march in one line, which even, by its very nature consists of different parts. It is enough to regard the proletarian revolutions and the national-revolutionary colonial and semi-colonial insurrections in order to become convinced that this is a great process which will extend over a vast epoch. We do not dispute this and the attempt to transfer the question of the subjects of the present dispute to the interpretation, to the repetition of the commonplace that we must be international revolutionaries, that we must carry through the slogan: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" is a complete failure, is wrong, incorrect and inadmissible.

Speech of Comrade Molotov.

Comrades! Anyone who is compelled to make such an all-embracing speech dealing with such a tremendous number of questions must certainly chose one basic question and concentrate his attention upon it. I have selected therefore the following themes: Why must the party characterise the present opposition, the present oppositional bloc as a social democratic deviation? It seems to me that we have sufficiently serious reasons for this and that these reasons are given in comrade Stalin's theses.

1. THE IDEAS OF BOLSHEVISM AND THE QUESTION OF THE HEGEMONY OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION.

Before the period of our revolution one can fix two chief stages in the development of the ideas of Bolshevism concerning the basic questions of the revolution and of revolutionary tactics. These two chief stages are in accordance with the stages of the development of our revolution. First of all, the stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution and secondly the stage of the proletarian revolution. Referring to the second question, I will make two further sub-divisions into two special periods for the sake of greater clarity, which are indissolubly bound up with one another. In this way it will be easier to concentrate attention upon the peculiarities of the present moment.

In the epoch of the first in its essence bourgeois revolution before 1905, Bolshevism and above all Lenin considered the question of the hegemony of the proletariat to be the basic question of the revolution. This question determined whether a comrade who called himself a Revolutionary, a really determined and logical revolutionary, a Marxist, a Bolshevik, or as we would now say a Leninist, was really so or merely a half-liberal, an opportunist, a Menshevist, or as we would now say, a social democrat in the present sense of the word. It was just this question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution which split the old social democratic party of Russia into two fractions, into the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. What is the revolutionary force upon which our party must rely as the leader of

There was a disagreeable incident yesterday when Comrade Trotsky said that the Conference might laugh because he had said that we must go side by side with the international proletariat. The Conference did not laugh for that reason but because Comrade Trotsky will chew the cud of this truism. Anyone must possess an enormous amount of pride, self glorification and district in the party who suspects a Party Conference of that of which Comrade Trotsky suspects it. (Applause. Lasian: "He has never known the party".)

Our dispute is as to whether our internal forces allow us to carry on the cause of socialist construction with complete certainty. We maintain that they do. We can build up socialism. Therefore we regard the line of the Nep not as a retreat, but as an attack. And when we speak of the current economic year, we are all aware of an actual, mighty growth of our forces, because this is a year of transition. In spite of the difficulties which we have in our own country, this is a year of a still more determined attack on capital. This finds expression in industrialisation, in the ousting of the private trader from retail trade, in the burden of tariffs laid on him, in the consolidation of the credit system and finally in the growing power of the socialist elements in our industry.

What is there in all this which resembles a "Thermidor"? It seems to me that the whole party is right in putting the urgent question to the comrades of the Opposition: Tell us, do you stick to your former resolution and to your former views about the "Thermidor" or do you condemn them? It seems to us quite ridiculous when Comrade Kamenev gets up and says that there are only small practical differences of opinion. (Applause.) We must now say: Answer these main questions: Do you prophesy that we shall rot to the core or do you agree with us that we are on the advance? This is the question, this is the fundamental question, and to this question we answer: We are marching forwards, we shall march forwards and shall triumph in spite of the prophecies with regard to Thermidor and in opposition to these prophecies. (Prolonged tempestuous applause. Ovation from the whole audience.)

the revolution? is it the proletariat or the liberal bourgeoisie? This is the question upon which the division into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks took place, this was the basic question of the split of that period.

He who came to the conclusion that in that period of our revolution it was necessary to propagate the idea of proletarian hegemony, he went the correct revolutionary way and came unavoidably to the practical Bolshevik conclusion that a realisation of the proletarian hegemony in the epoch of the bourgeois democratic revolution was nothing but the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. He who denied this or who vacillated, abandoned therefore the task of realising the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. And finally he who abandoned the idea of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, its unavoidable necessity, and the possibility of its realisation, inevitably went the way which rejects the basic idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in our revolution and hands over the leadership of the revolution to the bourgeoisie. This was the question in that stage of our revolution. The Bolsheviks were those Marxists, those logical revolutionaries, who approached the tasks of the proletariat in the period 1904 to 1917 as the tasks of realising the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution. The Mensheviks, on the other hand, concentrated themselves completely upon defending the hegemony of the liberal bourgeoisie in the revolution. In this basic question Comrade Trotsky was actually with the Mensheviks.

If we now consider the second period of the revolution, the period when our party put the question of the seizure of power, we meet with this same idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in a new form. The sixth party congress declared conclusively in the name of the whole party that we were approaching the solution of the questions of the new stage of the revolution, that we were immediately proceeding to the tasks of the seizure of power by the proletariat. This decision upon the immediate transition to the seizure of power was also a further stage of

the development of the idea of the proletarian hegemony in accordance with the conditions of the second half of 1917.

The whole course of the revolution showed us that only two possibilities remained for the proletariat and the toiling masses: either to follow the bourgeoisie, to follow one or the other liberal wing and in point of fact to follow the Entente and imperialism, or to follow the Bolsheviks, the advance guard of the proletariat, upon the way to socialism. Our party declared at that time that there could be no other way for the proletariat than that of insurrection against the bourgeoisie, against imperialism. The party declared conclusively that this was the only way to end the war, to obtain peace, and economic rebirth and the freedom of the people.

The party, and above all its leader Lenin, could not fail to formulate the questions: If we carry out the October insurrection, have we any hope of victory? A few weeks before the insurrection Lenin published his remarkable pamphlet: "Will the Bolsheviks maintain Power?" in which he gives a direct answer to this question. After examining the conditions in which the party found itself at that time and the way to pass the crisis, Lenin declared decisively: "... there is no power on earth which will prevent the Bolsheviks from maintaining power until the victory of the socialist world revolution, if they do not permit themselves to be intimidated and understand how to seize power..." Lenin proved not only the necessity of the proletarian and socialist revolution from the objective historical circumstances of the second half of 1917, but he raised the question whether the Bolsheviks under those conditions could maintain power and answered this question affirmatively. He therefore formulated the question of the insurrection bravely, decisively, and in a revolutionary and proletarian manner. Can one really lead an insurrection, lead the workers into a desperate struggle, without a belief in victory, without the possibility of winning?

It is characteristic that those who did not recognise the October insurrection as an unpostponable practical question, also did not admit that under those conditions the Bolsheviks could maintain power. These were the Mensheviks, the people from the "Novaya Shina" etc. But not only these. Also amongst the Bolsheviks there were those who did not believe in victory, who did not believe in the possibility of the Bolsheviks maintaining power and these comrades came unavoidably to conclusions in opposition to the October insurrection. Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev were amongst these. Kamenev and Zinoviev did not consider October 1917 to be the moment to open up a new stage of the socialist revolution because they did not admit that, of which Lenin was convinced, that is to say, the possibility that the Bolsheviks could maintain power. But at that time it was just this question which divided the Bolsheviks from the non-Bolsheviks, the proletarian revolutionaries from the bourgeoisie, including also the petty bourgeois politicians. And at the same time the decision in this question, the question of the insurrection and the victory of the proletariat under the new revolutionary conditions, meant the decision of the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in a new stage of the revolution.

As is known, in 1917 Comrade Trotzky was opposed to Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev. In the October insurrection he stood together with the Bolsheviks. Can one, however, say, that in this moment Comrade Trotzky stood completely upon the line of our party, upon the position of Lenin? Can one find in Comrade Trotzky's articles and speeches of that period one indication that he recognised as clearly as Lenin that the Bolsheviks had to proceed to insurrection and that they would win and be able to maintain power until the victory of the socialist world revolution? No, that is not to be found. Comrade Trotzky formulated his question differently. His position in the October period of 1917 was in general the following: He, like the Bolsheviks, was of the opinion that there was no other way out for the party and the working class than the insurrection and the struggle for power. Nevertheless to say of Comrade Trotzky (judging from what he said and wrote at that time) that he recognised like Lenin that the Bolsheviks could maintain power until the victory of the socialist world revolution, would be incorrect. That was the difference between Lenin and Trotzky in the October revolution. One must not forget that today, Lenin undertook the October insurrection and lead the workers with him because he knew that the October victory was possible and

not merely possible but certain "if the Bolsheviks do not permit themselves to be intimidated and understand how to seize power" — Lenin recognised therefore that, it depended upon the party, upon the Bolsheviks themselves, how this question was solved. It is another thing to make an insurrection and to regard it as an experiment which may perhaps succeed, or perhaps fail, but in the best case to hope for the immediate help of the European revolution. But to make an insurrection like an experiment without believing in its success — that borders upon a revolutionary adventurer's policy.

Let us take for instance the participation of the Left Social Revolutionaries in the October insurrection. This participation was quite elementary and to a considerable extent mixed with revolutionary adventurism. This, however, left its mark upon their whole attitude. I remember that in Smolny on the night of the 25th of October there were Left Social Revolutionaries in the Revolutionary Military Committee who justified their participation in the Revolutionary Military Committee with the most absurd reasons: We are participating in the Revolutionary Military Committee because we must defend ourselves against Kerensky; we are protecting revolutionary Petrograd from the danger of a new Kornilov dictatorship. At the same time, however, the guns were bombarding the Winter Palace and the Bolsheviks had taken the most decisive positions which determined the result of the insurrection. The Left Social Revolutionaries fell into this rather clumsy situation because they had no correct estimation of the objective force of the revolutionary events and no Marxist understanding of the revolutionary perspectives. This, however, was not the way which the Marxists, the Bolsheviks, the Leninists, that is to say our Party, went. Our course in the October Revolution was the course of the Bolsheviks who firmly believed in the triumph of the proletarian insurrection the leadership of which was completely in their hands.

Comrades! If we take the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in accordance with present day circumstances we see that it is only to be solved in connection with the perspectives for the building up of socialism. At the present time no one amongst us can deny that the building up of socialism is possible and that we are carrying it out. Nevertheless, it is not enough merely to say this. The question is: By carrying on the work of establishing socialism, do we believe in the possibility of victory, do we believe that the victory of socialism in our country is possible, or do we agree with comrades Trotzky, Kamenev and Zinoviev who say approximately the following: Yes, the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. is carrying out the work of socialist reconstruction, but whether it will triumph with its own forces we do not know. We are not convinced that the proletariat of the U. S. S. R. will maintain power with its own forces, that is to say, that it will build up socialism, and finally do not demand any theoretical or political oath from us.

However, if we had approached the October insurrection in 1917 in this spirit, it would have meant disbelief in the possibility of maintaining power and our appeal to the workers in October would have borne the stamp of political adventurism. Similarly, neither the Russian working-class nor the international proletariat can accept a policy which says that we are building up socialism but do not know whether we can complete that work or whether we can be victorious upon the basis of our own internal conditions without the direct support of the European revolution. From this it follows that he who does not believe, who is not convinced that socialism can be built up upon the basis of our internal relations of forces, he will also vacillate in practice, in this question, he will have no enthusiasm, he will be confused, have no logical policy and confuse all those whom he can. That is the logic of things. If we had approached the October insurrection without being convinced that we could hold power, then we would have been bad revolutionaries and would hardly have won. And even now we can only be victorious upon condition that we clearly understand that victory is possible (naturally assuming correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry which depend upon the policy of the party and assuming that an imperialist intervention which no longer depends upon us alone, does not prevent our victory). He who still does not believe in the victory of socialism, who does not admit the possibility of building up socialism in the U. S. S. R. without the victory of socialism in the other countries, he must, as Comrade Bucharin correctly says, in view of the delay of the international proletarian revolution, adopt the ideology of the "degeneration".

The logic of things will drive him to the conclusion that the "degeneration" of the Soviet power and of the Party in this or that form is unavoidable; he will develop involuntarily into a defeatist.

2. THE QUESTION OF THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM IN OUR COUNTRY AND THE IDEAS OF COMRADES TROTZKY, ZINOVIEV AND KAMENEV.

I put the following question: Can one remove from the agenda the question of the building up of socialism in one country as Comrade Trotzky proposed? When he said this he stressed continually that much had been said and written by him upon the socialist character of our revolution. It is possible that Comrade Trotzky at the beginning of his speech gave some comrades hopes in connection with his attitude to our work of socialist construction. He declared that the theses of Comrade Stalin chiefly quote his old articles and that he could quote this, that or the other articles dealing with the question of socialist construction. Comrade Trotzky also made numerous quotations from his speeches. Has he, however, produced one new quotation or even a phrase showing that we are not merely building up socialism in our country upon the basis of our internal possibilities, but that the possibility of building it up is there? No! He did not do that and could not do it. With a beautiful gesture he ignored this question and declared that for him it did not exist. Because Comrade Trotzky reckons that the international revolution will come, earlier than in 30 to 50 years, therefore in his opinion one cannot discuss this question. Is that so? Why then did Lenin speak of this question eleven years ago in 1915 and consider it even then to be real? At that time one could talk of socialist revolution as a perspective, but Lenin spoke already about the possibility of the victory of socialism "even in one single capitalist country". And today Comrade Trotzky finds that this question is unimportant, that the party need not make a decision upon it and that in any case it is not necessary to "demand a theoretical and political oath" from any one on the point. In actual fact this means to avoid a principle question of the revolution and to avoid giving a clear answer. Here we see a remarkable difference between Lenin and Trotzky.

Further, in passing I would like to point out that Comrade Trotzky flatters himself with quotations from his books but misuses other quotations. In particular he pointed out that the "Bolshevik" had quoted one of Lenin's articles printed in the 5th Lenin Almanach. He spoke here of the fact that the "Bolshevik" had printed a quotation from Lenin's article and left the most important phrase concerning the middle peasantry out. I am an editor of the "Bolshevik" and when I heard Comrade Trotzky say that I was astounded because I remembered distinctly to have read this quotation in full in one of the numbers of the "Bolshevik". Yesterday I compared Comrade Trotzky's statement with the quotation and what was the result? Comrade Trotzky mentioned the page containing the quotation. The quotation mentioned by Comrade Trotzky is on page 451 of Nr. 5 of the Lenin Almanac. If we take Nrs. 13 and 14 of the "Bolshevik", page 111, which contains a review of Nr. 5 of the Lenin Almanac we find the whole quotation of which Comrade Trotzky spoke. To say that the "Bolshevik" had mutilated an important quotation of Lenin is very peculiar. However, Comrade Trotzky did not mention this number of the "Bolshevik". In actual fact in Nr. 19/20 of the "Bolshevik" there is an article by a Polish comrade Kostrzeva "Concerning the Role of the Petty Bourgeoisie in the Revolution" and this article deals also with the article of Lenin in question. This article (or better the printed draft of this article published in the Lenin Almanac) deals with a very important question, that of the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. Lenin's article has six points. Comrade Kostrzeva quotes the first four points in full, the fifth point of which Comrade Trotzky has spoken, shortened and the sixth point still further shortened. Did Comrade Kostrzeva commit an error in quoting this draft of Lenin? It seems to me that Comrade Kostrzeva really committed an error by leaving out a very important part and by incorrectly shortening the last two points. May one, however, in this case say that the "Bolshevik" has mutilated important quotations of Lenin and has left out that which does not please us? To say such a thing is to misrepresent the real situation as I have mentioned it. It would have been good if Comrade Trotzky had made his representations to the "Bolshevik" in connection with the extremely interesting draft of Lenin mentioned here. Comrade Ba-

charin has already made the proposal that Comrade Trotzky should express his opinions in the press upon the permanent revolution and in particular upon the correctness or incorrectness in this question. This would have been particularly good in connection with this draft of Lenin. For this reason I entirely agree with the proposal of Comrade Bucharin.

I return now to the chief theme, the question of the victory of socialism in one country alone. If the question of the victory of socialism in one country alone can be removed from the agenda as a question of no serious significance, as is the opinion of Comrade Trotzky, what is then to be done with Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev?

The 14th party conference adopted a definite resolution for which we unanimously voted upon this question after a speech of comrade Zinoviev. This resolution of the Central Committee for which Comrade Zinoviev spoke, was unanimously adopted together with the votes of Zinoviev and Kamenev. It was unanimously adopted by the 14th party conference and ratified by the 14th party congress. We still stand completely upon the basis of this resolution. It is, however, interesting that not merely the resolution of the 13th party conference and the 13th party congress upon Trotzkyism, but also the resolution of the 14th party conference in connection with which Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev always declared, that there was no disunity, are now no longer recognised, in particular however, from Comrade Zinoviev, who himself defended the resolution at the previous party conference. This is a proof for the complete alteration of the line of Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev and shows what has happened with them since this time. Up to yesterday neither Comrade Zinoviev nor Comrade Kamenev have declared their disagreement with this resolution. Now, however, they formally oppose it.

What do they now say? They say, as we heard yesterday from Comrade Kamenev, the following: The 14th party conference declared that the victory of socialism in our country is absolutely possible if our country does not succumb to an imperialist intervention. Now, however, Comrade Kamenev considers this, so to speak, external condition, to be insufficient. He is of the opinion that for the final decision in the question of the victory of socialism, a second condition must be put; namely the guarantee of a sufficient tempo of the economic reconstruction of the U. S. S. R. By the side of the one condition, external danger, is now placed the necessity of a second condition, of internal order for the victory of socialism in our country. But why did neither Comrade Kamenev nor Comrade Zinoviev say anything about this at the 14th party conference? Why did we adopt the resolution at the 14th party conference unanimously together with their votes, according to which the only hindrance to the construction of socialism in our country, as long as the victory of the international proletariat is lacking, is a possible imperialist intervention? The reason is that in this question of principle concerning the character of our revolution, its perspectives and our tactics, Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev have abandoned their former position and gone over to Trotzkyism, against which they formerly fought. (Interruption: Quite so!)

The question of the "tempo" of our socialist construction, was raised in its essentials by Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev and also by Comrade Trotzky in the Plenary Session of the Central Committee last April. This is just why the present oppositional bloc is called the "April bloc". The question of the tempo was put by them in connection with the economic resolution which the party committee adopted at that time. Both Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev were then opposed to the resolution of Comrade Rykov upon the economic situation declaring that all the principle economic conditions, that is to say, all the objective material circumstances, for the building up of socialism in our country before the victory of the international proletarian revolution, were present, unless an imperialist intervention interferes. The 14th party conference, the 14th party congress and finally the Plenary Session of the Central Committee in April have given a clear and definite answer to the question whether our country possesses the objective conditions for the building up of socialism. In these resolutions the party declares definitely upon the basis of what Lenin has said upon this matter; "all the necessary and sufficient conditions are present" — that all objective conditions for the victory of socialism in our country are existent before the socialist victory in other countries.

3. THE OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE CONDITIONS FOR THE VICTORY OF CAPITALISM. THE SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND THE SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC DEVIATIONS IN THE C. P. OF THE U. S. S. R.

However, the victory of socialism depends not only upon the objective conditions but also upon the existence of the necessary subjective conditions, that is to say above all upon the existence of the class consciousness and the organisation of the workers, upon the capacity of the Communist Party to lead the proletariat correctly. The complement of the objective conditions with the necessary subjective conditions is necessary for the victorious construction of socialism in the present stage of our revolution. This is the essence of the question. From the existence of the objective facts as in our case, comes the extraordinary importance of the question of the capacity of the Communist Party to lead the working class correctly. Under the present circumstances this is of decisive importance and determines the further course and the real possibilities of the victory of socialism in our country. Lenin's words "Ten to twenty years of correct relations with the peasantry and the victory on a world-scale is assured", are to be understood from this point of view. From the point of view of Lenin and our party it is therefore not a question of the objective conditions, which exist in our country, but of the correct policy and before all of the correct relations between the proletariat and the peasantry, that is to say it depends upon the party itself whether it is capable of leading the proletariat on the way to the victory of socialism.

Further, Comrade Trotzky and after him Comrade Zinoviev have said that in deciding the question of building up socialism in our country, we cannot "isolate" ourselves from the international situation. But read what Lenin wrote in his article "Concerning the Co-operatives", read this article from the first to the last line. With the exception of two sentences in which he deals specially with the international situation and with our international communist duties, he examines the question and "isolates" it from international questions, concentrating his attention exclusively upon internal questions. This is the sense of Lenin's words "Everything necessary and sufficient" for the victory of socialism in our country is present, and also the following words of Lenin from his article "Concerning the Co-operatives": "We only need now this cultural revolution in order to become a completely socialist country".

The members of the opposition say: You demand that we believe in the possibility of victory, that we abandon our disbelief and lack of courage, but we need not believe as others believe and the reference to our disbelief has no political significance, for the words "disbelief" "lack of courage", etc. have no political but only a psychological significance. No, comrades, it is not so simple. This psychological characteristic mentioned by the opposition is not so absurd that one may not speak of it at the party conference as an important question. Lenin did not call the opponents of the October insurrection "pessimistic squallers" who did not believe in the victory of the proletariat, for nothing. Lenin grasped the fact that when the objective conditions for the victory of the insurrection are present, when the objective conditions for the victorious revolution of the proletariat are present, then, the belief in victory, the confidence in one's own forces, the real conviction of the correctness of one's own policy and the resultant unshakeable determination in the struggle are decisive.

This is also essentially the question at the present time when the party has spoken its decisive word upon the existence of the objective conditions for the victory of socialism in our country. One must remember that Lenin has proved, see his article against Suchanov "Concerning our Revolution", that in a certain revolutionary situation the proletariat can "first of all create the conditions for the further growth of the civilisation which is absolutely necessary for the building up of socialism, by carrying out the revolution".

Upon the basis of a scientific analysis of the course of our whole revolution and directly upon the basis of Leninism, we, (the party) declare that in the question of the victorious building up of socialism we can proceed from the existing objective conditions, but that we need in this period of intensive and protracted struggle for victory, firm hands and determined will, clear understanding and Marxist conviction that we can be victorious with a correct leadership of the working class and peasantry. I repeat that Lenin in his well-known estimation of

the objective conditions of the revolution only placed one condition for victory, namely the necessity of one or two decades of lasting correct and mutual relations between the proletariat and the peasantry. This is an internal condition the realisation of which depends upon the party, that is to say upon the subjective factor of the revolution.

Let us now treat the question of the socialist revolution on an international scale. What is at the present time at least in the most advanced capitalist countries, the relation of the objective and subjective conditions for the victory of socialism? There can be no question amongst us about the fact that in such countries as Great Britain, Germany, France and the United States the objective conditions for socialism are present but that the subjective conditions are not yet present. They are not prevailing because previously the leadership of the working masses has been in the hands of the social democracy which does not believe in the possibility of socialism. It is just the circumstance that in these countries the necessary subjective conditions were not prevailing, and that here the Communist Parties must first of all grow and consolidate, and that they have not yet completely found their feet, just this fact, this historical deficiency of a subjective nature has prevented and still prevents the victory of the proletariat in the leading capitalist countries.

If the Communist Parties in the leading capitalist countries had proved themselves capable, let us say, in the last years of the imperialist war or immediately following upon it, of leading the proletariat, would the victory of the latter in Great Britain, the United States, Germany and France have been certain or not? Every Bolshevik will answer: Yes, it would have been certain. But today also the chief hindrance for this victory is the fact that the social democracy has been able to maintain its influence upon broad masses of the working class and thus to prevent the victory of socialism in the leading capitalist countries. Comrade Trotzky says that "Purcellery" is a pseudonym, that is to say another name for capitalist stabilisation. He is completely right, however, "Purcellery" is not only to be found where there is a capitalist stabilisation, it is also expressed in the persons of those pessimists in our party who do not believe in the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country. However, that one must understand. Analogous to the role of the social democracy in the international working class movement would be in our country as the chief hindrance for the victory of the socialist revolution, the triumph of the policy which is embodied in our oppositional bloc, that is the tendency to disbelief in the possibility of victory. The party had therefore to carry on a merciless struggle against this policy of the oppositional bloc because at the present time the overcoming of this policy, the death of this ideology is a pre-condition for further progress towards the victory of socialism.

Naturally, our opposition is not the social democracy and no one says it is. However, its approach to the solution of important tasks of the working class of the U. S. S. R. express to a certain degree the spirit, tendency and policy of the social democracy. The ideology of distrust in the victory of socialism under our historical conditions is an ideology which reflects the remnants of the ideological influence of the social democracy, and for this reason our present opposition is justly called a "social democratic deviation".

4. FROM DISBELIEF IN THE VICTORY OF SOCIALISM TO THE IDEA OF THE DEGENERATION OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION.

This deviation, however, must be fought to the bitter end. For it is from the disbelief in the possibility of the victory of socialism under our present conditions that the talk of the "degeneration" of our revolution, the "degeneration" of our proletarian state issues.

Comrade Trotzky attempted to free himself from the suspicion that he has any part in contentions of this sort. However, Comrade Trotzky said at the plenary session of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee that our state is "by no means completely proletarian". He corrected himself upon this point, but his vacillation in this question was clearly visible. But such vacillations in a basic question where today one thing is said and to-morrow corrections made, such vacillations give people like Ossovsky reason to believe that our party and our state, already now try to follow, it is true a more or less "proletarian" policy, but do not follow a "purely proletarian policy",

but try to give this policy "the greatest possible maximum of proletarian character under present conditions". Thus says Ossovsky, read him.

I will only quote one of the recent documents of the opposition, which, it seems to me, is not essentially different from that which Comrade Trotzky said in the Plenary Session of the C. C. and the C. C. C. in July and which he corrected in the stenogram. It is one of those anonymous documents of the opposition which has recently been distributed in Tula and which was given to me at this conference by comrade Kabakov. Without a doubt it originated from the pen of one of the leaders of the opposition. It says: "The majority of the C. C. promote in reality the gradual diminution of the proletarian character of our state." Now compare "by no means completely proletarian state" and "the majority of the C. C. promote in reality the gradual diminution of the proletarian character of our state". In my opinion they are essentially the same. Between these two formulations there is no essential difference. And if Comrade Trotzky abandons his formulation in the stenogram which he corrected, then there is another document which says essentially the same, which expresses the same thoughts which Ossovsky expressed still more clearly.

We must have a clear and definite answer to this question of the nature of our state. Is our state and its policy, its principles, its class lines proletarian or "unproletarian", "by no means completely proletarian" or not "purely proletarian"? Above all it must be pointed out that every attempt to bring an antagonism between the state and the working class, is a thoroughly false attempt, a thoroughly negative attempt which embodies an abandonment of the basic line of the construction of the Soviet state.

Comrade Kamenev said here: Why does one always speak of the necessity of "proletarianisation"? That is true, we have spoken of this necessity and we will continue to speak of it and we will do everything in practice to carry it out. However, can we speak of a "proletarianisation" of our state as far as its policy, principles and direction are concerned? But find me a comrade who says that we must not only "proletarianise" our state apparatus, but also the policy and the class character of our state. Such a comrade would deny that the dictatorship of the proletariat exists in our country. One must not confuse the question of our state character, that is to say, the basic question of its class principles and its class direction, with the question of the state apparatus. This latter is something quite different.

Our state is a proletarian, a workers state, nevertheless, as Lenin and after him the whole party has said, our workers state is in a peasant country and in practice, that is to say in the work of its apparatus, it shows certain bureaucratic defects. Lenin has not merely said hard words in connection with the state apparatus. In his article "Concerning the Co-operatives" he says directly that our state apparatus is "good for nothing". Further than this characteristic of our state apparatus it seems to me, one cannot go. It is, however, also true, for the present time, that is to say, we must "proletarianise" the apparatus, better it and make it socialist. However, to confuse the question of the class character of our state with the question of what our state apparatus looks like in practice, means to fail to see the political line behind the question of the apparatus and thus to take up a purely mechanical standpoint, something of which Lenin more than once and with justification accused Comrade Trotzky. The capacity to confuse questions of principle with questions of the apparatus has nothing to do with Marxism. This was always one of Comrade Trotzky's failings and still is today.

It is worth while to spend a little time to discover how far the opposition has erred in its estimation of our state power, this first victorious dictatorship of the proletariat, similarly in the estimation of the leadership of this dictatorship by our party.

This can be shown most clearly of all when we compare its estimations with that which the foreign critics in the camp of Menshevism have to say about our proletarian dictatorship. In the "Socialist Messenger" it is always said that in our country there is no dictatorship of the proletariat but a dictatorship of our party.

To place the one in contradiction to the other is regarded by every Menshevik as his elementary duty. Our opposition, however, has gone still farther in this question. The opposition has committed the great stupidity of declaring that in our party allegedly a "fractional dictatorship" is dominant, that the leadership of the party has been replaced by a fractional dictatorship. The opposition, however, did not stop there. In the same

document from Tula from which I have already quoted, the opposition goes so far as to declare that in our country the "dictatorship of the proletariat" has been replaced by — what do you think — the "dictatorship of the secretariat". It is simply said: "The dictatorship of the proletariat is being replaced by the dictatorship of the secretariat". No Menshevik has quite gone so far. I think that this is the very extreme of hostility to our party, of an out and out bourgeois renegade attitude to our working class power, to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. Farther than that one cannot go.

THE PARTY AND THE OPPOSITION. WHY THE OPPOSITION HAS SUFFERED SUCH A COMPLETE DEFEAT.

Now I will proceed to the question of the relation of our party to the opposition.

The struggle of the opposition against the party has, as has already been sufficiently explained, gone recently beyond all bounds. The reason for this was apparently the attitude of the opposition to the party and its central committee. Naturally, every Party deserves the central committee it has. I think that this is also the case in our party. It is interesting to see how the opposition determines its attitude to the Central Committee and how it expresses itself with regard to the "majority of the C. C." at least in this "Document from Tula", which contains a list of "questions and answers" concerning the principle differences between the opposition and the party. Concerning the "majority of the C. C." this document says:

"Question 21: What principles unite the majority of the C. C.? The majority of the C. C. characterises the opposition as a group of the most varied elements — I will not make any objection to this expression for the moment — but what is it itself? It is itself a bloc of the most varied elements. There are party elements which have completely fallen to the standpoint of the Kulaks (Kalinin, A. P. Smyrnov, Voroshilov) united with elements which have fallen to the standpoint of the trade unions, elements amongst our trade union leaders who are greatly impressed by the 'lights' of the European trade unions (Tomsy, Ugarov, Schmidt) — communists who bend their backs before the strong peasants, with communists who crawl before all sorts of Purcells and Pughs as the strongest elements in the working class movement, further the party bureaucracy who do not see further than the end of their noses, who prefer the apparatus to the party and who consider the important questions put by the revolution and raised by the opposition to be the talk of intellectuals."

What strange voice is that, comrades? Who has put out those "ideological feelers"? They are the "ideological feelers" of the bourgeois intellectuals. (Interruption: Hear! Hear! Applause.) And whom have they found to accuse of spinelessness in face of the Kulaks and crawling before the Purcells? Whom have they found to fling into one sack and label it "party bureaucracy"? They mention six names, the names of six absolute proletarians: Kalinin, Smyrnov, Voroshilov, Tomsy, Ugarov and Schmidt — all workers, the cream of our party. (Interruption: Quite so! The whole conference stands up and cheers the comrades mentioned.) They are all without exception, workers. Five metal workers with, if one may say so, a printer at their head — Tomsy. Each one of them can look back of not less than 20 years of irreproachable Bolshevik work, some of them have already thirty years of such work on their backs. There are comrades who have never parted company with our party for one moment. They were never merely talkers like many others. They were never to be found amongst the Mensheviks or amongst the "compromisers" of any sort. (Applause.) According to the words of the opposition it is just this group representing the best elements of the real Russian proletariat which forms the majority of the present Central Committee. I support this with pleasure, for the six comrades and others like them are really the kernel of the party and of our C. C. (Applause.) This is the estimation of the opposition concerning our party staff. But what is its relation to the party as a whole?

I will not waste much time on this point. The facts, which we all know, the circumstances under which the leaders of the opposition were received in our workers nuclei, are sufficient.

This reception which the workers nuclei gave to these leaders is extremely instructive and is actually an extraordinarily important event in the history of our party. I must here make a slight digression and deal with another fact. In reply to the invitation of the nucleus "Aviopribor" on the fateful October 1st, Comrade Bucharin and myself wanted to go to this nucleus where almost all the members of the opposition were assembled: Trotzky, Zinoviev, Piatakov, Smilga, Saponov and Radek. We considered our intention a while and then decided not to go because we were convinced that the party masses and the local leadership would resist the overheated leaders of the opposition sufficiently well. We relied in this instance upon the growth of our internal party democracy. We came to the conclusion that this internal party democracy must be of some use. And we were not disappointed. Now it even seems to me it can soon happen that the dissatisfaction with the development of the internal party democracy is more on the side of those who have previously paraded in the role of leaders of the opposition. The party democracy has taught even these comrades something in the last few weeks. One only needs to ask which form of internal party democracy they like better, that in the "Aviopribor" or that in the "Red. Putilov Works" (Laughter). I believe that Comrade Zinoviev as a Leningrad local patriot would nevertheless prefer that of the Putilov works, Comrade Trotzky on the other hand would certainly prefer that of the "Aviopribor" (Laughter).

Our oppositional comrades now talk sometimes like this: When we spoke we only expressed our "fears" for the fate of the revolution and the party, we only pointed out the "difficulties". One cannot blame us for that. Comrades of the opposition, you certainly have pointed out the "difficulties", you have certainly expressed your "fears", and have reckoned so much with the "difficulties" that not every social democrat could keep up with you. That is, however, the question, for the social democracy must also think out dozens and hundreds of difficulties responsible for the postponement of every revolutionary struggle and for every spoke they put in the wheel of the proletariat. And all this despite the existence of objective conditions favourable to the victory of the workers, in order to justify their own rejection of the revolutionary insurrection and their own objection to a revolutionary struggle in general. The social democrats in the West differ from the communists by the fact that the former reckon with such a tremendous number of "difficulties" in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, they have so many "fears" for the possibility of a defeat of an insurrection of the working class that these "difficulties" and "fears" finally force them against the revolution and against the working class and make them in reality the crawling slaves of capitalism. This social democratic spirit is very dangerous for our party, and when this "spirit" gets into our party, the result is a "social democratic deviation" which the party must resist seriously and mercilessly. The name itself "social democratic deviation" which the oppositional bloc which has completely gone over to Trotzkyism, has justly earned, will become the sign of an ideological struggle with foreign influence in the ranks of our party.

Comrade Zinoviev expressed the hope that after the fractional attempt of the opposition and the reception it received on the part of the party membership, the party might get down to work by permitting the opposition the right to defend its opinions within the limits of the party statutes. But he hinted fairly clearly that oppositions had existed in the party before, for instance, the "Opposition of the Left Wing Communists" in 1918 which even had its own newspaper and he suggested that they were also only human. The party had tolerated them and everything had ended well. Comrade Zinoviev has, however, not grasped the fact that today is a very different period. Between 1918 and 1926 there is a very great difference.

They say to us: In 1918 the opposition had its own paper; but at that time the Mensheviks and the social revolutionaries also had their papers. Even the Cadets had their paper. Something is not in order. Is it not to be seen? For some it is probably not to be seen, for others, however, it is very obvious. In connection with the freedom of propaganda in our party we have a still later example than 1918. It is worth while for Comrade Zinoviev to remember 1921 when Lenin submitted a rather energetic resolution at the 10th congress with regard to the anarcho-syndicalist opinions of Shlapnikov, Medvedyev and others. In 1921 Lenin proposed not merely to give them no newspaper, but proposed the adoption of the following: The

approval of the propaganda of these ideas (the expression of a syndicalist and anarchist deviation) is irreconcilable with membership of the C.P. of the U.S.S.R. That has happened to "certain ideas" not to speak of "own" newspapers. The party has the right to say: If you want to be a Bolshevik, then be a Bolshevik, try to remember what a revolutionary, a proletarian fighter, a Leninist looks like, that is to say, the propaganda of ideas hostile to Leninism is irreconcilable with membership in the party. Lenin has taught us this and naturally if the opposition chooses the wrong way and pursues its social democratic deviation, it will end in an irreconcilable struggle with the party. The party cannot reconcile itself with the development of a social democratic deviation because under these circumstances the party cannot be built up, cannot develop itself. The party must call a halt here.

The latest events and the fact that the rejection of the fractional work of the opposition on the part of the party was carried out with extreme comradeship, are of quite exclusive significance. Why has the opposition suffered such a complete defeat? The leaders of the opposition must think more seriously about this.

The fact is really that the party which has fought since 1923 against Trotzkyism, which was and is a remnant of the social democracy within our own ranks; has grown to such an extent that it has now practically overcome this deviation. The comrades — who were recently leaders — who still cling to their leaning towards this opposition, are in a very absurd situation, making claims upon the leadership of the party with these ideas that the party has already rejected.

Once the party had become clear upon its relations to Trotzkyism, once it had digested the anti-Leninist nature of Trotzkyism, during the course of years, and once it had taken the decisive steps beyond it, all attempts to resuscitate this outworn social democratic deviation in our party were bound to meet with a fiasco. Under these conditions any one who attempts to defend an ideology rejected by the party, who attempts to march backwards and take the party with him, must inevitably get into an absurd situation, because despite all attempts to draw the party back, it will go further and further forward on the certain way to victory. Comrade Larin is right. The revolution and above all the party, grows beyond a certain section of its leaders. The party is proceeding securely to the victory of socialism. It must overcome every attempt to resuscitate Trotzkyism, this social democratic deviation in our party.

Concerning the Perspectives. Concerning the international Socialist Revolution and our international Duties.

A few words concerning the perspectives.

An examination of the facts of revolutionary development, of the internal objective preliminary conditions and subjective factors of our revolution leads us to the conclusion that the working class of the U.S.S.R. supporting itself upon these objective and subjective possibilities, can and must be victorious, in building and attaining socialism. That does not mean that we have already completely learnt the significance of the proletarian revolution in other countries for our victory. Comrade Trotzky here expressed the hope that the international revolution would come before thirty or fifty years. There can be no quarrel amongst us upon this point. However, the declaration of Comrade Trotzky at this party conference: "You reckon obviously with the prospect that the European proletariat will not seize power within the next thirty years" can only be characterised as an unheard-of slander upon the party. The party has not the faintest ground to doubt that we shall not have to wait three or more decades for the international revolution.

That, however, by no means means that we must get rid of the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country alone, as far as an imperialist intervention does not prevent it, like an objectionable fly. We have always declared and repeat once again that the final victory of socialism is only possible on an international scale and that only then the dangers of an international nature, that is to say the external dangers for the socialist revolution in one country, will disappear. If we manage to obtain clarity in principle upon our attitude to the question of the building up of socialism in one (in our) country, this has, as is clear from all, that has already been said, not only very great theoretical importance, but also the greatest practical importance. We can only advance with a firm tread towards the victory of socialism if we are convinced that the possibility of victory is present, if we believe in victory.

On the other hand (if one considers that the U. S. S. R. is economically surrounded by more highly developed states, that communism is growing in all capitalist countries, that the building up of socialism in the U. S. S. R. is a powerful effective factor for the advancement of the proletarian revolution in other countries and that with each new success the victorious proletariat of the U. S. S. R. will help more directly than ever) it is quite possible that in practice the victory of socialism in one (in our) country alone will coincide with the international victory of socialism and in any case will inevitably draw the victory of socialism on an international scale behind it, that is to say that also in case of a delay of the socialist revolution in other countries, the victory of socialism in one (in our) country under the historical conditions of contemporary imperialism turns into final victory, that is into a victory which not merely abolishes the internal but also the international hindrances in the way of an all round socialist development and thus itself leads to the victory of communism.

We are now coming to complete clarity in the fundamental principles relating to the possibility of the building up and the victory of socialism upon the basis of the given objective circumstances existing in our country. As far as we can, we will consider this question (at least methodologically) apart from the international situation. It is possible that that which the party said at the 14th party conference concerning the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country and which it ratified at the last party congress, has completely entered into the consciousness of our members. That will mean at the same time that the party will completely realise that the cause of the victory of socialism in our country is indissolubly bound up in historical perspective with the victory of socialism on an international scale. From this fact result all the international duties of which Lenin and the whole party have always spoken as of the unchangeable duties of every Communist Party, every victorious proletarian republic.

That we in actual fact follow this line, that in actual fact our whole internal work for the building up of socialism links up

the struggle for the victory of socialism with the interests of the international proletarian revolution, is proved by the undeniable facts that we connect our whole work, the whole party, the working class of our country, ideologically and practically in a revolutionary manner with the chief columns of the proletarian revolution (Great Britain and China) in which, as comrade Bucharin correctly says the chief line of the advance of the international proletarian revolution is proceeding at the moment. The U. S. S. R., the fighting working class of Great Britain and the developing revolution in China, these are the three chief directions of the proletarian revolution. And our party and our working class in its whole struggle, in its whole socialist work, is more than ever inseparably bound with all the chief directions of revolutionary development. The policy of our party is and remains the policy of the victory of socialism in our country and at the same time the policy of the final victory of socialism upon an international scale.

The workers of all countries know that we are not bad internationalists, that we, the Bolsheviki, connect our whole work with the interests of the international workers' revolution. We have not for nothing defined and internationalised the name of our oppositional deviation at the present time. We have called it "social democratic deviation" with complete justification and are giving its political character the necessary clarity in an international sense (Amusement). This internationalisation is also necessary from the standpoint of the interests of the international proletarian revolution (Interruption: Hear! Hear!) because our opposition attempts to find allies on an international scale. We have given the opposition the clear name that it has earned and say to the whole Communist International: There is a social democratic deviation in our party, we are fighting against it and appeal to all communists to take up the struggle against it wherever it may show itself. One can therefore not doubt that our party and at the present moment its representative, the 15th party conference, will be as unanimous in this question, as one man. (Protracted and stormy applause.)

Concluding Speech of Comrade Stalin on the Discussion on the Opposition Bloc and the Inner Party Situation.

I. CONCERNING A FEW GENERAL QUESTIONS. MARXISM IS NO DOGMA BUT A GUIDE TO ACTION.

Comrades! In my speech I said that Marxism is no dogma but a guide to action, that the well-known formulation of Engels, made by him in the forties of the last century, was correct in his time, but today it is no longer sufficient. I have said that it was therefore complemented by the formulation of Lenin according to which, under the new conditions of the development of capitalism and the class struggle, the victory of socialism in individual countries is completely possible and even probable.

Objections have been made to this during the course of the discussion. Comrade Zinoviev has been particularly zealous in this respect. I am therefore compelled to raise these questions once again and to deal with them in more detail.

I believe that Comrade Zinoviev has not read "The Fundamental Principles of Communism" by Engels and if he had read it then he has not understood it. Otherwise he would not have denied the fact that the social democrats in their struggle against Leninism, cling to the old formula of Engels. Otherwise Comrade Zinoviev would have grasped that when one follows the tracks of the social democracy, one meets with certain dangers of "degeneration".

Engels said the following in his "The Fundamental Principles of Communism" which deals with these fundamental principles in the form of questions and answers:

Question: Will the abolition of private property be possible at one blow?

Answer: No, just as the already existing productive forces will not permit themselves to be multiplied sufficiently in order to create the socialist commonwealth. The proletarian revolution which is in all probability approaching, will therefore only gradually transform existing society and only then be able to abolish private property when the necessary means of production have been created.

Question: Through what development will this revolution go?

Answer: It will above all create a democratic state form and with this directly or indirectly the political rule of the proletariat."

It is apparently here a question of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. You know, comrades that this point has already been reached in our country and already passed. (Interruption: Quite so!) And then:

"Democracy would be absolutely useless for the proletariat if it were not immediately used as a means to secure further measures directly attacking private property and guaranteeing the existence of the proletariat. The most important of these measures which already show themselves as the necessary consequences of the existing circumstances are the following:

1. Limitation of private property through progressive taxation, heavy death duties, the abolition of inheritance of relations not in the direct line, as for instance brothers, nephews, etc., compulsory loans."

You know that these measures were put into practice and are still in force in our country. Indeed, we have gone much farther. Further:

"2. Gradual expropriation of landowners, factory owners, railway owners and ship owners, partly through the competition of the state industry and partly through compensation by assignats."

You know that we carried out these measures in our country in the first years of our revolution. Further:

"3. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels against the majority of the people."

You know that we have already confiscated so much in this direction that there is nothing more to confiscate. (Laughter!) Further:

"4. The organisation of the proletariat to work upon the national farms, and in the national factories, etc. thus abolishing the competition amongst the workers and forcing those factory owners who still exist to pay the increased wages paid by the state."

It is known that we went this way, and that we had a number of successes. This point is essentially carried out in our country. Further:

"5. Similar compulsory labour for all members of society up to the complete abolition of private property. The formation of industrial armies particularly for agriculture."

You know that during the period of war communism we attempted to do this in the form of the organisation of labour armies.

We did not however, achieve very great results in this direction. We then set ourselves to reach this aim in a round about way and there is no doubt that we have achieved very considerably success in this direction. Further:

"6. The centralisation of the credit and currency system in the hands of the state through a national bank with state capital. The suppression of all private banks and bankers."

As you are aware, comrades, this has been done in its essential in our country. Further:

"7. An increase of the number of national factories, workshops, railways and ships. The tilling of all land and the betterment of all previously tilled land in the same proportion to the increase of the capital and labour at the disposal of the nation."

You know that this is also being done here and that it is developing, both through the nationalisation of the land and the nationalisation of the chief branches of industry.

"8. The education of all children from the moment when they are able to do without the first maternal attentions. This is to be done in national institutions at national cost."

This is also being done here although it has not yet been fully carried out in consequence of the devastations caused by the war and the interventions which prevented us from educating all children at the expense of the state. Further:

"9. The building of great palaces upon the national farms as community houses for communities of citizens working both in industry and agriculture and uniting the advantages of town and country life without the on-sidedness and disadvantages of one or the other of these forms!"

Here it was apparently a question of the housing question on a large scale. You know that we are making progress in this direction and although essentially this has not been carried out here and will not so soon be carried out, this is caused by the fact that we inherited a paralysed industry and have not yet had time to accumulate sufficient means for housing schemes on a large scale.

"10. The destruction of all unhealthy and badly built houses and districts."

This point is a part of the previous point and therefore what was said concerning point nine is also valid here. Further:

"11. Equal right of inheritance for illegitimate with legitimate children."

It seems to me that this matter is satisfactorily solved in our country. And finally the last point:

"12. The concentration of all transport in the hands of the nation."

You know that this has already been completely carried out in our country.

That, comrades, is the programme of the proletarian revolution set up by Engels in his "The Fundamental Principles of Communism".

You see that nine tenth of this programme has already been carried out by our revolution. Further:

"Question: Will this revolution (which was mentioned above, J. St.) be able to take place in one single country alone?"

Answer: No, industry by creating the world market has brought all the peoples of the earth and particularly the civilised peoples into such relations with each other that each separate nation is dependent upon what is done by the others. Further, it has made social development in all civilised countries in so far equal that in all these countries the bourgeoisie and the proletariat have become the two decisive social classes, and the struggle between these two has become the chief struggle of the time. The communist revolution will therefore not be simply a national revolution, but it will take place in all civilised countries, that is to say at least in Great Britain, America, France and Germany, at the same time."

That is the situation, comrades. Engels said that the proletarian revolution with the above programme could not succeed in one single country alone. The facts, however, show that under the new conditions of imperialism, such a revolution in its most essential parts has already been carried through in one single country alone, for we have carried out nine tenth of this programme in our country.

Comrade Zinoviev may say that we have committed a mistake by carrying out the points of this programme (Laughter). It is very easily possible that in carrying out these points we have shown a certain "national limitedness" (Laughter). That is very easily possible. One thing is nevertheless true; that which Engels wrote in the forties of the last century under the conditions of pre-monopolistic capitalism and which was impossible for one country alone has become possible under the conditions of imperialism in our own country.

Naturally, if Engels were alive today, he would not cling to the old formula. On the contrary, he would welcome our revolution and say: To hell with all old formulas! Long live the victorious revolution in the Soviet Union! The gentlemen in the ranks of the social democracy, however, do not think like that. They cling to the old formulation of Engels in order to facilitate their struggle against the revolution, against the Bolsheviks. That is naturally their affair. It is only serious when Comrade Zinoviev attempts to imitate these gentlemen and in this matter to go the way of the social democracy.

When I quoted the formula of Engels and dealt with it in detail, I did so from three considerations: First of all I wished to obtain the greatest possible clarity in this question by comparing the formula of Lenin upon the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone, with the formula of Engels which in that period represented the standpoint of Marxism in its most extreme and sharpest form. Secondly, I wish in this way to expose the reformism and hostility of the social democracy to the revolution which attempts to cover its opportunism with the old formula of Engels. Thirdly, I wished to prove that Lenin was the first who solved this question of the victory of socialism in one country alone.

One must recognise, comrades, that it was Lenin and no other who first of all established the proof of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone. One may not deny Lenin that which is due to him. One must not be afraid of the truth, one must have the courage to speak the truth, one must have the courage to declare that Lenin was the first Marxist who formulated the question of the victory of socialism in one country alone in a new form and answered it in the affirmative.

I do not wish with this to say that Lenin as a thinker stood higher than Marx or Engels. I only wish to say two things: First of all one must not demand of Marx and Engels although they were tremendous thinkers and geniuses, that in the period of pre-monopolistic capital they could foresee all the possibilities of the proletarian class struggle and the proletarian revolution which developed half a century later in the period of developed monopolistic capitalism. Secondly, there is nothing particularly wonderful in the fact that Lenin, himself a genius and a follower of Engels and Marx, should have understood the new possibilities of the proletarian revolution under the new conditions of capitalist development and thus establish the truth that the victory of socialism in one country alone is possible.

One must understand to distinguish between the letter and the spirit of Marxism, between the individual sentences and the methods of Marxism. Lenin was successful in establishing the truth that the victory of socialism in one country alone was possible, because he did not regard Marxism as a dogma, but as a guide to action. He was no slave of the letter and understood how to grasp the spirit, the chief significance of Marxism. In his "Left-Wing Communism" Lenin writes the following upon this point:

"Our theory is no dogma, but a guide to action, said Marx and Engels. The greatest error, the greatest crime of such 'patented Marxists' like Karl Kautsky and Otto Bauer is that they have not grasped and not understood how to apply this truth in the most important moments of the proletarian revolution."

That is the way of Marx, Engels and Lenin, that is the way we must go in the future if we wish to be consistent revolutionaries. Leninism has maintained itself as the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and the proletarian revolution because it has gone and is still going this way. To deviate from this way means to sink into the bog of opportunism. To abandon this way means to be dragged into the wake of the social democracy, as this has happened in this question with comrade Zinoviev.

Comrade Zinoviev said here that Marx and Engels had later modified the old formula of Engels and admitted the possibility that the proletarian revolution could begin in individual countries. He quoted Engels according to whom the French will begin and the Germans finish. That is correct, every student in our party courses knows that. But that is not the question of the moment, Comrade Zinoviev, It is quite a definite thing to say: Commence the revolution, in the immediate future the victorious revolution in other countries will support you and then in case of victory in the other countries you yourself can reckon on victory. It is quite another thing, however, to say: Commence the revolution and carry on in the consciousness that even although in the immediate future the revolution in other countries does not win, the conditions of the struggle are nevertheless such that in the period of developed imperialism you can win in order to cause the revolution in other countries.

That is quite a different matter. When I quoted the old formula of Engels, I did not do this in order to pass over the fact that later on Engels and Marx modified this sharp and extreme formula, but in order to create complete clarity in this question by comparing the two opposed formulas, and further, to expose the opportunism of the social democracy which is attempting to use the old formula of Engels as a cover, and finally to prove that Lenin was the first who formulated the question of the victory of socialism in one country in a new manner and answered it in the affirmative.

As you see, comrades, I was right when I said that Zinoviev had not read "The Fundamental Principles of Communism" or if he had read them had not understood them, for he dealt with the old formulation of Engels in a social democratic manner and thus slipped into the road of opportunism.

A FEW REMARKS OF LENIN CONCERNING THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

I said further in my speech that we are faced with a more or less similar case in the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the circumstances of developed imperialism. I said that in the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the sense of smashing the old bourgeois state apparatus and building up the new proletarian apparatus, Marx (in the seventies of the last century) permitted an exception for England and for America where militarism and bureaucracy where then very little developed and where at that time the possibility could exist to set up the political rule of the proletariat along "peaceful lines". I said that this exception or limitation which Marx permitted for England and America was correct at that time. According to Lenin, however, this is incorrect and superfluous under the present existing conditions of developed imperialism where militarism and bureaucracy is just as much developed in Great Britain and America as in the other countries.

(Interruption of Comrade Riasanov: It has not become incorrect today, it was incorrect then! Further interruption: Don't interrupt Comrade Riasanov! Comrade Riasanov: I am not interrupting!)

Permit me, Comrades, to appeal to Marx. Marx wrote the following in his letter to Kugelmann in April 1871:

"If you look at the last chapter of my Eighteenth Brumaire you will see that I declare the next attempt of the French Revolution to be: not merely to hand over, from one set of hands to another, the bureaucratic and military machinery — as has occurred hitherto — but to shatter it; and it is that is the preliminary condition of any real people's revolution on the Continent (underlined by me J. St.) It is exactly this that constitutes the attempt of our heroic Parisian comrades".

This was written by Marx in 1871.

As is known, the social democrats of all shades have clung to this quotation, above all Kautsky who contended that a violent revolution of the proletariat was not absolutely necessarily a method of the movement towards socialism, that the dictatorship of the proletariat was not necessarily to be understood as a breaking of the old bourgeois state apparatus and the building up of a new proletarian apparatus and that the proletariat must fight for the peaceful way of transition from capitalism to socialism.

What has Lenin to say to this? Lenin wrote the following in his book "State and Revolution":

"It is interesting particularly to notice two points in the passage quoted by Marx. First he confines his conclusions to the Continent. This was natural in 1871, when England was still the pattern of a purely capitalist country, without a military machine and, in large measure, without a bureaucracy. Hence Marx excluded England where a revolution, even a people's revolution, could be imagined, and was then possible, without the preliminary condition of the destruction of the "available ready machinery of the State".

Today in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, this distinction of Marx becomes unreal and England and America, the greatest and last representatives of Anglo-Saxon "liberty" in the sense of the absence of militarism and bureaucracy, have today completely rolled down into the dirty, bloody morass of military-bureaucratic institutions common to all Europe, subordinating all else to themselves, crushing all else under themselves. Today, both in England and in America, the "preliminary condition of any real people's revolution" is the break-up, the shattering of the "available ready machinery of the State", perfected in those countries between 1914 and 1917 to the "European" general imperialist standard".

You see that we have here a case which is more or less similar to the one of which I have spoken in connection with the old formula of Engels.

The exception permitted by Marx to England and America was based on the fact that at that time there was no developed militarism and bureaucracy in these countries. This limitation was in the opinion of Lenin no more valid under the new conditions of monopolistic capitalism, when militarism and bureaucracy in England and America was not less, perhaps even further developed than in the countries of the European continent.

For this reason the violent revolution of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the proletariat is an unavoidable and absolutely necessary preliminary condition for the advance towards socialism in all imperialist countries without exception.

The opportunists of all countries therefore, who still cling to the limitation imposed by Marx and who oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat, are not defending Marxism but their own opportunism.

Lenin came to this conclusion because he was capable of distinguishing between the letter and the spirit of Marxism, because he did not regard Marxism as a dogma, but as a guide to action.

It would be strange to demand from Marx that he should foresee all possibilities of the development of capitalism and the class struggle for many decades ahead. But it would be still more strange to wonder why Lenin was able to recognise these possibilities under the new conditions of capitalist development when these possibilities had shown themselves and developed to a more than sufficient degree.

An interruption was made, I believe, by Comrade Riasanov, that the exception made by Marx for England and America was not merely incorrect for the present stage of the class struggle.

but that it was also incorrect when Marx wrote it. I am not in agreement with Comrade Riasanov. I am of the opinion that he is mistaken. Lenin, in any case, does not agree with him. Lenin declares quite definitely that Marx was correct when he permitted an exception for England and America in the seventies. In this connection Lenin writes in his pamphlet "Concerning the Taxes in Kind":

"When we quarreled with Comrade Bucharin in the All Russian Executive Committee he remarked amongst other things: In the question of the high pay for bourgeois specialists 'we' stand 'further right than Lenin' because we see here no abandonment of principles. We think of the words of Marx that under certain conditions it would be more practical for the working class to 'purchase its freedom' from these bandits', (namely the bandits of capitalists) that is to say, to buy the land, the factories and the means of production from the bourgeoisie.

"That is very interesting. Let us place ourselves in the train of thoughts of Marx.

"In England in the 'seventies of the last century it was a question of the culminating period of pre-monopolistic capitalism, it was a question of a country in which at that time militarism and bureaucracy were very little rampant and the possibilities of a 'peaceful' victory of socialism in the sense of 'buying out' of the bourgeoisie by the working class were present. And Marx said: Under certain conditions the working class by no means refuses to buy out the bourgeoisie. Marx did not bind himself and the future leaders of the socialist revolution in the question of the form and methods of the overthrow. He grasped very clearly what a tremendous number of new problems would arise in the course of the transformation, how the whole situation would be altered and how often and how very much the situation would alter during the overthrow.

"And did not certain such conditions show themselves in Soviet Russia after the seizure of power by the proletariat, after the breaking of the military resistance and the sabotage of the exploiters, conditions similar to those which might have existed in England half a century ago if at that time a peaceful transformation to socialism had taken place?

"The subordination of the capitalists to the dominance of the workers could have been secured at that time by the following circumstances:

"1. By the preponderance of the working class, the proletarians in the population, in consequence of the lack of a peasantry (in the 'seventies there were signs in England which led to the hope of an extremely quick success for socialism amongst the agricultural workers);

"2. by the excellent organisation of the proletariat in the trade unions (at that time England held the first place in this connection);

"3. by a comparatively high cultural level of the proletariat which was schooled for centuries in the development of political freedom;

"4. by the long custom of the excellently organised English capitalists — at that time they were the best organised capitalists in the world — (at the present moment the German capitalists have first place in this connection) — to settle all political and economic questions by way of compromise.

"On account of these circumstances the idea of the possibility of a peaceful subjugation of the English capitalists was able to arise amongst the working class.

"Bucharin is an excellently schooled Marxist economist. He therefore said very correctly that Marx was completely right when he pointed out to the working class the importance of retaining the organisation of large-scale production just in the interests of facilitating the transition to socialism and when he admitted the complete permissibility of the idea to pay the capitalists well, to buy them out, when under exceptional circumstances (England was such an exception) such relations develop which force the capitalists to subordinate themselves peacefully and make possible in a cultural and organised manner the transition to socialism by buying out the capitalists."

I believe that here Lenin and not Comrade Riasanov is right.

I have a very high opinion of Comrade Riasanov, but I confess that my opinion of Lenin is still higher.

CONCERNING THE UNEQUAL DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES.

I said in my speech that Lenin had discovered and established the law of the inequality of the economic and political development of capitalist countries and that Lenin, proceeding from this law, from the fact of the progress and intensification of this inequality, came to the idea of the victory of socialism in one country alone. Comrades Trotzky and Zinoviev opposed this contention. Comrade Trotzky said that this sentence of Lenin was theoretically incorrect, and Comrade Zinoviev declared together with Comrade Trotzky that the inequality of development previously, that is to say in the period of pre-monopolistic capitalism, was greater than it is today in the period of monopolistic capitalism and that the idea of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone should not be connected with the law of the unequal development of capitalist countries.

The fact that Comrade Trotzky objects to the well-known theoretical theses of Lenin concerning the law of unequal development, is nothing surprising, for this law destroys the "theory" of Comrade Trotzky concerning the permanent revolution.

Apart from this, Comrade Trotzky obviously adopts a vulgar standpoint here. He confuses the economic inequality of individual countries in the past — such an inequality did not always lead to a jerky development on the part of these countries and could not do so — with the inequality of the economic and political development in the period of imperialism in which the economic inequality between the countries is less than it was in the past, the inequality of economic and political development, however, takes on an incomparably greater extent and shows itself more sharply than previously. This inequality inevitably leads to a development by jumps. It leads to an overtaking of more advanced countries, by industrially backward countries in a more or less short space of time, and thus inevitably creates the conditions for large-scale imperialist wars and for the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone.

It is hardly necessary to prove that such a confusion of two quite different conceptions does not point to a very high "theoretical" level of Comrade Trotzky.

I can, however, not understand Comrade Zinoviev who has, nevertheless, been a Bolshevik and smelt something of Bolshevism. How can one say that the inequality of development formerly was greater than it is today under the relations of monopolistic capitalism without running the danger of falling in the bog of super-imperialism and Kautzkyism? How can one say that the idea of the victory of socialism in one country alone is not connected with the law of the inequality of development. Is it not generally known that Lenin came to this conclusion directly from the law of the inequality of development? The following words of Lenin show this, for instance:

"The inequality of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. From this follows (underlined by me. I. St.) that the victory of socialism is possible first of all in several or perhaps in one single capitalist country alone."

From what does the law of unequal development proceed? It comes from:

1. The fact that the old pre-monopolistic capitalism has grown into a monopolistic capitalism, into imperialism;

From what does the law of unequal development proceed? It comes from: a monopolistic capitalism, into imperialism;

2. the fact that the division of the world into the spheres of influence of the imperialist groups and powers has already been concluded;

3. the fact that the development of world economy is proceeding under the relations created by a fatal struggle of the imperialist groups for markets and raw material and for the extension of their old spheres of influence;

4. the fact that this development is not even, but proceeds in leaps and bounds in the form of the pushing aside of the old powers from the markets and the advance of new powers;

5. the fact that this form of development is determined by the possibility that one imperialist group can develop its technique more quickly, cheapen its goods more quickly and capture the market to the disadvantage of other imperialist groups.

6. the fact that the periodical re-division of the already divided world will therefore be absolutely necessary;

7. the fact that this re-division can only take place by violence, in the measuring of forces, in the violent testing of power of this or that imperialist group;

8. the fact that this circumstance must inevitably lead to the intensification of conflicts and tremendous wars between the imperialist groups;

9. the fact that such a situation inevitably leads to a mutual weakening of the imperialists and creates the possibility of breaking through the imperialist front in individual countries;

10. the fact that the possibility of breaking through the imperialist front in individual countries must create favourable conditions for the victory of socialism in one country alone.

What determines the intensification of the inequality and the decisive importance of the unequal development under the conditions of imperialism?

Two chief factors: First that the division of the world amongst the imperialist groups is already at an end and that there is no longer any "free" territory in the world and that the re-division of the already divided world in order to establish an economic balance, can only be attained by means of imperialist wars; secondly that an unparalleled powerful development of technique makes it possible for one imperialist group to overtake and pass other imperialist groups in the struggle for markets, for raw material sources, etc.

These conditions, however, only developed and reached their culminating point in the period of developed imperialism. It could not be otherwise because the division of the world could only be concluded in the period of imperialism and the powerful technical possibilities could only appear in the period of developed imperialism.

This explains the fact that although formerly England, from the industrial point of view, was at the head of all states, and left them approximately a century behind, later Germany was able in approximately two decades to begin to overtake England, and America needed still less time in order to overtake all the European countries.

When one considers all this, how can one possibly say that the inequality of development was formerly greater than it is now, that the idea of the victory of socialism in one country alone is not connected with the law of the unequal development of imperialism?

Is it not clear that only vulgar theoreticians could confuse the economic inequality of industrial countries in the past with the law of the irregularity of economic and political development which was particularly intensified and sharpened first of all in the period of monopolistic capitalism?

Is it not clear that only a complete ignorance of Leninism could lead Comrade Zinoviev and his friends to the more than peculiar objections against the well-known theses of Lenin which are connected with the law of the inequality of economic and political development?

COMRADE KAMENEV CLEARS THE WAY FOR COMRADE TROTZKY.

What is the essential significance of the speech of Comrade Kamenev at this conference? When we ignore one or two smaller matters and also the usual diplomacy of Comrade Kamenev, then the significance of this speech consists in the fact that he made it easy for Comrade Trotzky to defend his standpoint in the struggle against Leninism in the chief question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone.

To this end Comrade Kamenev took the "trouble" to prove that the basic article of Comrade Lenin (1915) which deals with the possibility of socialism in one country alone, allegedly did not refer to Russia, but that when Lenin spoke of such a possibility he was thinking not of Russia but of other capitalist countries. Comrade Kamenev took this doubtful "trouble" in order to clear the way for Comrade Trotzky whose "scheme" was refused by the article of Lenin written in 1915.

To put it vulgarly, Comrade Kamenev has played the role of housemaid to Comrade Trotzky by cleaning the way for him (Laughter). It is naturally a sad sight to observe the director of the Lenin Institute in the role of Housemaid to Comrade Trotzky. Not that there is anything undignified in the work of a housemaid, but because comrade Kamenev is without doubt a capable person who might very well concern himself with more qualified work. He adopted this role, however, perfectly voluntarily, as of course he was fully entitled to do, so that nothing is to be done in the matter.

How has Comrade Kamenev carried out this peculiar role? Comrade Kamenev declared in his speech that the chief theses of Lenin in his article written in 1915, the theses which have determined the whole policy of our revolution and its work of reconstruction, the theses which speak of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone, does not refer to Russia and could not refer to Russia and that when Lenin spoke of the victory of socialism in one country alone, he was not thinking of Russia but of other capitalist countries. That is unbelievable and unheard of, that sounds like a direct slander against Comrade Lenin. But Comrade Kamenev evidently does not care what the party thinks about such a falsification of Lenin. He is only concerned to clear the way for Comrade Trotzky at any price.

How has he attempted to justify this peculiar contention?

He said that two weeks after the publication of the article mentioned, Comrade Lenin published his well-known theses concerning the character of the coming revolution in which he said that the task of Marxists would be exhausted with the efforts to achieve the victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia and that Lenin, when he said this, spoke on the assumption, that the Revolution in Russia would retain its bourgeois stage and not develop into a socialist revolution. As, however, the article of Lenin upon the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone deals not with the bourgeois revolution but with the socialist revolution, it is clear that Lenin in his article could not have been thinking of Russia.

According to Kamenev it turns out that Lenin interpreted the extent of the Russian revolution just as a left bourgeois revolutionary or a reformist of the social democratic type would have done, according to whose opinions a bourgeois revolution would not develop into a socialist revolution and that between a bourgeois and a socialist revolution a long historical interval, a long pause of at least several decades must intervene whilst capitalism develops and the proletariat vegetates.

According to Kamenev it turns out that in 1915 when he wrote his article, Lenin did not think and did not conceive of directly going on to the socialist revolution after the victory of the bourgeois revolution. You will say, this is unbelievable and unheard of. Yes, this contention of Comrade Kamenev is really unbelievable and unheard of. But Kamenev does not mind about that in the least.

Permit me to mention a few documents which prove that Comrade Kamenev has vulgarly falsified the opinions of Comrade Lenin in this question.

Already in 1905, when the forces of the Russian revolution were not yet so powerful and could not be so powerful as they later became in February 1917 in consequence of the imperialist war, Lenin wrote the following:

"After the democratic revolution we must begin immediately (emphasised by me. J. St.) to proceed to the socialist revolution as far as our forces, the forces of the class conscious and organised proletariat, permit us." (Lenin, Collected Works, Russian edition, Vol. 6. Page 449-450.)

This quotation was taken from an article written by Lenin in September 1905.

Does Comrade Kamenev know of the existence of this article? I believe that the Director of the Lenin Institute should know of its existence. We see from this that Lenin did not regard the victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution as the end of the struggle of the proletariat, but as the first phase and as a transitional step to the socialist revolution.

Perhaps, however, Lenin altered his attitude to the character and extent of the Russian revolution later on? Let us take another document. I am thinking of an article of Lenin published in November 1915, two months after the appearance of the basic article of Comrade Lenin upon the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone. This article contains the following paragraph:

"The proletariat is fighting and will fight ruthlessly for the seizure of power, for the republic and for the confiscation of the land, that is to say for the mobilisation of the peasantry, for the absorption of its revolutionary forces, for the participation of the 'non-proletarian masses of the people' in the struggle for the freeing of bourgeois

Russia from militarist, feudalist 'imperialism' (Czarism). And the proletariat will immediately use this emancipation of bourgeois Russia from Czarism, from the power of the landowners, not in order to support the well-to-do peasants in their struggle against the land workers but to bring about the socialist revolution in alliance with the European proletariat."

As you see, Lenin wrote here as in the previous quotation, in 1905 as in 1915, from the same assumption that the bourgeois revolution in Russia would develop into a socialist revolution, that the victory of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, is the first stage of the Russian revolution which is necessary in order to proceed immediately to the second stage, to the socialist revolution.

But where are we to fit in the theses of Lenin from 1915 to which Comrade Kamenev appealed in his speech and which deal with the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia? Do not these theses contradict the idea of the development of the bourgeois revolution into a socialist revolution. No, they do not, on the contrary. The basis of these theses is just the idea of the development of the bourgeois revolution into the socialist revolution, the idea of the first stage of the Russian revolution into its second stage.

First of all Lenin by no means says in these theses that the extent of the Russian revolution and the tasks of the Marxists in Russia are exhausted with the fall of the Czar and the landowners, by the fulfilment of the tasks set by the bourgeois democratic revolution. Secondly, Lenin in these theses limited himself to characterising the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution because he regarded this revolution as the first stage and as the immediate task of the Russian Marxists. Thirdly, Lenin proceeds from the assumption that the Russian Marxists must not commence their task with the second stage (as comrade Trotzky proposed with his slogan "down with the Czar, form a workers government") but with the first stage, with the stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution.

Is there any contradiction here? Is even the shadow of a contradiction with the idea of the development of the bourgeois revolution into the socialist revolution here? The opposite is the case.

We see that Comrade Kamenev has definitely falsified the standpoint of Lenin.

But we have not only documents, written by Lenin to support us against Comrade Kamenev, but also the evidence of living people, for instance Comrade Trotzky, our 14th party conference and finally, although this may seem peculiar, the evidence of Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev themselves.

It is known that the article of Lenin on the possibility of the victory of Socialism in one country, was published in 1915. It is known that at that time Comrade Trotzky immediately polemised against Comrade Lenin in this question, that is to say in 1915 he published a special critical answer to this article. What did Comrade Trotzky write in this article? How did he estimate the article of Comrade Lenin? Did he take up the attitude that when Lenin spoke of the victory of Socialism in one country he was not thinking of Russia? Or did he understand it in another way, say, as we understand the article today? I will read a quotation from this article of Comrade Trotzky:

"The only half-way concrete historical consideration formulated against the slogan of the United States was published in the Swiss 'Social Democrat', (the central organ of the Bolsheviki at that time which published the article of Lenin mentioned. I. S.) This was done in the following sentence: 'The inequality of economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism'. From this the 'Social Democrat' has drawn the conclusion that the victory of Socialism in one country alone is possible, and that therefore there exist no reasons to make the dictatorship of the proletariat in each individual country depend upon the formation of the United States of Europe.... It is an elementary idea that no single country in its struggle may 'wait' on the others. The repetition of this is useful and necessary in order to prevent the idea of parallel international action being replaced by the idea of procrastinating international inaction. Without waiting for other countries, we must begin and continue our struggle upon a national basis with complete confidence that our initiative will assist the struggle in other countries. Should this, however, not be the case, then it would be hopeless to think, and this

is proved both by historical experience and by theoretical considerations, that for instance, a revolutionary Russia could exist in face of a conservative Europe, or a socialist Germany isolated in a capitalist world."

It turns out that at that time Comrade Trotzky did not understand the article of Lenin as today Comrade Kamenev is trying to understand it, but he understood it as Lenin meant it to be understood, as the Party understands it and as we understand it. Otherwise Comrade Trotzky in his polemic with Lenin would never have used the argument with regard to Russia.

It turns out that in this quotation Comrade Trotzky gives evidence against his present ally, Comrade Kamenev.

But why did he not oppose Comrade Kamenev in this question at our Conference? Why did not Comrade Trotzky openly and honestly declare that Comrade Kamenev had obviously distorted? Does Comrade Trotzky think that his silence in this connection can be termed an example of honest polemics? Comrade Trotzky did not attack Comrade Kamenev because, apparently, he did not wish to interfere in the doubtful matter of a direct slander of Lenin, — he left this doubtful work to be done by Comrade Kamenev.

How does the Party consider this matter, however? For instance, its 14th party conference? The resolution of the 14th party conference, for instance, which deals with the question of the victory of Socialism in one country alone, says:

"From the 'inequality of economic and political development which represents an absolute law of capitalism' Comrade Lenin rightly drew two conclusions: a) The possibility of 'the victory of Socialism first of all in several capitalist countries or even in one single capitalist country' and b) the possibility that these few countries or even that this one country would not necessarily be countries or a country of developed capitalism. (Compare in particular with the Remarks concerning Suchanov). The experience of the Russian revolution has proved that such a victory first of all in one country alone is not merely possible but that, assuming a number of favourable circumstances, this first country of the victorious proletarian revolution (assuming that it received a certain amount of support from the international proletariat) can maintain and consolidate its position indefinitely even although the support which it received does not take the form of direct proletarian revolutions in other countries."

It turns out that the whole Party represented by its 14th conference, is against Comrade Kamenev and his contention that Lenin, in his article upon the victory of Socialism in one country alone, was not thinking of Russia. Otherwise the conference would not have said that the correctness of Lenin's articles upon the victory of Socialism in one country alone was proved by the experience of the Russian revolution.

It turns out that the 14th party conference understood the article of Comrade Lenin like Lenin meant it to be understood, like Trotzky understood it and like we all understand it.

What was the attitude, however, of Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev to this resolution of the 14th party conference? Is it not a fact that the draft of this resolution was drawn up by a commission amongst whose members were Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev, and that this draft was unanimously adopted by the commission? Is it not a fact that Comrade Kamenev was the chairman of the 14th party conference which unanimously adopted the resolution mentioned, and that Comrade Zinoviev made the chief speech in favour of this resolution? How did it come that Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev voted for this resolution, voted for all the points of this resolution? Is it not clear that at that time Comrade Kamenev understood the article of Lenin, a quotation of which appeared in the resolution of the 14th party conference, differently from his 'understanding' today? Which Kamenev should we believe: that Kamenev who as chairman of the 14th party conference voted for the resolution or that Kamenev who now, at the 15th party conference, comes forward in the role of housemaid to Comrade Trotzky? It turns out that Comrade Kamenev of the 14th party conference gives evidence against Comrade Kamenev of the 15th party conference.

And why is Comrade Zinoviev silent? Why does he not attempt to correct Comrade Kamenev who has obviously falsified both Lenin's 1915 article and the resolution of the 14th party conference? Is it not a fact that Comrade Zinoviev and no other but he defended the idea of the victory of Socialism in one country alone at the 14th party conference?

It turns out that everything is not in order with Comrade Zinoviev in this matter. Where is the honest polemic here?

It turns out that Comrades Kamenev and Zinoviev are no longer concerned with honest polemics.

And the conclusion? The conclusion is that Comrade Kamenev was not able to carry out the role of housemaid to Comrade Trotzky. He has not fulfilled the hopes of Comrade Trotzky.

UNBELIEVABLE CONFUSION OR: COMRADE ZINOVIEV UPON REVOLUTION AND IMPERIALISM.

I will now proceed to deal with the speech of Comrade Zinoviev. Whilst Comrade Kamenev in his speech did everything possible to clear the way for Comrade Zinoviev, Comrade Zinoviev undertook the task of proving that the leaders of the Opposition are almost the only revolutionaries and the only internationalists in the whole world.

Let us have a look at these "arguments". He joins issue with the words of Comrade Bucharin that in considering internal questions (the building up of socialism) we must proceed methodologically, independently of external questions; he then connects this sentence of Comrade Bucharin with the theses upon the oppositional bloc which speak of the possibility of socialism in our country, and he then comes to the conclusion that Bucharin and the Central Committee which ratified these theses in their essentials, through this ratification allegedly forgot the international tasks of our revolution and the interests of the international revolution itself.

Is that correct? No, it is nonsense, comrades. The secret is that Comrade Zinoviev is very weak in questions of methodology and represents his own confusion as reality. Bucharin does not by any means say that the internal questions are not related to the external questions, to the international questions, to the question of a guarantee against intervention in our country. He only says that one must not mix up the questions of the first order with the questions of the second. That is a fundamental and elementary methodological demand. Who is responsible if Comrade Zinoviev does not grasp elementary questions of methodology?

We proceed from the fact that our country shows two groups of contradictions: Contradictions of an internal, and contradictions of an external character. The contradictions of an internal character consist chiefly in the struggle between the socialist and capitalist elements of our economy for the leadership of the peasantry. We say that we shall be able to overcome these contradictions with our own forces, to defeat the capitalist elements of our economy, to draw the chief masses of the peasantry to a participation in the work for the building up of socialism, and finally to build up the socialist society itself. The contradictions of an external nature consist in the struggle between the country of Bolshevism and its capitalist environment. We say that we are not able to overcome these contradictions with our own forces. The victory of socialism at least in several other countries is necessary for this. Just for this reason we say that the victory of Socialism in one country is not an aim in itself, but a spur, a means, an instrument towards the victory of the proletarian revolution in all countries.

Is that correct? Let Comrade Zinoviev prove that it is incorrect. The misfortune of Comrade Zinoviev consists in the fact that he cannot see the difference between these two groups of contradictions, that he confuses them terribly and represents his own confusion as 'true' internationalism in the opinion that if one deals methodologically with the questions of one sort apart from the questions of the other sort, then one thereby forgets the interests of the international revolution.

That is very amusing, but it is understandable that it is not convincing.

With regard to the theses which allegedly ignore the international implication of our revolution, one only needs to read these theses in order to understand that once again Comrade Zinoviev has created confusion. The theses contain the following paragraph:

"The Party proceeds from the fact that our revolution is a socialist revolution, that the October Revolution does not

merely signify the commencement of the socialist revolution in the West, but that it is simultaneously 1) a basis for a further development of the world revolution and 2) that it opens the transitional period from capitalism to Socialism in the Soviet Union (the dictatorship of the proletariat) in which the proletariat, carrying out a complete socialist society, provided of course the power of the international revolutionary movement on the one hand and the power of the proletariat of the Soviet Union on the other hand, will be sufficient to guard the Soviet Union against the danger of military intervention."

We see that the international implication of our revolution is completely dealt within the theses.

Further: Comrade Zinoviev and with him also Comrade Trotzky, have read quotations from the works of Lenin to prove that a complete victory of the socialist revolution in one country alone is unthinkable. It demands according to them the most active co-operative work of at least several of the most advanced countries. Peculiarly enough they draw the conclusion from this that the building up of socialism in our country is beyond the forces of our proletariat. That is confusionism, comrades! Has the Party ever said that the complete victory, the final victory of socialism in our country is possible for the proletariat of our country alone? Where and when was that said?

Does not the Party say and has it not always said together with Lenin that the complete and final victory of socialism is only possible after the victory of Socialism in a number of countries? Has not the Party said a dozen times, a hundred times that one must not confuse the victory of Socialism in one country alone with the complete and final victory of Socialism? The Party has always proceeded from the assumption that the victory of Socialism in one country means the possibility of the building up of Socialism in that country and that this task is within the forces at the disposal of that country. However, the complete victory of socialism means a guarantee against intervention and restoration and this can only be given by the victory of the revolution in several countries. After all this, how can one possibly so confuse one part with the other? Who is responsible for the fact that Comrade Zinoviev and with him also Comrade Trotzky confuse the victory of Socialism in one country with the final victory of Socialism? One has only to read the resolution of the 14th party conference in this connection. This resolution explains this question with an accuracy which would satisfy even a student in one of our Party schools.

Comrade Zinoviev and with him also Comrade Trotzky have read a number of quotations from Lenin's works during the period of Brest Litovsk which say that the external enemy could suppress our revolution. Is it, however, so difficult to grasp that these quotations do not concern themselves with the question of the possibility of the building up of socialism in our country? Comrade Lenin said that we are not certainly guarded against the possibility of an intervention, and he was perfectly right. But has the Party ever said that we are in a position, by our own forces, to guarantee our country against the danger of an intervention? Has not the Party said and does it not still say that only the victory of the proletarian revolution in several countries can give us this guarantee against intervention? How can one contend on this basis that the building up of Socialism in our country cannot be carried out by the proletariat of our country. Is it not high time to stop deliberately confusing external questions, the question of the direct struggle against the world bourgeoisie with the question of the building up of socialism in our country, that is to say with the internal questions?

Further: Comrade Zinoviev has quoted from the Communist Manifesto, according to which the united efforts of at least the most civilised countries are one of the chief conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat. He connects this quotation with a quotation from a manuscript of Comrade Lenin according to which the common efforts of the workers of several advanced countries are necessary for the victory of Socialism, and comes to the conclusion that our Party is allegedly opposed to these generally recognised and undeniable principles, that it has forgotten the international conditions for the victory of the proletarian revolution. Is that not absurd? Where

and when has our Party underestimated the decisive importance of the international efforts of the working class and the international conditions for the victory of the revolution in our country? What is the Comintern other than the expression of the united efforts of the proletariat, not only of the advanced countries but of the whole world, both for the world revolution and for the development of our revolution? Who took the initiative for the formation of the Comintern and which is the leading group in the Comintern if not our Party?

And what is the policy of trade union unity if it is not that of uniting the efforts of the workers not only of the advanced countries but of all countries? Who can deny the prominent role of our Party in the carrying out of the policy of trade union unity in the whole world? Is it not a fact that our revolution has always supported the development of the revolution in other countries and will always support it? Is it not a fact that the workers of all countries have supported our revolution on account of their sympathy for it and through their struggle against the attempts at intervention on the part of their governments? What is this if it is not the unification of the efforts of the workers of all countries in the interest of the victory of our revolution? And the struggle of the British workers against Curzon at the time of his famous note? And the support of the British miners by the workers of the Soviet Union? I could quote many such well-known facts of this nature if it were necessary.

How can one say therefore that the Party forgets the international tasks of our revolution?

Where is the secret here? The secret is that Comrade Zinoviev attempts to replace the cardinal question of the possibility of the building up of socialism in our country, the cardinal question whether or not, under the given international circumstances, the proletarian power will be able to maintain itself in the face of conservative Europe, by the question of the joint efforts of the proletariat of all countries in the interests of the victory of socialism in our country.

Comrade Trotzky, the present teacher of Zinoviev, says:

"It would be hopeless to think... that, for instance, a revolutionary Russia could exist in face of a conservative Europe..."

Comrade Trotzky, the present teacher of Zinoviev says:

"Without a direct state support on the part of the European proletariat the working class of Russia cannot maintain power nor transform its temporary hegemony into a permanent socialist dictatorship. This cannot be doubted for one moment."

The party contends, however, that both these quotations from the works of Comrade Trotzky express a social democratic deviation, express disbelief in the power of the proletariat.

That is the question, comrade Zinoviev, that is what we are quarelling about.

Comrade Zinoviev attempts to replace this basic question by another question, the question of the unification of the efforts of the proletariat in the advanced countries in the interest of the victory in our country. Comrade Zinoviev attempts to do this by quotations from Lenin and from the Communist Manifesto.

Here is the real significance of the statements of Comrade Zinoviev with regard to the alleged negligence of the party of the international tasks of our revolution.

Here is the secret of the confusion and the contradictions in the speech of Comrade Zinoviev.

And Comrade Zinoviev "modestly" attempts to present this unbelievable confusionism, this porridge of senselessness in his own mind as "real" revolutionism and as "real" internationalism of the oppositional bloc!

Isn't that absurd, comrades?

No, Comrades of the opposition, in order to be an international revolutionary in our time one must, if one is a member of our party, support it with all ones forces, for our party is the advance guard of the Comintern. You, however, weaken and threaten to destroy it.

In order to be an internationalist in our time, one must support the Communist International with all ones forces. You, however, disrupt it and threaten to destroy it by supporting Maslov and Souvarine, and whatever they are all called. It is high time, comrades of the opposition, that you should grasp that one cannot be a revolutionary and an internationalist if one is continually on a war footing with ones own party, the advance guard of the Communist International! (Applause.)

It is high time, comrades of the opposition, that you should understand that by your declaration of war against the Comintern you have ceased to be revolutionaries and internationalists. It is high time that you should grasp that you are neither revolutionaries nor internationalists but only talkers about the revolution and about internationalism (Applause).

It is high time, that you understand that you are no revolutionaries of action but revolutionaries of high-sounding phrases, kino-revolutionaries (Laughter, Applause).

COMRADE TROTZKY FALSIFIES LENINISM.

The Magic of Comrade Trotzky or the Question of the "Permanent Revolution".

I will now deal with the speech of Comrade Trotzky. Comrade Trotzky declared that the theory of the permanent revolution stands in no connection with the discussed question of the character and perspectives of our revolution. That is, to say the least of it, peculiar. Isn't the theory of the permanent revolution a theory relating to the driving forces of our revolution? What is the question of the character and the perspectives of our revolution if it is not the question of the driving forces of our revolution? How can one then say that the theory of the permanent revolution stands in no relation to the discussed question? That is not true, comrades. That is a red herring, that is a lawyers quibble, that is hide and seek. Comrade Trotzky, your efforts are in vain. Don't try to hide yourself, you will not succeed.

In another part of his speech comrade Trotzky attempted to "hint" that he has already ceased to attach any serious importance to his theory of the permanent revolution and Comrade Kamenev in his speech gave us to understand that Comrade Trotzky was not averse to turning his back upon the theory of permanent revolution if he has not already done so. A wonderful thing!

Is it true that the theory of permanent revolution has no relation to the question under discussion, and if it is not true, can one believe Comrade Kamenev that Comrade Trotzky has practically abandoned this theory of permanent revolution and attaches no longer any serious significance to it?

Let us look at the documents. I am thinking above all of a letter written by Comrade Trotzky to Comrade Olminsky in December 1921 which was published in the press in 1925, a letter which Comrade Trotzky has neither directly nor indirectly withdrawn and which in consequence is still completely in force. What does this letter say concerning the permanent revolution. Let us see:

"I by no means believe that in all my differences with the Bolsheviks I was in the wrong. I was wrong and thoroughly wrong in the estimation of the Menshevik fraction. I overestimated its revolutionary possibilities and hoped that it would be possible to isolate and destroy the Right wing. This fundamental mistake comes, however, from the fact that I treated both fractions, both the Bolshevik and the Menshevik fraction from the standpoint of the idea of the permanent revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, whilst both the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks stood upon the basis of the bourgeois revolution and the democratic republic. I believed that the differences of principle between the two fractions were not all too deep and hoped (I expressed this hope more than once in letters and in speeches) that the course of the revolution itself would bring both these fractions to the standpoint of the permanent revolution and the conquest of power by the working class. To a certain extent this took place in 1905 (Preface of Comrade Lenin to the article of Kautsky upon

the driving forces of the Russian Revolution and the general tendency of the newspaper "Natshalo").

I believe that my estimation of the driving forces of the revolution was undeniably correct. The conclusions, however, which I drew in connection with the two fractions were undeniably incorrect. Only Bolshevism concentrated within its ranks, thanks to its irreconcilable policy, the real revolutionary elements both of the old intelligentsia as also of the advanced sections of the working class. Only thanks to the fact that Bolshevism succeeded in creating this revolutionary consolidated organisation, was such a swift turn from the standpoint of the democratic revolution to the standpoint of the socialist revolution, possible.

Today also I can, without difficulty, divide my polemical articles against the Mensheviks the Bolsheviks into two categories. One category is devoted to an analysis of the internal forces of the revolution and its perspectives, (the Polish theoretical organ of Rosa Luxemburg "Neue Zeit") and the other category is devoted to an estimation of the fractions of the Russian social democrats, their struggles, etc. I could issue the articles in the first category today without any corrections, because they coincide completely with the standpoint of our party in 1917. The articles in the second category are obviously erroneous and it would not be worth while to publish them."

What results from this?

Comrade Trotsky admits that he has made mistakes in organisational questions, contends, however, that in his estimation of our revolution in the question of the permanent revolution, his opinions were and are correct.

Comrade Trotsky must certainly know hat up to the time of his death Comrade Lenin fought against the theory of permanent revolution. That does not deter Comrade Trotsky, however.

It turns out that both fractions, both the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks should have adopted the theory of permanent revolution, but that only the Bolsheviks adopted this theory because they had a revolutionary consolidated organisation of workers and elements from the old intelligentsia and even they did not adopt this theory at once, but only "since" 1917.

It turns out finally, that the theory of permanent revolution completely coincides with the standpoint of our party in 1917.

Now judge for yourself whether this shows that Comrade Trotsky no longer attaches any serious significance to the theory of permanent revolution. No, it does not show anything of the kind, on the contrary, if the theory of permanent revolution is really "since 1917" in agreement with the standpoint of the party, then one can only draw the conclusion that Comrade Trotsky attached and still attaches a very decisive importance for our whole party to this theory.

What does that mean, however "coincide"? How could the theory of permanent revolution coincide with the standpoint of our party when it is a fact that our party represented by Lenin fought against this theory the whole time? One thing or the other: Either our party had no theory of its own and was forced by the course of events to adopt the theory of the permanent revolution of Comrade Trotsky or it had its own theory and this theory was finally replaced in 1917 by the permanent revolution of Comrade Trotsky.

Comrade Trotsky has explained this "misunderstanding" for us in the "Preface" to his book "1905". (This "Preface" was written in 1922.) After describing the nature of the theory of permanent revolution and after an analysis of the estimation of our revolution from the standpoint of the theory of permanent revolution, Trotsky arrives at the following conclusion:

"This opinion was completely justified after an interruption of twelve years."

In other words, the theory of permanent revolution which was worked out by Comrade Trotsky in 1905 was "completely justified" in 1917, that is to say after an interruption of twelve years.

How could it be justified, however? And what happened to the Bolsheviks? Did they enter the revolution without any theory

of their own? Were they only capable of uniting the revolutionary intelligentsia and the revolutionary workers? And upon what basis did they unite the workers? Had the Bolsheviks no theory, no estimation of the driving forces of the revolution? Was there no other theory in our party apart from the theory of the permanent revolution? Judge for yourself: Have we Bolsheviks lived without perspectives and developed without a revolutionary theory? Did we wander through the years from 1903 to 1917 in order then to swallow suddenly the theory of permanent revolution and find our feet? That is undeniably an extremely interesting fairy tale. But how could that happen so suddenly, so unnoticeably, so without struggle, without any trouble in our party? How could that happen so simply? It is well-known that Comrade Lenin and his party fought against the theory of the permanent revolution from the first day of its birth.

Comrade Trotsky also explains this misunderstanding to us in another document. I am thinking of the "Remarks" upon the article of Comrade Trotsky "Our Differences" which he wrote in 1922.

The part of this article in question reads:

"The Mensheviks proceed from the abstraction 'our revolution is a bourgeois revolution' and come to the idea of adapting the whole policy of the proletariat to the attitude of the liberal bourgeoisie up to the seizure of the state power by the latter. But the Bolsheviks from the same stark abstraction: 'democratic and not socialist dictatorship' come to the idea of the bourgeois democratic self-limitation of the proletariat in whose hands the state power rests. Certainly there is a very important difference between them in this question: Whilst the anti-revolutionary sides of Menshevism already show themselves in full force, the anti-revolutionary characteristics of Bolshevism are only dangerous in case of a revolutionary victory."

It turns out that not only Menshevism had anti-revolutionary sides, but that also Bolshevism was not free from "anti-revolutionary characteristics" which however, "are only dangerous in case of a revolutionary victory".

Have the Bolsheviks got rid of their "anti-revolutionary characteristics"? If so, in what manner?

Comrade Trotsky explains this misunderstanding to us in the "Remarks" to his article "Our Differences". Listen:

"That was, as is known, not the case. For Bolshevism under the leadership of comrade Lenin (not without internal struggle) changed its ideological armament in this most important question in the spring of 1917, that is, to say before the conquest of power."

We see therefore a "change of armament" of the Bolsheviks since 1917 upon the basis of the theory of permanent revolution and thus the salvation of the Bolsheviks from the "anti-revolutionary" characteristics of Bolshevism and finally the fact that the theory of permanent revolution received in this way its "complete justification" — these are the conclusions of Comrade Trotsky.

But where is Leninism? Where is the theory of Bolshevism, the Bolshevik estimation of our revolution, the Bolshevik estimation of the driving forces of our revolution, etc.? They have either not been "completely justified", or they have not been "justified" at all or they fled at the time of the "change of armament" of the party and made way for the theory of the permanent revolution.

There were therefore once upon a time Bolsheviks in the world, they "consolidated" the party, since 1903, they had no revolutionary theory, they wandered through errors and confusion since 1903 and somehow reached the year 1917. They then noticed Comrade Trotsky with a theory of permanent revolution in his hand and decided to "change their ideological armament" and they did so. They flung the last remnants of Leninism and the Leninist theory of revolution over board and thus caused a "complete coincidence" between the theory of the permanent revolution and the "standpoint" of our party.

That is a very interesting fairy tale, comrades. That is to say, if you like such wonderful magic can be seen in circuses. But we are not in a circus, we are at a conference of our

party and we have not engaged Comrade Trotzky as a circus magician. Why then all this magic?

What did Lenin think of Comrade Trotzky's theory of permanent revolution? In one of his articles he wrote the following, scorning this theory and terming it "original" and "wonderful".

"The chief task of a revolutionary party is to clarify the class relationships in the coming revolution. Trotzky carries out this task in 'Nashe Slovo' incorrectly. He repeats his 'original' theory of 1905 and will not consider why life has ignored this wonderful theory for full ten years. This original theory of Trotzky takes the demand for a decisive revolutionary struggle of the proletariat for the conquest of power, from the Bolsheviks and from the Mensheviks it takes the 'denial' of the role of the peasantry... In this way Trotzky actually assists the liberal labour politicians of Russia who understand the phrase 'denial' of the role of the peasantry as unwillingness to lead the peasantry to a revolution."

It turns out that according to Lenin the theory of the permanent revolution is a half Menshevik theory which ignores the revolutionary role of the peasantry in the Russian revolution.

It is ununderstandable how this semi-Menshevik theory could possibly have 'completely coincided' with the standpoint of our party even if only since 1917.

What does our party think of the theory of permanent revolution? The well-known resolution of the 14th party conference says the following about it:

"A part of the Trotzkyist theory of permanent revolution is the contention that a real progress of socialist economy in Russia will only be possible after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe (Trotzky 1922), a contention which condemns the proletariat of the Soviet Union in the present period to a fatalist passivity. Comrade Lenin wrote the following against such 'theories':

"It is terribly mechanical, for instance, this conclusion which they learnt by rote during the development of the West European social democracy which contends, as various 'learned gentlemen' expressed themselves, that the objective economic preliminary conditions for socialism are not prevailing in Russia' (Concerning Suchanov)."

It turns out that the theory of permanent revolution is a theory like the theory of Suchanov which Lenin in his work "Concerning our Revolution" characterised as a social democratic standpoint.

It is ununderstandable how our Bolshevik party could have "changed its ideological armament" to accept this theory.

Comrade Kamenev gave us to understand in his speech that Comrade Trotzky was about to abandon his theory of the permanent revolution and in order to support this contention Comrade Kamenev read the following more than ambiguous quotation from the last letter of Comrade Trotzky to the supporters of the opposition:

"We proceed from the fact that experience has undeniably shown that in all those more or less basic questions in which any of us have disagreed with Lenin, Lenin was always right."

Comrade Kamenev, however, concealed the fact that immediately following this quotation in the same letter of Trotzky he makes the following declaration which nullifies the quotation read by Comrade Kamenev:

"The Leningrad opposition has energetically opposed the theory of socialism in one country alone as the theoretical justification of national limitedness."

What significance can the first ambiguous declaration of Comrade Trotzky which binds him to nothing, have in comparison with his second declaration which completely cancels it?

What is the theory of permanent revolution? The denial of the Leninist "theory of socialism in one country alone"?

What is the Leninist "theory of socialism in one country alone"? The denial of the theory of permanent revolution of Comrade Trotzky.

Is it then not clear that Comrade Kamenev has attempted to mislead and confuse our party by reading the first quotation from Trotzky's letter and concealing the second quotation?

But, comrades of the opposition, it is not so easy to mislead our party.

JUGGLING WITH QUOTATIONS, OR COMRADE TROTZKY FALSIFIES LENINISM.

Have you noticed, comrades, that the whole speech of Trotzky is interspersed with various quotations from the works of Lenin? When one reads these quotations which have been torn out of various articles by Comrade Lenin, than one is at a loss to understand what Comrade Trotzky actually wanted. Did he want to justify his own standpoint with these quotations or did he perhaps wish to catch Comrade Lenin "contradicting himself"? He read a series of quotations from Lenin which declare that the danger of intervention can only be abolished by the victory of the revolution in various other countries and seemed to believe by this to "expose the party". He does not grasp, however, or will not grasp that these quotations are not against the standpoint of the party, but for the standpoint of the party and against the standpoint of Trotzky, as the estimation of external danger by our party is in complete agreement with the policy of Lenin.

He read a number of other quotations which say that the complete victory of socialism is impossible without the victory of the revolution in several other countries. He attempted to juggle with these quotations in all possible ways, but he does not understand or will not understand that one must not confuse the complete victory of socialism (the guarantee against intervention) and the victory of socialism (the building up of a socialist society). He does not grasp or will not grasp that these quotations of Lenin are not against the party, but in favour of the party and against the standpoint of Comrade Trotzky.

By reading all sorts of quotations which have nothing to do with the question, Comrade Trotzky apparently thought that it would not be necessary to deal with the basic article of Lenin upon the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country alone (1915). He apparently assumed that Comrade Kamenev with his speech had fortunately spared him the necessity of dealing with this article.

One can, however, now regard it as definitely proved that Comrade Kamenev was not able to carry out his role and that therefore the article of Lenin remains completely valid. Comrade Trotzky further quoted from the well-known article of Comrade Lenin in which Lenin says that in the peasant question no differences existed between him and Trotzky regarding immediate policy. He forgot to say, however, that this article does not touch the questions of the differences in the peasant question in connection with the possibility of the building up of a complete socialist society in our country.

This explains also the operations of Comrade Trotzky with his quotations which developed into an empty juggling.

Comrade Trotzky attempted to prove that his standpoint "coincided" with the standpoint of Lenin in the question of the possibility of building up a socialist society in our country with the internal forces of our revolution. How can one, however, prove the unprovable?

How can one reconcile the thesis of Lenin that "the victory of socialism is possible first of all in several countries or even in one single capitalist country" with the theses of Comrade Trotzky that it would be hopeless to think that... revolutionary Russia could exist in face of a conservative Europe?"

How can one reconcile the thesis of Lenin that "the victorious proletariat of this country after it has expropriated its capitalists and organised the socialist production would rise against the rest of the capitalist world" with the thesis of

Comrade Trotzky that without a direct state support on the part of the European proletariat the working class of Russia could not maintain power and not transform its temporary hegemony into a permanent socialist dictatorship?

And finally, how can one reconcile the thesis of Lenin that "only an understanding with the peasantry can save the socialist revolution in Russia as long as the revolution does not break out in other countries" with the thesis of Trotzky that the contradiction in the situation of a workers government in a backward country with an overwhelming majority of peasants, can only find its solution on an international scale in the arena of the proletarian world revolution?

And then: what is the difference between the standpoint of Trotzky in the question of the victory of socialism in our country and the standpoint of Otto Bauer that:

"in Russia where the proletariat is only a small minority of the nation, it can only temporarily maintain its hegemony."

And that:

"it must lose this hegemony as soon as the peasant masses of the nation are culturally mature enough to take over the power themselves."

And that:

"only the conquest of political power by the proletariat of the industrial West can guarantee a lasting hegemony of industrial socialism in Russia"?

Is it not clear that Trotzky stands nearer to Bauer than to Lenin? And is it not true that the standpoint of Trotzky is a social democratic deviation? Is it not true that Trotzky essentially denies the socialist character of our revolution?

Comrade Trotzky attempts to justify his thesis upon the impossibility of maintaining the hegemony of a proletarian power in face of a conservative Europe by the contention that present-day Europe is not conservative, but that it is more or less liberal, and that if Europe were really conservative, the proletariat of our country could not maintain power. Is it difficult to grasp that here Comrade Trotzky is in complete confusion? How can one, for instance, call present-day Italy or England or France Conservative or liberal? What is present-day North America, a conservative or a liberal country? What significance for the integrity and the maintenance of our republic can this "fine" and absurd stressing of the difference between a conservative and a "liberal" Europe have? Did not republican France and democratic America intervene against our country in the period of Koltchak and Denikin just in the same way as monarchist and conservative England?

Comrade Trotzky devoted especially much attention to the question of the middle peasantry. He read a quotation from Lenin's works from the period 1906 in which Lenin foresaw the possibility that a section of the middle peasantry might turn away into the camp of the counter-revolution after the victory of the bourgeois revolution. Trotzky is apparently trying to prove that this quotation "coincides" with his standpoint in the question of the peasantry after the victory of the socialist revolution. It is difficult to understand how Comrade Trotzky manages to compare incomparable things. Comrade Trotzky tends to regard the middle peasantry as something absolute, something permanent, something definite once and for ever. The Bolsheviks, however, have never regarded the middle peasantry in this way. Comrade Trotzky has apparently forgotten that the Bolsheviks had three plans in connection with the chief masses of the peasantry: a plan for the period of the bourgeois revolution, a second plan for the period of the proletarian revolution and a third plan for the period after the consolidation of the Soviet Power.

In the first period the Bolsheviks said: Together with the whole peasantry against the Czar, against the landowners, for the bourgeois democratic revolution; the liberal bourgeoisie to be neutralised.

In the second period the Bolsheviks said: Together with the poor peasantry against the bourgeoisie and against the Kulaks for the socialist revolution; the middle peasantry to be neutralised.

What does the neutralisation of the middle peasantry mean? It means to hold it under the political control of the proletariat, not to trust it and to take all measures that it does not get out of hand.

In the third period, the present period, the Bolsheviks say: Together with the village poor in permanent alliance with the middle peasantry against the capitalist elements of our economy in town and country for the victory of the construction of socialism.

Whoever confuses these three plans, these three different lines, which reflect three different periods of our revolution, understands nothing of Bolshevism.

Lenin was completely right when he said that a section of the middle peasantry would go over to the camp of the counter-revolution after the victory of the bourgeois revolution.

That was for instance the case in the period of the government of "Ufin" when a section of the middle peasantry in the Volga district made common cause with the counter-revolution and the Kulaks whilst a great section of the middle peasantry vacillated between the revolution and the counter-revolution. It could not have been otherwise. The middle peasant is just a middle peasant in order to wait and hesitate and see: "The Devil knows who will win; it is much better to wait and see." Only after the first serious victories of the revolution over the counter-revolution and particularly after the consolidation of the Soviet Power, did the middle peasant definitely begin to swing over to the side of the Soviet Power. He was apparently of the opinion that nothing could be done without power that the Bolshevik power was strong enough to represent the only solution.

Just in this period Comrade Lenin wrote the following important words:

"We have entered such a stage of socialist construction that we must concretely and in detail work out all basic rules and regulations upon the basis of the experience of our work in the village, and we must allow ourselves to be guided thereby in order to place us upon the basis of a permanent alliance with the middle peasantry." That is the question of the middle peasantry.

The mistake of Comrade Trotzky is that he approaches the question of the middle peasant metaphysically, that he regards the middle peasantry as something absolute and thus confuses the question and distorts and falsifies Leninism.

Finally, it is by no means said that the proletariat could not and will not have conflicts with a certain section of the middle peasantry. The differences between the party and the opposition do not concern themselves with this matter. The differences between the party and the opposition, consist in the fact, that the party considers these contradictions and these possible conflicts as solvable upon the basis of the forces of our revolution whilst comrade Trotzky and the opposition are of the opinion that these contradictions and conflicts can only be solved upon "an international scale and in the arena of the proletarian world revolution".

Comrade Trotzky juggles with quotations and attempts to drop somehow these differences of opinion. But I have already said that he will not be successful in misleading our party.

And the conclusion? The conclusion is that one must be a dialectician and not a magician. If, comrades of the opposition, you had learnt dialectics from Lenin, if you had read his works, then you would be some use. (Applause, Laughter).

"TRIFLES" AND CURIOSITIES.

Comrade Trotzky accused me as the author of the thesis that I spoke in them of the revolution "as such" as a socialist revolution. Comrade Trotzky is of the opinion that such a treatment of the revolution is metaphysical. I can by no means agree with him.

Why does the thesis speak of the revolution "as such" as a socialist revolution? The reason for this is that this expresses the whole difference in the estimation of our revolution between the standpoint of our party and the standpoint of the opposition. What is this difference? The difference is that our party regards the revolution as a socialist revolution, as a revolution with certain independent forces which is capable of taking up the struggle against the capitalist world, whilst the opposition regards our revolution as a free supplement of the future, as a free supplement to the revolution in the West which has not yet shown itself, as a supplement to the future revolution in the West, as something which has no independent power. One only needs to compare the estimation of the proletarian dictatorship in our country made by Comrade Lenin with the estimation made by the oppositional bloc in order to grasp the great chasm which lies between us.

Whilst comrade Lenin regards the proletarian dictatorship as capable of great initiative which, after the organisation of the socialist economy, must proceed directly to the support of the world proletariat in the struggle against the capitalist world, the opposition regards the proletarian dictatorship in our country as a passive force over which the sword of Damokles, i. e. the immediate loss of power is hanging because of the existence of "conservative Europe".

Is it not clear that the word "metaphysics" is used in order to cover up the nakedness of the social democratic estimation of our revolution by the oppositional bloc?

Comrade Trotzky also declares that I have replaced the incorrect and inexact formulation of the question of the victory of socialism in one country alone, which I made in my book "The Fundamental Principles of Leninism" in 1924 by a more correct and more exact formulation. Comrade Trotzky is apparently dissatisfied with this. But he does not say why nor give his reason. What can be wrong in the fact that I have replaced an incorrect formulation by a correct one? I by no means consider myself to be infallible. I believe the party can only gain if a mistake which is made by this or that comrade, is recognised and corrected by him. What does Comrade Trotzky want to say when he stresses this fact? Does he perhaps want to follow my good example and finally rectify his numerous errors? (Laughter and Applause.) Very well, I am prepared to assist him in this matter if my assistance is necessary, I am prepared to take the initiative to assist him. Comrade Trotzky, however, apparently has another aim in view. If that is so then I must say, he will not succeed.

Comrade Trotzky said in his speech that he was by no means such a bad Communist as the representatives of the party majority would make out. He quoted a great number of points from his own articles to prove that he Comrade Trotzky, recognised and recognises the "socialist character" of our work and that he does not deny the "socialist character" of our state industry.

What novelties comrade Trotzky has told us, to be true! It will be the limit if Comrade Trotzky denied the socialist character of our work, of our state industry. These facts are admitted today even by the New York stock exchange, even by our own Nep men, not to speak of Otto Bauer. Today everyone sees, both our friends and our foes, that we are not building up our industry like the capitalists build theirs, that we have introduced into the development of our economic and political life certain new elements which have nothing to do with capitalism.

No, comrades of the opposition, this is not the question. The matter is far more serious than the oppositional bloc seems to think.

It is not a question now of the socialist character of our industry, but whether we will be able to build up the socialist economy in its entirety despite our capitalist environment, despite the existence of internal and external foes who expect the fall of the proletarian dictatorship. We must work for the complete triumph of Leninism in our party.

It is now no question of trifles and curiosities. One cannot talk today about trifles and curiosities before the party. Today the party demands more than that. Either you will have the courage and be able to recognise and abandon your errors openly and honestly or you will not do so and you will have

to accept the justified characterisation of the party for your standpoint as a social democratic deviation.

One or the other. You have the choice! (Interruption: "Hear! Hear!" Applause.)

THE PRACTICAL PLATFORM OF THE OPPOSITION — THE DEMANDS OF THE PARTY.

After juggling with quotations the leaders of the Opposition attempted to go on to the differences of a practical character. Comrades Trotzky and Kamenev and similarly Comrade Zinoviev attempted to formulate these differences and contended at the same time that not the theoretical but the practical differences were of importance. I must say, however, that not one single formulation concerning our differences of opinion which the opposition has placed before this conference, can be termed objective or complete.

You want to know, comrades of the opposition, of what our practical differences consist? You want to know what the party demands of you.

Very well, listen.

1. The party cannot and will not any longer tolerate it, that any time you are in the minority you go into the highways and the byeways and declare that there is a crisis in the party and attack the party. The party will tolerate that no longer. (Interruption: "Hear! Hear!")

2. The party cannot and will not tolerate any longer that you, after you have lost hope of winning the majority of our party, mobilise around yourselves all dissatisfied elements as material for a new party. The party cannot and will not tolerate this any longer.

3. The party cannot and will not tolerate that you slander the leading party apparatus and the regime in the party, break the iron party discipline and mobilise all the tendencies condemned by the party under the flag of fractional freedom in order to form a new party. The party will not tolerate that (Applause).

4. We know that we are faced with great difficulties on the way of the building up of socialism. We see these difficulties and we have the possibility of overcoming them. We would welcome the assistance of the opposition in overcoming these difficulties. But the party cannot and will not tolerate that you attempt to exploit these difficulties to worsen our situation, and to attack the party. (Applause).

5. The party understands better than all the oppositions together that the advance of the industrialisation and the advance of socialism is only possible upon the condition of a permanent rise of the material and cultural situation of the working class. The party is doing everything and will do everything to see to it that the material and cultural situation of the working class permanently improves. But the party cannot and will not tolerate it that the material and cultural situation of the working class demagogic demands for an immediate increase of wages from 30 to 40 per cent although it very well knows that at the present moment industry is not in a position to stand such wage increases. Such demagogy has not the betterment of the situation of the working class as its aim, but the promotion of dissatisfaction amongst the backward sections of the toilers against the party and to organise it against the working class. The party cannot and will not tolerate this. ("Hear! Hear!")

6. The party cannot and will not tolerate it that the opposition continues to undermine the basis of the alliance between the workers and the peasants by propagating the idea of raising the prices of industrial commodities and increasing the pressure of taxation upon the peasantry. That the opposition represents the relation between the proletariat and the peasantry not as a relation of economic co-operation but as a relation of the exploitation of the peasantry by the proletarian state. The party cannot and will not tolerate this.

7. The party cannot and will not tolerate that you, comrades of the opposition, continue in the future to cause confusion by exaggerating our difficulties and creating defeatism by propagating the idea of the impossibility of the building up of socialism in our country and thus undermining the fundamental principles of Leninism. (Interruption: "Hear! Hear!")

8. The party cannot and will not tolerate it, although it is not a matter for the party alone but a matter for all the sections of the Comintern, that you continue to hinder the Comintern in its work, to disorganise its sections and weaken its leadership. The party cannot and will not tolerate it.

These, comrades of the opposition, are our practical differences of opinion.

This is the essence of the political and practical platform of the oppositional bloc against which our party is fighting today.

Comrade Trotzky who explained several points of this platform in his speech and carefully concealed the rest, asked: "What is social democratic here?" I would like to ask however: What is communist in the platform of the oppositional bloc? What is not social democratic? Is it not clear that the practical platform of the oppositional bloc represents a deviation from Leninism and an approach to the social democracy?

You wanted to know what the party demanded of you? Now you know it. Either you will carry out these conditions which at the same time represent the conditions for complete unity in our party, or you will not do so, and then the party, which defeated you yesterday, will finally defeat you tomorrow. (Applause.)

THE BALANCE.

What are the conclusions, the results of our internal party struggle? I have before me a document dated September 1926 and undersigned by Comrade Trotzky. This document is remarkable in the sense that to a certain extent it attempts to prophesy the results of our internal party struggle, that it contains a certain prognosis, a certain perspective of our internal party struggle. It says:

"The united opposition has shown in April and July and will also show in October, that the vulgar and disloyal campaign which has been carried on against it, will only strengthen the unity of its opinions, and the party will grasp that a way out of the present serious crisis is only possible upon the basis of the ideas of the united opposition." (Letter of Comrade Trotzky to the supporters of the Opposition.)

You see that this is almost a prophesy. (Interruption: "Almost!") This is almost a prophesy of a truly Marxist type, a prophesy made fully two months in advance. (Laughter.)

Naturally, there are one or two exaggerations in this prophesy. (Laughter). It speaks for instance of the present serious crisis in our party. Thank god, we are alive, we are healthy

and we have not even noticed this crisis. There is naturally a certain crisis, but it is not a party crisis, it is the crisis of a faction, a faction calling itself the oppositional bloc. One must, however, not represent the crisis of a small faction as the crisis of a great party. The document of comrade Trotzky further says that the oppositional bloc is consolidating itself and will be still more consolidated in the future. I think that here also there is a certain exaggeration. One cannot deny the fact that the oppositional bloc is decaying, that its best elements are leaving it, that it is being stifled in its own contradictions. Is it not a fact that for instance Comrade Krupskaya is leaving the oppositional bloc. (Storms of Applause). Is that an accident?

The document of Comrade Trotzky further says that there is a way out of the present crisis only on the basis of the ideas of the united opposition. I think that Comrade Trotzky exaggerates here also. The Comrades of the opposition must know that the party has consolidated itself not on the basis of the ideas of the oppositional bloc, but in the struggle against these ideas, upon the basis of the socialist perspectives of our work of construction. That is an obvious exaggeration in the document of Comrade Trotzky.

If one subtracts from the document of Comrade Trotzky all the exaggerations, then, comrades, there remains nothing left of the prognosis.

As you see, comrades, what resulted was exactly the opposite prophesied by Comrade Trotzky.

In conclusion, comrades, Comrade Zinoviev boasted for a long time that when he puts his ear to the ground, (Laughter) he can hear the march of history. It is possible that this is really so. But one must recognise that Comrade Zinoviev who can hear the march of history, sometimes fails to hear certain "trifles". (Interruption of Comrade Syrzov: "He hears with the wrong ear".) Perhaps the opposition can really place its ear on the ground and hear such a wonderful thing as the march of history. But one must recognise, that whilst it hears such wonderful things, it has not noticed the trifling fact that the party has long ago turned its back upon the opposition and left it stranded. The opposition has not noticed that. What conclusion must one draw from this? The conclusion is that the hearing of the opposition is not in order. (Laughter.)

That is my conclusion: Comrades of the opposition, have your hearing attended to! (Storms of protracted applause during which the assembly rises from its seats.)

After the closing speech of Comrade Stalin, the thesis presented by him on behalf of the Polit Bureau was unanimously accepted unaltered.