

**THE
NEW PHASE
IN THE
SOVIET
UNION**

BY

V. MOLOTOV





THE NEW PHASE
IN THE SOVIET UNION

THE NEW PHASE
IN THE SOVIET UNION.

Report to the Executive Committee of the Comintern,
February 23, 1929

By V. Molotov.

NEW YORK WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHED

THE NEW PHASE
IN THE SOVIET UNION

THE NEW PHASE IN THE SOVIET UNION.

*(Report to the Enlarged Presidium of the Executive
Committee of the Communist International,
February 25, 1930.)*

By V. Molotov.

NEW YORK: WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I.—THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE	6
1. The Struggle for the Plan and the Working Class	6
2. The Socialist Reconstruction of Agriculture	12
II.—THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM AND THE MASSES	18
1. The Enthusiasm of the Masses	18
2. The Village Turns to Socialism	26
3. The Rising Tide of Culture	29
4. The Masses and the Party	31
III.—THE TASKS OF THE PARTY	33
1. The Sowing Campaign	34
2. The Problem of Personnel	37
3. The Reconstruction of the Work of our Organisations	42
4. Internal Party Problems	44
IV.—CONCLUSIONS	47
V.—CLOSING REMARKS	51

THE NEW PHASE IN THE SOVIET UNION.

My task is to deal with questions of the internal situation in the U.S.S.R. I shall therefore spend very little time on the international situation and our foreign policy. I shall only point out that events in the mutual relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries are bound to be linked up most intimately with the internal situation in the Soviet Union.

I may illustrate this linking up by two groups of facts. In the first group fall such events as the change in relations between Great Britain and the U.S.S.R. and the conflict on the Chinese Eastern Railway. In both cases, as you are aware, the U.S.S.R. emerged the victor. The MacDonald Government was forced to disavow the action of the Conservatives in breaking off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in 1927. The resumption of relations which had been broken off on the initiative of Great Britain cannot but be recognised as a very great success for us. It is equally well known that the dispute on the Chinese Eastern Railway was also not settled in favour of those who began the provocation in the Far East. The Chinese landlords and capitalists and the imperialist forces backing them, who attempted to seize the C.E.R., were taught a severe lesson. They found themselves obliged to sound a retreat. Thus in the Far East also we demonstrated the growing strength and importance of the Soviet Union in international affairs.

This is one group of facts characteristic of our successes on the international field. On the other hand, and particularly recently, we find new attempts by the capitalist countries to increase their attacks against the U.S.S.R.

Our international successes are the result of the internal consolidation of our country; and the newly-intensified anti-soviet campaign in Europe and America cannot be considered apart from this circumstance either. It is the internal consolidation of the Proletarian State that excites the ire of the capitalists of the whole world, and prompts the ruling cliques in the capitalist countries towards new steps in the preparation of military intervention. Recently the anti-soviet campaign abroad has developed most extensively in connection with the question of religion. All the forces of bourgeois reaction and Russian emigrant counter-revolution, with the active sympathy and support of the social democrats in every country, are engaged in a furious drive against the U.S.S.R. on this pretext—in reality, first and foremost, on

account of the practical effect now being given in our country to the watchword of "liquidating the kulak as a class." The exceptionally violent anti-soviet campaign is intended to serve as a preliminary on the part of the imperialists to the attack on the Soviet Union.

In connection with the first item on the agenda of our session, we saw how this anti-soviet campaign is bound up with the internal situation in the capitalist countries and colonies, and what relation it bears to the economic development and the sharpening of class conflict in those countries. My task, therefore, is only to examine the connection between this anti-soviet campaign abroad and our internal situation.

I.—The Building of Socialism and the Class Struggle

I.—THE STRUGGLE FOR THE PLAN AND THE WORKING CLASS.

The first part of my report will try to bring out what is going on in the U.S.S.R., what is the economic position here, and how class relations are taking shape at the present stage of the building of socialism. For this purpose I shall have to dwell on the main facts of economic development and the class struggle, confining myself to the principal events in the economic year just concluded and the new year which began in October. This means that I shall be dealing with facts bearing on the first and the beginning of the second year of the Five Years' Plan.

I shall first deal with industry.

Exactly one month ago the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. appealed to the Party and to the whole working class to make a new effort along the whole industrial front. The Party established the fact that the industrial plan laid down for the current year was not being carried out, and sounded the alarm. It directed the eyes of the working class first and foremost to the front on which the struggle for the industrial and financial plan is proceeding. An energetic mobilisation of working-class forces to carry out the second year's plan has begun.

Further on, I shall deal with the definite facts which produced the Central Committee's manifesto of January 25th. I must, however, first of all expose the bourgeois lie, assiduously circulated by the capitalist newspaper trusts abroad, in connection with the courageous proletarian self-criticism contained in the manifesto I have mentioned. The bourgeois press asserts that the Party has itself admitted the failure of the industrial plan, and that this shows the economic collapse of the country. We are used to these lies, and are used also to reply to such an outcry by facts and an analysis of the real economic situation of the U.S.S.R. We shall do the same on this occasion. What are the facts?

It is true that the increase of production by 31 per cent. as compared with last year, which had been laid down for the current year in the branches of industry controlled by the Supreme Economic Council, was not carried out during the first quarter. During the first three months of the current year (October-December) we have an increase of only 26 per cent. as compared with the same period last year. But this very figure of an increase of 26 per cent. shows how futile is the rejoicing in the bourgeois press about an economic crisis in the U.S.S.R. Let me remind you also that the Five Years' Plan provided for an increase of industrial output during the current year of 20 per cent. The programme of production (31 per cent.) for this year is half as large again as the programme for last year (22 per cent.). Lastly, we should compare industrial output during the first quarter of this year with the same quarter last year. Such a comparison shows us that the increase of industrial output during the first quarter of 1928-29 was 19 per cent., while this year we have a further increase of 26 per cent. In respect of the productivity of labour, we have the following figures: last year 10 per cent. in the first quarter, this year a further increase of 18 per cent. So far as costs of production are concerned, instead of an *increase* of 2 per cent. in the first quarter of 1928-29, we have the opposite in 1929-30, namely a *decrease* of 4 per cent. These facts have long been published in our press, but are hushed up by the bourgeois press, which is howling about the collapse of the bolshevik plans for industry.

In spite of all this, our Party is sounding the alarm, and has proclaimed the struggle for the industrial and financial plan to be the most important task before all Party, trade union, Young Communist and economic organisations, because in the first quarter of the year the increase achieved was only 26 per cent., and the level of 31 per cent. which had been fixed was not attained.

During the last few days there have been published the results of the first four months of the new economic year (October-January). These show that we now have an increase of industrial output by 27 per cent. While this represents an improvement on the first three months, it means that the industrial and financial plan for the year is still not being carried out. The front has not been straightened out. The press continues to print daily communiques exposing the defects of the economic, industrial and party organisations. Side by side with the defects are indicated also the successes achieved by individual factories and districts. The papers have introduced a "black list" for workers and organisations which are not carrying out their obligations under the plan. At the same time the names of the leaders of organisations notable for their achievements are being printed in "red

lists." Proletarian self-criticism is developing, the mobilisation of forces is proceeding, and confidence in the successful achievement of the objectives laid down is growing.

Experience has shown that the first months of the new economic year are always the most difficult in the execution of the economic plan. Numerous delays in confirming programmes of production in central offices begin to take effect. Lack of capacity to adapt oneself quickly to the new problems arising in the districts also makes itself felt. In spite of all this, judging from the past, the plan will be carried out.

Last year the leeway in the first quarter of the plan was even greater, and yet the programme for the year was not only carried out but surpassed—by an increase of 24 per cent. instead of 22 per cent. This year the production programme is more than *half as large* again as that provided for the second year under the Five Years' Plan; and still the Party considers it practicable and obligatory. In its manifesto of January 25th, the Central Committee calls for the economic plan to be not only carried out but *surpassed*. And we are certain that this appeal will meet with a response in practice.

In order to give you a picture of the state of affairs in our industry, I will quote one more fact. Under the Five Years' Plan, capital expenditure for this year was fixed at 2,265 million roubles (£226 million). But the actual plan of capital expenditure exceeds this estimate by more than 50 per cent., and has already reached 3,664 million roubles (£366 million). Quite recently this figure, too, has been increased, and probably the whole sum of capital expenditure this year, apart from electrical construction, will be somewhere near four milliard roubles (£400 million).

Returning to the question of the carrying out of the plan, I believe it is essential to emphasise that the main difficulty is to carry out the task of reducing the costs of industrial production while improving its quality. Instead of the reduction of 11 per cent. provided for in the first quarter, we have a reduction of only 4 per cent. : a very considerable discrepancy. Here, in the opinion of the Party, is the principal task arising under the industrial and financial plan.

The fulfilment of this task is bound up first and foremost with an increase in the productivity of labour. At this point I must deal with several questions concerning the position of the working class.

The increasing of the productivity of labour in industry and throughout the socialised sector of our economy is bound to claim our undivided attention. Last year the plan provided for an increase in labour productivity of 16 per cent. The task was fulfilled. This year we have accepted provisions for a further

increase of 25 per cent. Notwithstanding the fact that the original increase laid down in the second year of the Five Years' Plan was only 14 per cent., we do not consider this task (25 per cent.) exaggerated or beyond our strength. We do not doubt that the Party's mobilisation on the front of the struggle for the plan ensures the success of our efforts in this direction. The main proof of this is the increase in the equipment of the industrial worker with electrical and mechanical power. Last year this technical equipment increased by about 12 per cent.; this year the plan provides for a further growth of 30 per cent. Thus an increase in the productivity of labour in our industry is very much bound up with a growth in the technical equipment of labour.

I turn now to the question of industrial man power and unemployment. From year to year the number of persons engaged in our industry increases. On an average, during the last three years' we have had a yearly increase of 5 to 6 per cent., while last year it reached 7 per cent. Apart from this, we see a very rapid growth of the number of persons engaged in the building industry. In recent years this increase has reached 20 to 30 per cent. yearly, while this year, in view of the tremendous extension of our building operations, we anticipate a further increase of over 50 per cent. This gives an indication of the rate at which the working-class army is expanding.

Naturally enough, unemployment is visibly decreasing. During 1929 the total of unemployed decreased by 19 per cent. In the industrial workers' section the number of unemployed was reduced from 237,000 to 188,000, i.e., about 21 per cent. Increases in the number of unemployed take place only in the unskilled sections, which on January 1st, 1930, represented 60 per cent. of the total mass of unemployed. In reality the percentage is somewhat higher, as there is a certain proportion of unskilled workers amongst the unemployed in the industrial section. Thus it will be clear that the unemployment position in the U.S.S.R. is altogether different from the position in the capitalist countries. There it is constantly increasing, here it is noticeably decreasing.

We are making successful progress in the application of the seven-hour working day in industry. During last year one-fifth of the total number of workers had their working day reduced to seven hours, while not less than 43 per cent. of the workers will be working the shorter day by the end of the present economic year. This figure does not take into account the new works, where the seven-hour day is being introduced from the outset.

The chief difficulty as regards the position of the workers is in the questions of housing and feeding. Despite our growing volume of house-building, housing is still at a low level, owing to the growth of the population in the towns, particularly the

industrial centres. This year there is a definite speeding up provided for in the housing programme, which will render possible a small rise in the average housing space allotted. As for the food situation, we have a definite improvement in the central question, that of the bread supply. But the supply of dairy produce (butter, milk, meat) is still far from adequate to meet the growing demand. Due to the fact that the supply of this produce is partly dependent upon the private market, while the state and co-operative organisations have not taken a thorough grip of the situation, there are frequent rises in prices in this sphere, which of course have their effect upon the workers' wages.

As a result, the increase in real wages is proceeding more slowly than was provided for in the plan. During last year it amounted to approximately 3 per cent., notwithstanding a much larger increase of money wages. This year it has been laid down that real wages must be increased not less than 12 per cent. In spite of a certain improvement which has to be registered, we are bound to admit that the increase is as yet much behind the plan. We have to remember, however, that during the whole period of the New Economic Policy there has not been a year in which wages of the workers in the U.S.S.R. have not risen. The policy of the Soviet Government is indissolubly bound up with the work of improving the material and cultural conditions of the workers, and this policy is firmly and unalterably maintained.

The successes of the soviet state in developing industry and improving the position of the working classes have been made possible by a determined effort to overcome tremendous difficulties, particularly to overcome the most bitter resistance on the part of our class enemies. I need only refer to the numerous facts of counter-revolutionary sabotage on the part of former owners and bourgeois experts engaged in our industry. There is scarcely a single branch of national economy in which during the last two years counter-revolutionary organisations of saboteurs were not discovered. These organisations were brought to light both in heavy and in light industry, in transport and agriculture, in the banks and the co-operatives. The network of sabotage was most widespread in industry. Here counter-revolutionary experts, supported by white emigrants and foreign capital, undermined our constructive work. There have even been individual cases of sabotage by workers, amongst whom elements alien to the proletariat had penetrated. Sabotage increased particularly during the last three or four years, special attention being paid to the war industries.

The organisations of sabotage varied their tactics according to the special features of the different stages of development of our economy. From 1918 onwards they went through three stages.

In the first, their object was to preserve the property of the former owners and delay the development of soviet industry. In the second, when the new economic policy began, the wreckers conceived illusions about the economic degeneration of the proletarian state, and set themselves the task of undermining the process of restoring industry and of extending the granting of concessions, expecting in this way to hasten the downfall of bolshevism. When we had grappled successfully with the problems involved in the restoration of industry, and set about the total reconstruction of our national economy, they saw the futility of their efforts and began the direct preparation of intervention. In this they received constant support from the Russian and foreign organisations of former property owners abroad. We have numerous and extremely detailed evidence of all this from the saboteurs themselves and from the counter-revolutionary organisations crushed by G.P.U.

Unquestionably the destructive organisations in industry represented one of the most dangerous forms of struggle on the part of our class enemies. They inflicted many severe blows on our industry. Nevertheless, the agents of the former owners and bourgeois governments suffered defeat, as the tremendous successes of socialist industry can testify.

Now, comrades, we can strike a balance of our industrial development, and the best way of doing it is to compare it with the development of industry in the capitalist states. As the watchword of the working class in the Soviet Union is to "overtake and outstrip" the capitalist countries, such a comparison is exceptionally important.

Let us compare the development of industry in the Soviet Union and the largest capitalist countries in its relation to the pre-war level of 1913. We find that in comparison with the pre-war level, the U.S.S.R. has achieved greater successes than even France and the U.S.A., which developed most rapidly after the world war. The comparison shows that as early as 1928 the Soviet Union had already outpaced France, while during the second half of last year it outstripped the industry of the U.S.A. During the last months of 1929 the so-called physical volume of industrial output in the U.S.S.R., compared with 1913, surpassed the similar index of any capitalist country. Consequently we have here the partial achievement of the objective of "overtaking and outstripping" the capitalist countries. This is the most important result of industrial development in the U.S.S.R.

We cannot, however, by any means rest content with the results achieved so far. A more careful analysis of the growth of Soviet industry, mentioned above, reveals most important shortcomings. The fact is that the level of the growth of our *heavy* industry, compared with the pre-war figure, is still lower than the corres-

ponding level of this industry in such countries as France and the U.S.A. This obliges us to place special emphasis on the regeneration of our heavy industry and the increasing output. That is why the industrial and financial plan for 1929-1930, while providing for an increase in industrial output as a whole of 31 per cent., provides for an expansion of the heavy industries by 46 per cent. We are confident that this plan will be not only carried out but surpassed. We shall strive to increase the output of heavy industry this year by at least 50 per cent.

2.—THE SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION OF AGRICULTURE.

To turn to the question of agriculture.

The first and principal question is that of the *grain supply*, on which depends the feeding of our cities.

This year we achieved substantial successes on the grain front. The situation on this front during the two preceding years was one of exceptional difficulty, owing to the opposition of the kulaks, while the task of laying in the necessary stores of grain was protracted throughout the whole year, which had an adverse effect upon all our economic activity. But the last grain collection campaign demonstrated our substantial achievements in the mobilisation of the poor and middle peasantry against the kulaks, and was very successful. In the main it was concluded in the first five months, and the plan was more than carried out. For the first time this year we have been able to constitute a grain reserve of two million tons. Thus we have achieved a decisive change on the grain front, and our workmen and Red Army have their bread assured until the new harvest.

Now we are faced with another campaign in connection with agriculture. I have in mind the *spring sowing campaign*. During the next few months this will be the *principal front* of socialist construction. On this front we are now concentrating special forces and, in keeping with the progress of mass collectivisation, are making a preparation for the spring sowing by new methods. I will speak more in detail of the tasks of this campaign later. At the moment I want to dwell on the special conditions which have developed in our agriculture. I refer to collectivisation, which has developed in recent months to a gigantic extent.

The radical change in the rate of development of collective agriculture which made itself felt in the second half of last year represents an event of exceptional importance for the cause of communism. It expresses itself in the fact that the "central figure of agriculture"—*the middle peasant*—has turned towards socialism. Vast masses of the peasants, poor and middle, have become involved in the process of collectivisation. Wholesale collectivisation, i.e., that in which eighty to ninety per cent. of

peasant farms participate, is now the characteristic feature, not only of individual districts and areas, but of whole regions and national republics. Amongst such regions come at the present time the Northern Caucasus and the Central "Black Earth" Region.

At the present time not less than one-half of the total mass of peasant farms have already entered the collective farms. This means that not less than 13 or 14 millions of poor and middle peasants have been drawn into the movement for collectivisation. This means that several dozens of millions of adult able-bodied men and women are members of collective farms in the countryside—a fact of world historic importance.

Collectivisation has developed particularly rapidly in recent weeks. During the last 30 days there have entered into the collective farms as many peasant households as were brought into collective farms during the preceding twelve years. This exceptional rate of collectivisation during the most recent period requires concentration of the utmost attention on *consolidating* the successes achieved, to avoid any ebbing of the tide out of the collective farms. The most determined work among the masses of poor and middle peasantry is essential if the further successes of the collective movement are to be rendered possible. This in its turn necessitates a most persistent and resolute struggle against distortions of the party policy in effecting collectivisation, particularly a struggle against infringements of the voluntary principle when bringing peasants into the collective farms, and against bureaucratic methods of collectivisation which mean replacement of patient and stubborn work among the masses by purely administrative methods and the chase after exaggerated speeds of collectivisation.

We have three main forms of the collective movement. The simplest is the *society* for joint tillage, in which only labour is socialised. Even the chief means of production are not socialised in this form. The highest form of the collective movement is the *commune*, in which both agricultural machinery and cattle, and living conditions themselves are socialised. The commune means not only the joint working of the land and the joint ownership of the means of production, but also the communalisation of feeding and housing. The prevailing and principal form of the collective movement at the present stage is, however, the agricultural *artel*. In this the socialisation of the chief means of production, i.e., agricultural machines, working cattle, agricultural buildings and undertakings, has been carried out. But the artel does not involve communal feeding or housing, or the socialisation of land attached directly to houses, minor cattle producing for immediate consumption, which remain the property of individual families. The

consolidation of the agricultural artel means the consolidation of the *principal* form of the collective farming movement in present conditions. Last year, when the swing in the direction of mass collectivisation began in the autumn, the lowest form of collective farm, i.e., the society for jointly tilling the soil, developed particularly rapidly. Lately the predominance is visibly on the side of the artel. The proportion of communes amongst the general mass of collective farms cannot as yet be very large, in the present stage of the collective movement.

The forms and methods of collective farming are extremely varied. At the Tenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. we noted the importance of machine and tractor depots for the collectivisation movement. But in practice the anticipations of that time about the rate of development of machine and tractor depots have been left far behind. These depots are now organised by a special state and co-operative body, the Tractorcentre. This body selects the most important agricultural districts and there organises, with the assistance of local co-operative organisations, special depots equipped with dozens of tractors and suitable agricultural machines. These machine and tractor depots sign agreements with collective farms, to plough their fields and gather in the harvest with the help of their tractors and agricultural machines. The contract provides for the obligation on the part of the collective farms to carry out all necessary agricultural works with their own labour, to maintain the machine and tractor depots, and to acquire them out of their own resources in three years. The depot receives a definite proportion of the harvest—from one-quarter to one-third—as payment for their work. These machine and tractor depots, which began on the local initiative of the Shevchenko soviet farm in the Ukraine, have rapidly won tremendous popularity amongst the peasantry. In the spring of 1930 the Tractorcentre is organising 162 machine and tractor depots, which will till an area of 3,750,000 hectares. By the autumn of 1930 the Tractorcentre proposes to organise 237 depots.

Apart from this, the agricultural co-operative societies propose themselves to organise, in the spring of this year, a large number of machine and tractor depots and tractor columns. The tractor column, consisting of several dozen tractors, does not represent a fully-developed organisation, and constitutes the embryo and incomplete form of the machine and tractor depot.

The machine and tractor depots are becoming centres of mass collectivisation. They possess the necessary tractors and machines, they organise the essential technical basis, they build up a skeleton force of skilled workmen, and at the same time they develop their work with the active participation of the peasant co-operators. Thus they are destined to be one of the decisive

methods of mass collectivisation, one of the best means of reorganising the petty peasant farms on the foundations of machine production and large-scale collective agriculture.

However, in view of the lack of tractors and larger agricultural machines, tens of thousands of the newly-erected collective farms are vitally interested in the organisation of *machine and horse* depots. By bringing about a definite centralisation of the means of production they provide a number of the advantages of collective farming. In many districts we cannot postpone mass collectivisation until tractors have arrived. In such cases machine and horse depots are a transitional step to the organisation of collective farms on the basis of tractors, combines and other higher-grade agricultural machinery. It is proposed this spring to organise over 7,000 machine and horse depots throughout the U.S.S.R.

Particularly important in the development of socialist agriculture is the success of our efforts to build up *soviet farms*, i.e., large-scale state agricultural undertakings. In the course of 1929, 55 new large soviet farms were created, under the control of the Grain trust, in which 1,950,000 hectares were tilled. This year 125 soviet estates, covering a tilled area of not less than 4,000,000 hectares, will be in existence. The whole of the ploughing will be carried out by tractors (10,000), while at least two-thirds of the harvesting will be carried out by 1,550 combines. You will see that these soviet estates are of a giant size, unprecedented throughout the world. Even in America there are no such large-scale agricultural undertakings as our large soviet estates. This year their output will be 830,000 tons, while next year their output will be over 3,000,000 tons of marketable grain. This means that the vast plan for the building of new soviet farms laid down in the five years' programme will by the third year have already been carried out nearly 200 *per cent*.

We do not hide the fact that in 1929, when we were casting up accounts for the year, we discovered considerable defects in the first year's work on the new soviet farms. The average harvest proved to be lower than was anticipated. This is to be explained by the unfavourable climatic conditions of this year and the predominance of virgin soil in the new soviet estates; furthermore, it should be borne in mind that we have to build the new soviet farms, as a rule, in districts which are constantly in peril of drought, and this is bound to have an effect on the harvest. This obliges us to take a number of steps to raise the output in the soviet farms. But individual defects cannot arrest the general movement towards the organisation of large-scale socialist agriculture. The experience of one of the most extensive new Soviet farms,—the "Gigant" (Giant), in the Northern Caucasus—shows what tremendous potentialities there are in undertakings of this

type. The "Gigant" not only carried out its full programme, but exceeded it, while the cost of production turned out to be much lower than was anticipated: a result of great importance, not only for the soviet farm movement, but also for the work of collectivisation. Soviet farms of this type are model organisations of large-scale socialist agriculture, and give a practical object lesson of the great advantages of such socialist organisation.

The formation of soviet farms in the sugar industry has made considerable progress, and similarly in the cotton-bearing districts. New centres for special soviet estates for cattle and sheep farming have been set up.

Apart from these new undertakings, we are continuing to develop as rapidly as possible the old soviet farms. In dimensions these are much smaller than the new farms, but they are much more numerous, and fall within territories which are agriculturally much more favourable.

These facts show how rapidly the building of soviet farms is developing. The soviet government is determined to continue the development of these farms, and is convinced that models of large-scale socialist agriculture can be, and will be, set in this way before the eyes of the millions of peasantry who have entered the collective farms.

I should also mention that recently in some districts relations have been established between the soviet farms and the surrounding collective farms, amalgamations being created under the leadership of the soviet farm. There is a great future before this form of development of socialist agriculture, given the necessary attention by the soviet farms themselves.

Exceptionally important in this connection is the problem of tractors, combines and agricultural power stations.

This year the output of agricultural machinery will be nearly doubled. Next year the plan provides for a further doubling again. The steps taken to enlarge tractor and combine production are worthy of particular attention. Part of the "Red Putilov" works has been transformed into an independent tractor works, while this year a large tractor works is being completed at Stalingrad; in addition, two new gigantic tractor works are being commenced this year in the Urals and the Ukraine. This autumn we shall have in the fields of the U.S.S.R. tractors whose aggregate power will be equivalent to that of nearly 100,000 tractors of the Fordson type. As yet imported machinery represents a considerable proportion of the whole; but next year the number of tractors produced in soviet works will begin to grow rapidly. Furthermore, the organisation of two very large combine works has begun in Northern Caucasus and Ukraine. Thus it will be seen that the soviet government, led by the Party, has taken drastic

steps to make a complete change in the technical basis of agriculture. I should add that this year the assembling shop of the motor works being built in Nizhni Novgorod has begun operations. As a result, we shall this summer have already two or three thousand motors of soviet construction in the country districts. This is an example of how before one's eyes the radical reconstruction of living conditions in the country is taking place.

The collectivisation of millions of peasant farms produces a radical change in the development of class relations in the villages. It is drawing more and more of the poor and middle peasantry into its scope. In the areas of wholesale collectivisation, this inevitably leads to the expropriation of the kulaks. The Central Committee resolution on January 5th pointed out that now "we have the material basis for *replacing* large-scale kulak production by large-scale collective production . . . not to speak of the soviet farms." Hence the Party was bound to review its attitude to the kulaks. The Party, in its resolution of January 5th, declared that it was necessary "to proceed in practice from the policy of limitation of the exploiting tendencies of the kulaks to the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class." It is with the watchword of "liquidating the kulaks as a class" that the Party is now advancing its work in the villages, and rallying around this watchword very wide masses of the peasantry in a determined struggle against the kulaks.

In view of the great differences in economic development existing between the various areas of the U.S.S.R., and also the totally different conditions under which agriculture has to develop, e.g., the central districts as compared with the soviet republics in the East, the Party's policy with regard to the kulaks cannot be applied without the necessary careful consideration of the peculiarities in the more backward districts. In the majority of the national republics in the East, our problem at the moment is to take the necessary preliminary steps through the co-operatives, soviets and Party organisations in the villages with the object of effecting the mass collectivisation of the peasant farms at some time in the future. The main task here is constantly to apply and enforce those limitations on the activities of the kulaks which arise out of the very foundations of communist and soviet policy. Hasty collectivisation in these districts imperils our contact with the masses, and is therefore not to be thought of for a moment. To fail to reckon with the peculiarities of the backward districts means to ignore one of the main principles of Leninist policy.

Mass collectivisation has fundamentally altered the productive basis of agriculture. Together with the development of the soviet farms, it means that socialist agriculture is growing up side by

side with socialist industry, and it will be clear to you that this is of tremendous significance for our economic life.

However, the picture of the economic development of our country will be incomplete if I do not mention some new facts in other spheres of our economic life.

This applies, above all, to the sphere of *commerce*. It is important to note that by the beginning of the present economic year 93 per cent. of the total commercial turnover came within the socialised sector, and only 7 per cent. in the private, which, by the end of the present year, will be further decreased approximately to 3 per cent. Private trading maintains itself almost entirely in the retail section. In addition should be noted the tremendous growth of the *Budget*. During the current year alone the Budget will expand by about 50 per cent. Quite recently there has taken place the reorganisation of the whole credit system, leading to its complete adaptation to the requirements of planned socialist economy. All these features reflect the success of the element of planning in our reconstruction, and this in its turn is a reflection of the growth of socialism in our country.

So much for the general picture of what is going on in the U.S.S.R.

II.—The Building of Socialism and the Masses.

The second part of my report will aim at showing *how* the building of socialism in our country is taking place. I shall have to deal with the political situation in the U.S.S.R., and in particular with the attitude of the working class and the masses of the peasantry. The successes of socialist construction mentioned above would have been impossible had not the working class and millions of the working peasantry been inspired with exceptional political enthusiasm, had not millions upon millions of them been rallied under the banner of the Communist Party and the soviet government. Our successes are founded on our support by the masses of workers and peasants.

I.—THE ENTHUSIASM OF THE MASSES.

When we speak of the participation of the working masses in socialist construction, we are speaking of the principal condition requisite for the success of this construction. The fulfilment of a great plan of production, the execution of plans for developing industry which expand year by year, are possible only with the active support of the widest sections of the workers. In its turn, our economic progress arouses the socialist enthusiasm of the working class. A striking example of the growing activity of the masses is the impressive response to the Central Committee's

appeal to fill the gaps in the execution of the industrial and financial plan. True, it cannot yet be said that the subsequent mobilisation of Party, trade union, Young Communist and economic organisations has completely ensured the fulfilment of the plan, but there is ample evidence to show that the workers' activity in carrying it out is steadily growing.

As an example of this attitude, I will quote the case of one of our largest works, the importance of which is enhanced by the fact that the principal items in its programme of production are locomotives, tractors and internal combustion engines. I refer to the "Comintern" locomotive works at Kharkov. On February 13th "Pravda" printed the manifesto of the workers, clerical staff and engineers of this works which was adopted at shop meetings and a works conference. The manifesto states:

"During the first quarter our work was poor and unorganised, arising out of the belief that everything would come right by the end of the year. The rate and methods of work of the factory organisations had not been readjusted in keeping with the economic tasks of the works. The falling short in the first quarter aroused all the organisations. The work was effectively reorganised. Those who tried to gloss things over by assertions that 'there was nothing very much wrong' were firmly put in their place. The whole works was mobilised to overcome the lag.

"The reorganisation of all the mass work in the factory, with the object of bringing it into direct touch with the 'shock brigades,'* was begun. The work of the Party groups was overhauled, and 171 industrial groups were organised at different points of production. Every single group had a thorough discussion on the reasons for the breakdown in its section. In addition, the breakdown was studied by specially appointed brigades, and a temporary control commission elected from the whole works.

"This made it possible to establish the precise reasons for the breakdown, and to begin the struggle for their elimination. An active part was played by the works paper, the 'Kharkov Locomotive Worker,' which began to appear every other day, instead of weekly as hitherto. Every other day shop wall-papers began to appear, showing how the programme was being carried out and drawing attention to the section lagging behind. A special leaflet for the workers, engineers and technical staff was issued, daily communiques were introduced in every shop, and inspections of the evening and night shifts were made. All these measures greatly increased the activity of the workers, and the temporary control commission received over 200 suggestions for improving the process of production. Socialist competition also received a

* Voluntary groups of workers who set the example in better work, elimination of waste, etc.

great impulse: 113 new shock brigades were formed, the number of brigade members rising from 2,302 to 3,884.

"The resolution of the Central Council of Trade Unions and the Central Committee of the Young Communist League, which dealt with the Lenin levy* of shock brigades, gave a new impetus to this movement. During the first two days of the Lenin levy over 600 entered the shock brigades. At the same time the masses began to stream into the Party. Hundreds of workers handed in collective applications for membership of the Communist Party to the shop cells.

"The enthusiasm and tremendous concentration of will and muscle on the part of the whole body of workers led to a complete victory.

"Instead of 11 locomotives, provided for under the January plan, 12 were produced; instead of 40 tractors, 50; and internal combustion engines to a total of 2,200 horse power, instead of 2,000 as planned. The steel works, the iron foundry and the copper foundry carried out their programme in full. The total programme for January has been carried out 113.3 per cent., and for the first four months of the new economic year the programme has been fulfilled 100.12 per cent."

The manifesto speaks for itself. The "Comintern" workers at Kharkov have won an honourable name for themselves. I need not add anything to what I have read. But I will quote the report of a comrade who was recently at this works by instruction of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. He gives the following opinion of the situation in the works:

"I am bound to say that there is quite unprecedented industrial enthusiasm. To take an example: the tractor shop, which is now working on a very full programme, has been very extensively covered with shock brigades, and people frequently come to work at 8 a.m. If the materials are not ready they are told to come back at 11. They go away and return at the appointed time, beginning work at any moment required. There are people who literally spend the night at the bench in this works."

Here, of course, we cannot help noticing the unsatisfactory arrangements made by the management. We have to meet similar defects in many factories. Yet, at the same time, this report also emphasises the unprecedented enthusiasm reigning amongst the working masses.

Another example can be drawn from experience at Dnieprostoi. The report of the departments of the Supreme Economic Council charged with supervision of this enterprise refers to the following very important achievements:

"Big successes, ranking with any in the world, have been

* See below.

achieved at the Dnieprostroi in the sphere of large-scale engineering. The successful damming of the middle channel of the Dniepr is one of these great achievements. Another is the fact that the Dnieprostroi has broken the world record for setting concrete. This record hitherto was held by the United States, at the Conovingo power station, the size of which is somewhat smaller than the first section of Dnieprostroi.

"The Conovingo station reached a monthly setting of 56,000 cubic metres of concrete. At the Dnieprostroi 58,000 cubic metres have been reached. It is worth noting that the American and German expert commissions, which have already been working for two years, did not consider the Dnieprostroi programme of production a practicable one, and declared in favour of a more protracted period for carrying out the works, basing themselves on the conditions which had prevailed prior to the present year. This mistake was due to their under-estimation of the importance of socialist competition, which has developed most extensively at Dnieprostroi."

I could quote a number of other illustrations of socialist competition at our works and factories no less striking than those at the "Comintern" works and the Dnieprostroi.

Socialist competition, emulation in the successful fulfilment of programmes of production, in the reinforcing of labour discipline and the raising of labour productivity, is growing everywhere. The number of shock brigades, which organise the most advanced participators in the competition, is growing constantly larger, notably in Moscow, Leningrad, Ukraine and the Urals. On January 21st, the anniversary of Lenin's death, the trade unions and the Young Communist League appealed to the working class of the Soviet Union to enrol 500,000 members in the shock brigades as a "Lenin levy." In the short space of a month over 900,000 working men and women had entered the shock brigades. This rapid rate is characteristic of the growth of the shock principle in our factories.

In some cases the workers pass on from the usual forms of competition of individual workers and groups, of individual shops and works, to new forms of socialist emulation. Such higher forms are productive groups and productive communes in the works. The aim of the usual forms of competition is to increase the productivity of labour and to carry out the programme of production, leading as a general rule to an increase in wages in keeping with the individual degree of skill of the various participators. When productive "collectives" and communes are organised in a works, the case is different. Those who take part in the productive communes, which as yet are not very numerous, pool their wages and divide them up *equally* amongst themselves.

This leads in turn not only to amalgamation in industry, but to the communalisation of living conditions (hostels, common dining room, etc.). In the "collectives" wages are paid on one common wages book, just as in the communes, but are divided according to the grade to which various groups of participators in the "collective" are allotted. To-day's "Pravda" gives examples of productive "collectives" and communes organised in the Urals, where they have been developed most widely. In the one area of Zlatoust there are over 1,000 such bodies. The experience of this new form of competition has as yet been very little studied. But, of course, these are not the principal forms at present; it must be clearly understood that the principal form at the present time is, and is bound to be, the shock brigades. The advanced workers in the shock brigades have to set an example to the whole mass of workers of how to consolidate intelligent proletarian discipline in the factories, how the activity of the masses should be directed towards raising the productivity of labour, and consequently how to strive to fulfil, and if possible to surpass, the production programme.

Naturally, there is still a great deal lacking in the shock brigade movement. Not infrequently formal decisions to set up shock brigades are passed without preliminary work amongst the masses, which, of course, does not lead to real improvements in production. I could quote a number of cases in which works or shops which declared themselves shock undertakings have as yet given no perceptible improvements in production. It would not be difficult to point out tendencies towards "effect" and mere agitation in this movement. The Party carries on an energetic warfare against all these defects.

But at the same time socialist competition has already many examples of genuinely successful proletarian initiative to record. Here are two such examples. The first is at the "Stalin" metal works at Leningrad:

"After an output in the first quarter of 1929-30 which was 11 per cent. lower than the programme, the 'Stalin' metal works in January, the first month of the second quarter, produced 148 per cent. of the monthly plan, with output to a total value of 2.67 million roubles.

"The breakdown in the first quarter was completely liquidated and surpassed in all branches of production with the exception of turbines. The turbine shop, which carried out the first quarter's plan only to 56 per cent., exceeded the plan by 20 per cent. in January, and turned out four turbines instead of three. The boiler shop turned out in the first quarter 20 boilers with a surface area of 683 square metres; in January alone it turned out 12 boilers with a surface area of 3,800 square metres.

"The whole works staff has pulled itself together noticeably. The number of shock brigades is growing rapidly. On January 15th the works had 60 brigades, comprising 430 members, while by February 6th the number of brigades had risen to 199, which included 60 per cent. of all the workers employed." (*Ekonomicheskaya Zhizn* (Economic Life) of February, 1930.)

Here is a second example, the Nizhni Saldinsky works in the Urals :

"A splendid model of Communist attitude to work is the activity of the Nizhni Saldinsky workers. On February 1st all the main shops joined the C.P.S.U. The works has been 70 per cent. 'communised.' The workers who joined the Party at the same time joined the 'collectives.' As a result, discipline and productivity improved greatly. During the first ten days of February the works carried out the programme 102 per cent. for the first time this year" (*Pravda*, February 13th, 1930).

The competition which takes the form of shock brigades is the best method for the socialist training of the workers. It teaches the proletarian masses to approach their own labour in a socialist spirit, and strengthens the first elements of communist consciousness in the working class.

One interesting fact should be noted in connection with this. We frequently meet with a situation in which the initiative for developing the shock movement in the factories and works—both in the form of brigades and in the form of productive collectives and communes—comes from the non-party workers. The Central Committee of the Party has recorded the fact that there is a very small proportion of communists and Y.C.L.ers in the shock brigades. The contrasting of these two facts is an indication of how even the Party organisations lag behind the growing activity of the mass of workers. At the same time, it shows very clearly that the shock movement in present conditions comes from the mass itself and that it is the reflection of a genuinely rising enthusiasm in the working class. It is just this that constitutes the greatest importance of the competition, and the foundation of the stability and reliability of the shock movement. In spite of the fact that some of our organisations lag behind, it is our Party, of course, which heads the movement. In their turn, all the best workers of the shock brigades tend to join the Communist Party and enter the ranks of its most active members. Those communists and Y.C.L.ers who lag behind have to pull themselves together.

The watchword of socialist competition was put forward by Lenin as long ago as 1918, but in practice began to be carried into effect on a large scale only in 1929. Scarcely a year had passed

before it began to be very widely popularised, on the initiative of the Young Communist League. To-day it is one of the most popular slogans in the working class.

Equally characteristic of the growing political activity of the working class are the new forms which the mass participation of the workers in the management of the state is taking. This springs directly from the carrying into effect of the watchword of self-criticism. The essential importance of this watchword is its assistance in mobilising the masses to fight bureaucracy, distortions of our class policy in state bodies, and elements of demoralisation in the state machinery and in the party organisations themselves. It is a watchword that has become one of the best means of drawing the masses into the work of government. Owing to this the new forms whereby the mass of workers participate in the state apparatus acquire great importance, particularly in connection with the cleansing of the state machinery from elements hostile to the proletariat.

The XVI. Party Congress devoted particular attention to the struggle against bureaucracy, and thereafter the promotion of workers into the state machinery, and control of its work from below, grew more extensive and took on new forms. One of the latter is the so-called "patronage," exercised by works and factories over soviet and co-operative institutions. In the Moscow region alone, including Moscow with its government offices, I could name 35 offices over which factories and works have established their patronage. In Leningrad there are over 20 such factories, in Nizhni Novgorod and Kiev seven each, etc.

Another form of participation of the workers in the business of administration is the employment of workers' brigades in carrying out various tasks set them by the state, apart from their participation in the cleansing of the state machinery. Thus, in order to collect arrears of taxation on private traders, tens of thousands of workers, mainly volunteers, were employed in a number of towns. Already substantial results have been achieved, and over 25,000,000 roubles collected on account of arrears. At the same time improvements have been brought about in all the work of the finance department.

Thus we see how the workers' share in controlling the state machinery from below is increasing.

In connection with the practical application of the slogan of *self-criticism*, I believe it is necessary to mention one example which the Party brought out with particular force in front of the masses of workers. This example is the notorious Astrakhan case. At Astrakhan, one of the most remote of our cities, where there are practically no large industrial undertakings and where,

owing to special local conditions (the fishing industry), private capital has played a prominent part in local economic life for a fairly long time, extensive corruption in the soviet machinery was discovered. The influence of the private traders had led to the corruption of a number of soviet and co-operative bodies, and had affected the local leadership of the Party. The Party opened up this ulcer ruthlessly and decisively. Those guilty of corruption, both soviet employees and private traders, were sent for trial. Fourteen of the principal culprits, including three former communists, were sentenced to be shot. Apart from severe judicial measures, resolute cleansing of the Party organisation took place. About 19 per cent. of the leading members, 56 in all, were expelled from the Party. The leading personnel of the organisation was changed to the extent of more than two-thirds of its number. Tens of thousands of workers and toilers were drawn into the cleansing operations throughout the districts. The Astrakhan organisation still has serious work to do in consolidating all the steps taken and improving its work.

What were the practical results at Astrakhan of these measures?

•First of all, a complete change in the attitude towards the private trader. The collection of all kinds of arrears, running into millions of roubles, took a sharp turn for the better. The rôle of the state and the co-operatives in trade greatly increased. The fishing industry has also passed almost completely into the hands of the state and the co-operatives. A very serious test for the local organisations was the autumn catch. They passed the test with flying colours. The programme was not only carried out but surpassed by 42 per cent. These are the main results of the Astrakhan case, and serve as a brilliant illustration of the application of the slogan of self-criticism in practice, as well as an extra proof of our successful progress along the road to socialism.

In the improvement of the state apparatus and the drawing of the working masses into the business of administration we have therefore won undoubted successes during recent months. But this is only a beginning of the real mass enlistment of the workers in these activities. By avoiding bureaucratic regulations by every possible means, we must ensure in the future an even greater development of mass participation in the whole business of governing the country.

I have already quoted sufficient illustrations to show how, thanks to the tremendous growth of mass activity, the building up of socialist industry—the leading branch of national economy—has made great strides. We have seen what new forms of participation of the masses in the work of government we now possess. On the other hand, the fact of mass collectivisation bears witness to the advancing of millions in the countryside towards socialism.

Sufficient has been said of this also. Now I must dwell, in the most general way, on *what rendered possible* such an advance amongst the great mass of the peasantry.

2.—THE VILLAGE TURNS TO SOCIALISM.

The entry of the peasant masses on the road of collectivisation was the result of all the work of the Party and the soviet government in recent years. The soviet system alone, rendering possible as it does the drawing of great masses of the workers into the task of building socialism, could create the necessary conditions for this historic change. Only as a result of greatly increased confidence of the working masses in the villages towards the soviet government and the policy of the C.P.S.U. could this change take place in the opinions of the peasantry. The change is founded, first of all, on our great successes in the restoration and reconstruction of industry on socialist lines; secondly, on the successful application of the policy of limiting the growth of capitalist elements, and, particularly in recent years, of intensified attack on the kulaks while simultaneously and systematically granting the utmost government assistance to the poor and middle peasant farms; thirdly, on the rapid development in the last two years of the soviet and large collective farms, and the utilisation of tractors and complex agricultural machinery, which have greatly quickened the general realisation amongst the peasantry of the advantages of large-scale socialist agriculture. Naturally, the successes here enumerated should be taken in conjunction with the whole political and educational work of the Party in the village and amongst the workers. Once this is realised we can understand what is going on in the villages.

At the same time it must be clear that none of this could take place without a vast and unprecedented expansion of the activity of the peasants themselves in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. Without this, no influence from above, no agitation, no skill in mass organisation could adequately explain the mass collectivisation which now covers tens of thousands of villages. True, when the collectivisation plans are being applied there are cases of over-zealousness for administrative methods among our workers. In the scramble to have the most advanced district, attempts are sometimes made to replace by mere pressure from above the real work of genuinely preparing the masses for collectivisation. This might result in waverings amongst certain sections of the peasantry who have already moved in the direction of the collective farms. Such events can inflict tremendous damage on the collective farming movement, and consequently the Party carries on a determined battle against them. However, it would be foolish not to see the wood for the trees, and to fail

to realise that the foundation of mass collectivisation is the tumultuous energy and activity of the peasant masses. Only by understanding this shall we understand how collectivisation to-day takes place.

I could quote many vivid examples of how the activity of millions of peasants breaks loose and pours in a vast torrent along the channel of the collective farming movement. Numerous examples of this are printed day by day in our newspapers. I must limit myself to a very few examples.

I have already mentioned the "Gigant" soviet farm in the Northern Caucasus. It is not yet two years old. But, during the last year alone, it has been inspected by over 50,000 visitors who have made themselves acquainted with this best model of large-scale socialist agriculture in our country. One of the visitors, the peasant Grib, of the village of Preobrozhensky, Tersky district, left the following letter at the farm :

"I have visited the Gigant farm, i.e., the farm of our proletarian state, where for ages the landlords walked to and fro, and now the fields are ploughed up with steel horses. When I get home to my own village I must tell my comrades, the poor and middle peasants, that we must all go as one man into the collective farm on the 12th anniversary of November. If the kulaks and their parasites try to prevent us, we shall shut their mouths and send them up to the Murmansk coast to catch fish with their trousers."

This statement expresses the frame of mind of many hundreds of thousands of peasants who have only now had their eyes opened to the advantages of socialist agriculture on a large scale. After seeing a Soviet estate with his own eyes, Grib came to the conclusion that the poor and middle peasants "as one man" must enter the collective farms and begin a sharp struggle with the kulaks. This is the mood in which millions of poor and middle peasants are entering the collective farms.

I will quote another example. It shows how the peasants in the collective farms influence the non-collectivised districts, and how this influence leads to the formation of yet further collective farms. I am quoting from the report of the Ostrogzhsky district committee of the Party, on the mass propaganda expedition of collective farmers into the non-collective villages of the Nikitovsky area. Here is this most interesting report :

"From the village of Degtyarny we moved to the village of Gritsyno. Ahead went the 'cavalry' of the collective farmers, numbering 120, behind them 70 wagons with red flags. From this village there moved on and joined us about 1,500 of the poor peasants. On foot and in broken ranks they set out across the mountain; it all reminded us of our campaign at the front in 1918-19. The unorganised mass and the collective farmers went

together through the villages. The leaders of the detachments drew up the ranks and reported to those present on the objects of their tour—a 'military' report on the peaceful subject of collective farms! Afterwards there was a meeting and a show, and the nett result was that the unorganised mass entered the collective farm."

In this way the collective farmers infect by their enthusiasm new sections of the toilers, who now are moving in serried ranks along the road of collectivisation.

The problem of the political education and organisation of the peasant masses which are entering the peasant farms is developing at such a rapid rate that the most active help is required in the villages from the industrial workers to enable it to be successfully dealt with. It was on account of this that the Party and the trade unions proclaimed a mobilisation of the advanced workers in the factories for the countryside. *Seventy thousand workers*, instead of the twenty-five thousand asked for, responded to the call in a very short time. The majority of them were not members of the Party. Selecting the best, we have sent over 25,000 workers into the villages during the last two months. This mobilisation took place amidst scenes of great enthusiasm, as can be seen, for example, from the following communication in a local paper:

"The despatch of 200 workers leaving for the collective farms of the Northern Caucasus became a gigantic demonstration, in which about 30,000 took part" (*Molot (The Hammer)*, February 1st, 1930).

The villages also met the mobilisation of the workers most sympathetically. This is evidenced by the reports coming in from the districts to the effect that the majority of the workers sent are already in the leading bodies of the collective farms.

Furthermore, the Party and the soviets have quite recently carried out a mobilisation of several thousand workers from amongst their leading officers, particularly members of town soviets. This also has been of great assistance to the villages in their task of collectivisation.

The workers sent to the villages have begun already to send in their impressions. The latter reflect the same fact of vast enthusiasm amongst the peasant masses. Here is what Comrade Zaitsevsky, a workman of the Moscow "Parostroi" works, and one of "the 25,000," writes of his observations in the Penza district. Describing a peasant meeting at which a resolution was passed to enter the collective farm, Comrade Zaitsevsky concludes his letter thus:

"I have been in the Red Army, I have been at the front when the Soviet Republic was in peril at the hands of the Whites, but nothing at any time moved me so deeply as this meeting. The

position in the villages to-day is such that we shall undoubtedly fulfil everything we have planned."

Granted all the exceptional optimism of the writer, his words reflect all that is new in the state of mind of the villages. But I shall yet have to speak of the vast efforts required, precisely because of the rapid growth of the collective farming movement, if the collective farms are to be transformed into genuinely socialist undertakings.

3.—THE RISING TIDE OF CULTURE.

The enthusiasm making itself felt amongst the working class and the great mass of the peasantry finds its outlet also in the sphere of culture. Cultural standards are rising at an exceptionally rapid rate. Nothing else was to be expected in a country in which Socialism is being built.

In the sphere of culture we are terribly backward. It is sufficient to say that, even in 1920, and even in the R.S.F.S.R.—the relatively most cultured part of the Soviet Union—there were only a little over 30 per cent. of the people literate. We have most backward regions in the East, such as Turkmenistan and Tadjikistan, where the literates in the villages number only one or two per cent.

But during the revolutionary years a tremendous work of education has been carried out. The liquidation of illiteracy has made particular strides during the last two years. In the R.S.F.S.R. alone, in 1929, it embraced about 2,000,000 people. This year, this scale is being enlarged by roughly 400 per cent.

In all directions an intense cultural effort is proceeding. In addition to the schools for liquidating illiteracy there has been a noticeable increase in the number of elementary schools, and next year it is proposed to introduce in practice universal compulsory education (at first in the R.S.F.S.R.). The number of adult schools, technical and industrial courses for young workers, schools for young peasants, polytechnics and colleges is constantly growing. Clubs in the towns and workers' settlements, reading huts in the villages, are on the increase. The network of wireless stations and receivers is rapidly widening. Particularly great is the demand for newspapers and books.

One of the most vivid indications of the growth in activity of the masses and their cultural progress is the demand for mass political literature. In 1929 the State Publishing Agency of the R.S.F.S.R. alone published about 30,000,000 copies of such literature as against 10,000,000 the previous year. In connection with the spring sowing campaign, a little over 2,000,000 copies of books were issued last year, whereas this year the State Publishing Agency is issuing over 25,000,000, the purchasers for which are

already assured. Equally symptomatic is the circulation of our newspapers. I will quote the example of the *Krestyanskaya Gazeta* (Peasant Newspaper), the newspaper most popular in the countryside. It is published twice weekly, with a circulation of 1,750,000. In connection with the spring sowing campaign, a special issue of this paper came out in 10½ million copies, and this quantity did not satisfy the whole demand. Very often we have to take artificial steps to limit the print of our newspapers and books, as, in spite of the rapid development of our paper production, we are suffering from an acute paper famine.

The facts I have cited are evidence that socialist construction is being accompanied and consolidated by the cultural progress of the working masses. Without that progress, socialism could not be built on firm foundations.

This cultural progress is most closely bound up with the changes now taking place in the social and living conditions of the workers and peasants. The break-up of the system of petty individual economy in the villages brings with it radical alterations in the peasants' living conditions. The consolidation of socialised economy will involve the rapid development of various socialised forms of living conditions in the countryside. Socialist construction in the towns raises even more acutely the question of changing the living conditions of the working men and women. The importance of housing and consumers' co-operation is growing, particularly as regards the development of public dining rooms.

Arising out of the building of our gigantic new factories, we are already faced with the practical question of building new cities of a socialist type. For example, in the districts where the vast tractor works at Stalingrad (*Tractorostroi*) and the new giant metallurgical works in the Urals (*Magnitostroi*) are being built, provision is being made for the erection of new large settlements which are in fact cities of a new type. A lively discussion of these new problems of social life is developing.

Particularly important is the introduction in our factories and offices of the so-called "continuous working week," i.e., four days' work and one day's rest. While as a result of this change the number of rest days of the individual worker has certainly not decreased, work goes on in the factories and offices all the year round, apart from the five days of the main revolutionary holidays. This increases the work of the factories by 60 days a year and hastens the absorption of the unemployed. By now 53 per cent. of the industrial workers are working the continuous week, while in some branches of industry, e.g., coal mining and electrical engineering, the overwhelming majority of the undertakings have completed the transition. The introduction of the four-day working week in all institutions, it must be mentioned, has taken place

without an increase in the number of government employees, and has made it possible for the workers to apply to government and co-operative offices on any day, as well as to Party and trade union organisations.

It is in the light of all this, and particularly the tremendous wave of culture amongst the masses, that we must consider the change in the attitude of the masses towards the priests, as representing the reactionary ideology of religion.

The capitalist press throughout the world, and its "socialist" echoes, are at present making a great outcry about this, in development of their anti-soviet campaign. This lying outcry reflects the growing alarm of the bourgeoisie, faced as it is with the vast activity developing in the working class and the sudden advance in the peasant masses, which have moved by dozens of millions along the channel of collectivisation and liquidation of the kulaks as a class.

4.—THE MASSES AND THE PARTY.

Lastly, what has been the direct effect of all this on the Party? The unprecedented successes achieved have had the effect of leading to a great influx of workers into the Communist Party, and a further increase in its authority in the eyes of the workers and peasants.

The Party is absorbing new drafts of many thousands of advanced workers, and at the same time cleansing its ranks of elements which are foreign to its spirit, which accidentally found their way into its ranks, or which had become demoralised. This general cleansing of the Party has been going on already for many months, with the active assistance of non-party workers and the toilers generally. In the cleansing process the mass of workers received a new proof that the Party is irreconcilably against all elements which are alien to the proletariat, unreliable from the communist point of view, bureaucratic and corrupt. The expulsion of such elements from the ranks of the Party raises its prestige in the eyes of the workers. The results of the cleansing show that in the majority of Party organisations about 11 per cent. on an average have been expelled; in relation to the *workers* in the Party, the percentage is lower (8 per cent.). The cleansing has not yet been concluded. It is natural that the checking of over 1½ million members and probationers of the Party requires considerable time.

In recent months the Party cleansing has been accompanied by an increasingly large recruitment of workers into the Party. This new phase is a reflection of the general rising enthusiasm amongst the masses.

I have already had to deal in the press with this mass influx of workers. I quoted the case of the Kolomna works, one of the biggest machine building factories near Moscow, where during the "Lenin days" 12 shops signed a collective application to join the Party. Some weeks later similar applications were put in by all the other shops, and in this way over 8,000 metal workers, in 37 shops, collectively declared their desire to enter the C.P.S.U.

It is characteristic that this took place at a factory, the majority of the workers in which have still their links with the villages and of recent months have entered the collective farms in a body.

The Kolomna works is no exception. In Leningrad alone, 24 shops in 15 works, comprising 5,184 workers, throughout the largest factories such as the *Red Putilov*, the *Runner*, the *Red Triangle*, the *Bolshevik*, the *Stalin Metal Works*, the *Red Viborg Worker*, the *Northern Shipyards*, the *Red Dawn* and others, have put in collective applications for admission to the Party. There is not a single working-class area of any importance in which there have not been similar collective declarations by shops and even whole factories. We have had them from the Don Bas and Dniepropetrovsk, in the South, to Perm in the North, from Krasnoyarsk in Siberia, to Ivanovo-Voznesensk and Bezhitsa in the West. As a rule these collective applications are made by the shock brigades, or else resolutions are adopted simultaneously to apply for membership of the Party and to proclaim the shop a shock brigade. In Moscow the entire body of workers in four factories passed resolutions to apply collectively for membership of the Party. In all, during the last six weeks, we have had in seven of our largest Party districts over 120,000 applications from workers.

These facts speak for themselves eloquently enough. They vividly reflect the new enthusiasm of the mass of workers, and give some indication of the tremendous growth of the Party's authority in the eyes of the working class.

In this connection the Central Committee has made an alteration in the decision adopted 18 months ago to the effect that the Party by the end of 1930 should be not less than 50 per cent. composed of workers at the bench. The alteration is that the Central Committee has recognised this objective as attainable *earlier* than the time fixed, namely, by the 16th Party Congress in May. This is of great bearing on the strengthening of the Party. The Party has also recognised it as desirable to increase the recruitment of agricultural labourers, poor peasants and the most advanced collective farmers.

The mass influx into our Party is not allowed in any way to relax our demands of the applicants. Admission takes place only

individually, whether application has been made individually or collectively. This is how the Party acted during the memorable Lenin levy in 1924, and it acts on this precedent to-day. While emphasising the political importance of the fact of collective applications by the workers, the Party tests the desirability of admission in each individual case. The Party is bound to take cognisance of the fact that even elements hostile to the proletarian revolution, from Mensheviks to Black Hundreds inclusive, find their way into the ranks of the working class. We consider it essential that the Party should have its ranks swelled by the really advanced workers, capable of moving at the head of the working class both in production (through socialist competition and the shock brigades) and in struggle against every sign of hostile class influence (petty bourgeois waverings in periods of difficulty, jingoism, etc.).

Summarising all that has been said, my report was intended to show, although in the most general way, what is going on in our country and by what means socialism is being built in the U.S.S.R. The facts which show the growth of socialism and the unprecedented enthusiasm of the masses are ample evidence to prove that the U.S.S.R. is striding forward along the road to communism.

Marx wrote: "The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism by weapons. Material force must be overthrown by force equally material; but even theory becomes a material force directly it takes hold of the masses." These last words of Marx are particularly appropriate to what is now going on in the U.S.S.R. From the time that not only in the working class but also amongst the millions of peasantry, there began to take place the definite turn of the tide towards socialism, the ideas of communism "become a material force." These ideas, penetrating deeper and deeper into the masses, become transformed into the real facts of socialist construction, the volume of which is becoming truly gigantic.

III.—The Tasks of the Party.

Let us pass now to the third part of my report, on the tasks of the Party.

Needless to say, all our main problems follow from the economic development of the Soviet Union, which constitutes the basis of the building of socialism. In particular, these tasks are closely connected with the carrying out of the industrial and financial plan, the backbone of all our constructive work. I shall deal only with the most important.

I.—THE SOWING CAMPAIGN.

First on the order of the day at present is the spring sowing campaign. Its importance is truly decisive, and this is recognised by all those whom we can justly reckon amongst the most far-seeing enemies of the U.S.S.R. Thus the "Observer," the leading British conservative newspaper, writing on February 2nd on such facts as the lack of tractors, the slaughtering of cattle and the sale or consumption of seeds intended for the sowing, states:

"These are perhaps the principal obstacles to the success of the spring planting and the decisive harvest which will follow it. If they are overcome, and the ambitious projects for extending the planted acreage and increasing the yield per acre are realised, the Russian revolution will have solved its basic contradiction of building up socialism in a peasant country . . . The tremendous significance of the issues at stake is obvious. That is why all eyes in Russia are turned towards the 'agrarian front,' where a struggle which will ultimately loom larger in history than nine-tenths of the so-called decisive battles of the world is now being fought out."

The British conservative newspaper understands very well the importance of the extension of the area sown, and the increasing of the harvest in the U.S.S.R. just in the *present* year. The outcome of the agricultural campaign decides a great deal in the whole fabric of socialist construction. Its victory means the victory of collectivisation and the crushing of the kulaks as a class. It will be a decisive victory for socialist construction in our country.

Since more than half of all the peasant households have entered the collective farms, and have begun to carry out in practice the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class, the grain and food supply in general of the towns becomes directly dependent upon the socialised sector of agriculture. Up to last year this sector was responsible for a very small percentage of the grain output. About three-quarters of grain marketed came from the individual poor and middle peasant farms. In addition, one-fifth came from the kulak farms, thus occupying a very substantial place in the grain supply. In respect of other foodstuffs, such as meat and butter, the part played by the kulak farms was even more important. This year there is a radical change in the relationship between the various social sectors in agriculture. The rôle of the kulak farms falls sharply. Undoubtedly the individual sector still retains considerable importance, particularly in some of the grain districts where a large part of the poor and middle peasants have not yet been brought into collective farms. However, the supply of grain and other foodstuffs will now depend first and foremost on the collective farms, together with the soviet farms. Thus the

main question is, to what extent will the socialised section of agriculture deal adequately with its problems.

This is the economic aspect. As we are speaking of the supply of the main foodstuffs to the towns, it will be easy to understand the political importance also of the spring sowing campaign. But a correct picture of the political importance of the campaign depends upon realisation of what is involved in the practical application of the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class. Mass collectivisation, embracing the overwhelming majority of the poor and middle peasant farms, is bound to be accompanied by expropriation of the kulaks. The Party watchword of liquidating the kulaks as a class in the principal agricultural districts is now being effected by practical measures applied by the peasant masses with the support and under the leadership of the proletarian dictatorship.

Until quite recently there existed in the Soviet Union about 25,000,000 individual peasant farms, of which 1.2 to 1.3 millions were kulak farms. With their families the kulak section represent a population of six or seven millions. These figures alone show that the drastic changes now taking place involve many difficulties.

The approach of the spring sowing campaign facilitates the speeding up of the main social and political changes in the villages. The rate of collectivisation has been rapidly increasing of late, and this was bound to be accompanied by an acute sharpening of the class struggle in the villages. In spite of the fact that the overwhelming mass of the peasantry are intensely hostile to the kulaks, the latter continue to try to resist. In its turn this leads to a more severe struggle and the hastening of the process of expropriation. We are living at a time when the kulaks are undergoing a crushing blow.

Naturally the application of this watchword necessitates new practical measures on the part of the machinery of the proletarian dictatorship. Without dealing in detail with these measures, I will only say that the approach of the sowing campaign necessitates the maximum of systematic organisation in carrying them through.

Mass collectivisation has created in the countryside conditions which are totally different from those previously prevailing. To-day, the principal question in the sowing campaign is that of the socialised sector. The preparations for the sowing campaign in the collective farms throws great responsibilities, not only on the leadership of the collective farms, but on all our organisations.

Without the most concentrated effort we cannot succeed in extending the area sown and increasing the harvest.

The first tasks in this campaign are the creation of adequate seed reserves and the repairing of agricultural machinery. The Party has devoted great attention to this in recent weeks. The

progress achieved in carrying out these tasks is reflected in systematic bulletins published in our press. We consider the sowing campaign, no less than the struggle to carry out the industrial and financial plan, a most important front of socialist construction, necessitating the mobilisation of tremendous forces of the working class and peasantry, and the systematic leadership of the Party. As a result, we already have fairly important successes in respect of the seed supply: according to the People's Commissariat for Agriculture of the U.S.S.R., over 80 per cent. of the plan has been completed, and we have every reason to believe that in the near future the full programme will be carried out. The districts with a bad harvest will be assisted out of the state reserves. Matters are not quite so favourable as regards the repair of agricultural machinery and tractors, in which we are still lagging behind. But here, too, great efforts have been made recently.

In the southern areas we have already reached a new stage in the sowing campaign, the organisation of the sowing itself. To imagine that this takes place "spontaneously" means to underestimate the responsibilities devolving upon us. The approaching sowing campaign definitely imposes upon us the task of organising the actual sowing in bolshevik fashion. We must prepare the collective farms for an organised entry into the fields. We have to do a very great deal, during the days and weeks which remain, in respect of the organisation of labour during the sowing campaign. In this we have a very difficult problem since we are extremely badly prepared. Nevertheless, we believe we can organise a real bolshevik sowing.

Our experience last year in the Khopersky district (wholly collectivised) on the Lower Volga, whatever its deficiencies, has convinced us of the possibility of successfully carrying through the sowing campaign this year. The autumn campaign in that district was exceptionally successful. The collective ploughing in the autumn for the spring sowings exceeded the area of the previous year by 150-200 per cent.

To take another example, in the same district, and in several others of the Volga region, the peasants all this winter have carried out undertakings which have never been thought of on such a scale before. Over a vast territory of about 1,000,000 hectares in the Lower Volga, mass preparations for artificial retention of snow in the fields were made; special ploughing of the snow, building of snow walls, etc. Despite the elementary character of this work, it is of the greatest importance in fighting drought, while its execution on such a vast scale is within the powers of only a collectivised countryside.

Thus if we in real bolshevik fashion prepare and organise the

sowing campaign, we shall be able to carry out the task of extending the area sown by 10-15 per cent. This alone would mean a great victory on the agricultural front, and would consolidate the socialist reconstruction of agriculture in the highest degree.

In order to organise the sowing campaign, the Party is sending a large number of people into the villages. Thousands of responsible Party workers are now being sent into the districts, not to speak of tens of thousands of advanced non-Party workers. A special mobilisation of agricultural experts is taking place. The supply of literature and the treatment of problems of the sowing campaign in our press have been greatly extended.

The spring sowing campaign is a test of collectivisation and a test of the whole work of the Party in the villages. We attribute tremendous importance to this work. We have set before ourselves the objective of smashing at all costs the prophecies of our enemies abroad who foretell a famine for our country. We believe that our enemy will once again prove mistaken, while collectivisation will achieve its decisive victory.

This is how matters stand with the first and most important task of the present moment.

2.—THE PROBLEM OF PERSONNEL.

Passing to the question of personnel: at the present stage of socialist construction this problem is an outstanding one. Our weakest spot lies here. The lack of experienced workers makes itself felt literally in all branches of our constructive work, and makes this problem exceptionally acute. The growth of our cadres up to the present time lags far behind the growth of national economy. It is for this reason that of late we have had so frequently to have recourse to all kinds of mobilisations—for the technical colleges and the collective farms, for local work and the central government institutions. First and foremost, this affects the communists, but mobilisations of non-party experts also (engineers, agronomists, doctors, etc) are becoming more and more frequent. The need for workers, particularly for technical experts, is growing.

The problem of personnel can be divided into two parts—the treatment of the old cadres and the preparation of the new.

Our main cadres still consist of the old scientists and technical experts. The influx of new really proletarian experts is still very insignificant. Hence the problem of the proper distribution and employment of the old cadres had, and still has, exceptional importance. It is not merely an economic, but a profoundly political problem. The proper fitting in of the old expert forces into the machinery of socialist construction is a very complicated task and,

as experience has shown, has far from invariably been fulfilled with satisfaction. An example is the sabotage of engineers and technicians in industry. In spite of having discovered many counter-revolutionary organisations for sabotage, we have still not yet properly cleansed our state machinery of saboteurs. The latter continue to maintain their group solidarity, and are headed by prominent ideologists, irreconcilable enemies of the soviet government, drawn from the old scientific and technical forces. We still have to deal with individual acts, overt and covert, of these people. In their person the soviet order has relentless enemies, always dreaming of the return to power of the landlords and capitalists. Characteristically enough, these wrecking organisations noticeably increased their activity at the sharpest moments of the Trotskyist struggle against the Party. The ideologists of counter-revolution were banking on the disintegration of the Party. The open demonstrations of the Right opposition were also of importance to them. Thus the academician Platonov, one of the most prominent ideologists of monarchism, frankly declared in his evidence: "I consider the most politically far-sighted people to be the Right elements in the ruling party, since their outlook, taken in perspective, is correct." The enemies of the working class interpreted the political position of the Right elements in the Party after their own fashion.

Naturally, we cannot expect that the ideologists of counter-revolution and active participants in sabotage should abjure their own cause. The workers' dictatorship takes decisively repressive steps against them. But this counter-revolutionary group plays the part of a tiny minority even amongst the old experts. Up to the most recent date the most prominent part in the Union Academy of Science at Leningrad and the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences at Kiev was played by anti-soviet elements. In spite of this, we cannot consider these counter-revolutionaries to be representative of the main body of the old intellectuals. At all events they did not succeed and could not succeed in rallying round themselves any considerable proportion of the intellectuals.

At the same time we must recognise that the work of sifting out the intellectuals, particularly amongst the engineers and technicians, continues to be extremely unsatisfactory. Our trade unions have not been able to cope with the task. Yet this task must be classed amongst our most important obligations. When historic events, such as the turning of the middle peasant towards socialism and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, are taking place, there is no room for neutrality in politics. The whole mass of the old intellectuals, and the technical personnel in particular, must realise this. 1930 is the last date for choosing the road. Either with the proletariat and the peasant masses to socialism,

or with the saboteurs to counter-revolution—this is the question that faces the old cadres of intellectuals.

We must help them to choose their path, we must intensify our work of *re-educating* the main body of these cadres and help them to pass from neutrality to conscious support of the policy of the proletariat. We must give support to that frame of mind amongst the experts which facilitates the coming together of the intellectuals with the working class, and ensure their more active participation in the building of socialism. The policy of drawing into greater activity elements from amongst old experts which are politically akin to the proletariat is particularly important just now. While systematically exposing the sabotage and bringing out its counter-revolutionary class significance, it is essential to redouble our attention to, and care for, the main body of engineering and technical personnel. We can already perceive a definite break in its attitude towards socialist construction. Evidence of this is a number of mass demonstrations of experts in Moscow and Leningrad, which have taken place around the watchwords of fighting sabotage and active participation in the building of socialism. Other evidence is the growing number of cases of exceptional loyalty to their work, and what must be frankly called labour heroism of some of the engineers and technicians in our undertakings. Lastly, amongst the advanced section of the soviet intellectuals, there has considerably increased the movement to join the C.P.S.U.

The lack of experts obliges us to draw on the scientific and technically skilled workers whom we can get from abroad. By the end of last year there were already working in the factories of the U.S.S.R. 850 specially employed foreign experts and 550 skilled workers. Most of these came from Germany. The recruiting of new workers from Germany, and also from America, will be increased in the future. For the Tractorostroi at Stalingrad alone, from two to three hundred skilled workers knowing the tractor industry will be required. A group of engineers is being brought from Japan to work on the rationalisation of the railway transport. Special groups of engineers and workers are being recruited for the other giants in process of construction. In this way we absorb the experience of large-scale production in the advanced capitalist countries, and shall do this still more extensively in the future.

However, the core of the whole problem of personnel is the training of new experts. Whatever our achievements as regards the proper utilisation of the old forces, we are bound to reckon with the fact that a certain section of them is incapable of properly readjusting itself in keeping with the new problems of socialist economic reconstruction, and that the vast new demands made

upon us can by no means be adequately served by the numerically limited old cadres. We are building a number of great undertakings, and developing branches of industry which in the old Russia either did not exist or existed only in embryo. The motor and tractor industries, a number of new chemical industries, light metallurgy—all this vast process of construction necessitates new knowledge, and cannot be completely served by the old personnel. In the sphere of agriculture the question of personnel is even more acute. There were very few old experts in this sphere, and scarcely any at all in Russia with a knowledge of large-scale agriculture. The question of cadres for agriculture leads directly to that of training large numbers of new experts in various branches of economy, and at the same time of re-training a considerable part of the old experts. Finally, we have to train our own, very numerous cadres for cultural work, reconstruction of living conditions, etc.

Despite the tremendous growth of activity amongst the workers, despite the expansion of the shock brigade movement and other forms of socialist competition, we encounter at every step incapacity to direct this growing activity along the proper channels and utilise suitably the labour enthusiasm of the masses. The problem here is both the unsatisfactory character of a considerable portion of the engineering and technical personnel and (not infrequently) the poor acquaintance of our economic leaders with the essential principles of the productive processes. The same reasons explain the slow application of the principle of one-man management in the administration of industry. Yet the Party requires the resolute application of the principle of one-man management, beginning with the workshop and ending with the highest economic authorities. Only given this condition can the strict responsibility of economic and technical managers for the work committed to their care be ensured. Without it we cannot secure a rapid rationalisation of production, nor, consequently, the lowering of the cost of production while improving its quality. The introduction of one-man management in our factories must be reinforced by the active support of the workers' organisations, and must create still more favourable conditions for an increasing participation of the workers in the management of industry.

Such a system of management represents a big step forward in the organisation of socialist production. The more decisive are our successes in the training of new cadres and the re-education of the old, the more quickly and successfully shall we apply the principle of one-man management. The closer the approach to the workers on the part of our engineers and technicians, and the better they understand the necessity of relying in their work on the active support of the proletarian organisations, while main-

taining the unquestioned and strict responsibility of the administrative and technical staff for their work, the more successfully shall we grapple with the execution of our production programme. The more our communist managers grasp the essential principles of the processes of production, the more confidently can they approach the task of instituting one-man management and really bringing about both strict responsibility of the managers and high productive discipline of the workers, without which we cannot "overtake and outstrip" the capitalist countries.

Nearly two years ago, after the exposure of the Shakhty sabotage, the Party declared war against those methods of economic management which are characteristic of the so-called "commissars of a poorer type" in industry. In this struggle we have as yet achieved very little. The problem faces us still of mastering the essential principles of the processes of production and acquiring their technique. This necessitates the intensification of the technical and economic training of communist managers, and, still more, work on a large scale to train new personnel who could independently master the whole organisation of production, including its technique.

In passing, it should be noted that the necessity for training experts for economic and cultural work on a large scale led the Party to take a decision to reorganise the whole system of universities, technical colleges and technical schools. These educational institutions are being handed over to the appropriate People's Commissariats and economic organisations. I should mention also such new steps as the transformation of individual factories into factory technical schools. The Supreme Economic Council has fixed upon three factories with which to make this change in the near future. Thus there are being created new methods of training personnel which have never previously existed in practice, and at the same time we are feeling for new paths to bring about the rapprochement of school and production.

As an illustration of the new problems facing communists in the U.S.S.R. I will quote an example from the work of our learned institutions. Until quite recently, at the Institute of Red Professors, a certain menshevik, Rubin, enjoyed a tremendous influence in questions of political economy. He succeeded in directing the activities of part of our students in the I.R.P. along a false path, by diverting their attention from militant questions of the theory of soviet economy and the theory of world imperialism to scholastic and abstract discussions. For some time a considerable body of our students in training for research work were in the grip of this "Rubinism," which was menshevik in its political tendency, and "idealistic" in its philosophical basis. Owing to the fact that the criticism of Rubin was at first undertaken only

by comrades who themselves were guilty of a tendency towards Right ideology, the exposure of the true menshevik substance of Rubinism was retarded. It was only quite recently, and not without the intervention of the Central Committee, that there was a sharp break in this respect. Both Rubinism and the mistakes of its former critics have been fundamentally exposed. Materials on this question can be found in the last issue of the *Bolshevik*.*

Much that is similar to the situation in the region of political economy prevails in some other spheres of scientific work. The task of independently mastering science and technique faces the bolsheviks as a militant problem of the day. Without definite successes in this direction we cannot move ahead with certainty. This is how matters stand with the problem of personnel.

3.—THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE WORK OF OUR ORGANISATIONS.

I will now deal with a third group of problems : problems of the reorganisation of the work of all the organisations of the proletariat in keeping with the new conditions and the transition to the period of reconstruction. The increase of activity amongst the masses and the new practical tasks dictate the most sweeping changes in the machinery of the proletarian dictatorship and the methods of its work. However, the reorganisation very often takes place too slowly.

Let us take *trade unions*. This is the second year that the Party has been struggling for decisive readjustment of the unions to their new problems. "Eyes on production" is their new watchword. But its application up to this very day encounters tremendous obstacles in the union apparatus. Again and again the leading bodies in the trade unions lag behind the masses, as is shown, for example, in their inability to take the lead of the shock brigade movement. The absence of proper checking of the work of the shock brigades leads to a large number of show resolutions and formal declarations, the unjustified assumption of the title of shock workshops, etc. The most advanced shock brigades frequently have no proper guidance, and therefore do not receive the requisite support. Yet the latter is one of the most important conditions for ensuring that the watchword of "Eyes on production" should in practice become the watchword of the trade unions, beginning with the works committee and ending with the highest trade union bodies. It stands to reason that to turn towards production cannot mean any forgetfulness of so-called "defensive" work. Concern for the every-day and petty requirements of the workers, sensitiveness to the workers' demand for better living conditions, closeness to the masses, have always been the first

* *Bolshevik*, No. 2, January, 1930.

obligation of the trade unions. To-day this side of their activity, so far from being weakened, must be intensified in every possible way, while waging a still sharper struggle against bureaucratic tendencies in the trade union apparatus.

Given such an attitude to the work of the trade unions, we shall achieve its considerable improvement and raise it still one stage higher. It is with the same object in view that, by the decision of the Central Council of Trade Unions, the cleansing of the trade union apparatus has begun. When we recall the great inertia, routine and bureaucracy which exist in the trade union apparatus, we are bound to welcome this decision. The campaign for re-electing leading committees which has begun in the Metal Workers' Union will also prove very important. The Party strives to bring about the adjustment of the trade unions to the tasks of production, i.e., to extend their part in carrying out the industrial and financial plan and in fulfilling the Five Years' Plan in four years.

Passing now to the *soviets*, I must say that in the sphere of soviet construction, particularly in the villages, our tasks have now undergone important changes. Last year's campaign for the re-election of the *soviets* took place in quite different conditions, when the swing of opinion in the main mass of the peasantry towards collectivisation had not yet taken place. To-day there is necessity for a sharp change in the work of the *soviets*, embodied in the slogan of: "Eyes on the collective farming movement." With this object in view, the Central Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. held a special conference in January of representatives of the local *soviets*. But can it be said that we have already applied this slogan? Of course not. Yet the organisation of the work of the *soviets* has a tremendous bearing on the cause of collectivisation. As the basic organs of the proletarian dictatorship, they must take the lead of the mass movement for collectivisation, they must constitute the leadership in the building of collective farms, they must face fairly and squarely the requirements of the collective farms, assisting them to eliminate defects and mistakes. This, however, we have not achieved as yet; and hence, in a number of places there have taken and are taking place the re-election of the *soviets*, with "Eyes on the collective farms" as the main watchword.

There has also taken place the reorganisation of the *Party apparatus*. Its guiding principle is to intensify the attention of the whole apparatus to the problem of personnel, the problem of distributing old and training new workers, and also the improvement of the Party guidance of various branches of our constructive work. The staff of the higher bodies is now being numerically reduced, and the composition of the leading personnel strengthened

with more skilled Party workers. Our Party cells, particularly in the factories, also require a serious reorganisation of their work.

In the direction of the reconstruction of the work of the unions, soviets and the Party, and also of other organisations of the working class, there is still considerable work ahead of us.

4.—INTERNAL PARTY PROBLEMS.

Now as to the tasks arising directly from our *internal Party policy*. It should not be forgotten that the successes we have won have been possible only thanks to our stubborn and systematic fight against distortions of the Leninist policy of the Party, against all deviations from Leninism.

Events move so fast that we do not always remember clearly enough the stages we have gone through. Yet after the 10th Plenum of the E.C.C.I., i.e., in quite recent months, we have had in the C.P.S.U. some very momentous happenings.

Amongst these must be classed the rout of the Right wing and their subsequent capitulation. This fact has been of great importance, not only for the C.P.S.U., but for the whole Communist International. It had its influence on the attitude of various groups in other parties. The latest news of the capitulation of some of the Right wingers in Germany, e.g., Ewert and others, confirms this conclusion.

During the same time the final disintegration of the Trotskyist cadres has taken place. You are aware that the overwhelming majority of the Trotskyists, together with their most prominent leaders, have capitulated and recognised the correctness of the Party's policy and the mistaken character of their own views. Trotsky retains only a miserable group who are unknown by the workers. All this must be put down to the credit of the Party.

But, comrades, we are not concerned with the laurels of the victor. We are concerned above all with the principle at stake. The principle involved in the struggle against the Right opportunists—the opportunists of the frank type—and against the "Left" opportunists—those of the Trotskyist persuasion—we must recall again and again. Without overcoming these Right and "Left" deviations we should never have the successes which the proletariat of the U.S.S.R. has achieved to-day.

The struggle against Trotskyism was a struggle for a Leninist policy in respect of the main ally of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R.—for an alliance with the middle peasantry. Without routing Trotskyism, without exposing its anti-revolutionary essence to the bitter end, we should not have been able to make our alliance with the middle peasant so firm and powerful as it had to be to carry out collectivisation. Without this alliance, led by the working class in power, the building of socialism is impossible. Yet the very

essence of Trotskyism was its denial of the possibility of a stable alliance with the petty proprietor, the middle peasant, and its lack of faith in the possibility of the successful building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. Without exposing this defeatist essence of Trotskyism and fighting all its variations, the working class of our country would be unable to overcome the obstacles in its path with indomitable persistence and enthusiasm. The rout of Trotskyism and the consolidation of the alliance with the middle peasant were the most important preliminary conditions for the successful progress of socialist construction.

Our resolute struggle against the Right opportunists was also of tremendous significance for the principle at stake. It was essential in order to transform the alliance with the middle peasant into a weapon wherewith to fight the capitalist elements for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. Right waverings made their appearance in the Party with particular force just at the time when the working class was to enter upon a policy of decisive offensive against the capitalist elements, particularly in the villages, which was bound to add to the waverings of the petty bourgeois elements. Nor is it an accident that the capitulation of the right-wingers in our Party coincided with the drastic swing in the attitude of the middle peasantry towards socialism. The struggle against the right-wingers means the struggle against petty bourgeois waverings in the working class, not to speak of pro-kulak waverings amongst the peasantry. Without exposing the liquidatory essence of the Right opportunists' policy, without overcoming the Right waverings in the ranks of the Party, we could not have carried out the mobilisation of the working class, and the mass of peasantry likewise, for the successful application of the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class. Such was the tremendous principle at stake in the struggle against the Right deviation and the conciliatory attitude towards it.

However, the struggle against Trotskyism and the Right deviation cannot only be regarded as a stage passed through. In new forms, variations of these moods are still with us and we shall meet them again in the future. The struggle on two fronts has not been removed by the Party from the order of the day.

Lapses in the application of the Party's policy are still far from rare. There is still, even in the ranks of the Party, not a little of the petty bourgeois spinelessness and hysteria so characteristic of the Trotskyist frame of mind. They show themselves in instances of "Leftism," like the substitution of administrative pressure for real mass work in carrying through collectivisation, like the expropriation as "kulaks" of some middle peasants who have not as yet entered the path of collectivisation, or closing churches by administrative decree, etc. Here, too, must be

classed the idea that, in view of our successes, Lenin's problem of: "Who beats whom?" is no longer a question of the day. Such jumping over a stage of acute class struggle—as undoubtedly the present period is—constitutes a vivid example of an opportunist attempt to slur over the class problems of the proletariat under the cover of "Left" phrases; and therefore it is incompatible with Leninism. The fight against such "leftness," in reality only a variety of opportunism, is our bolshevik duty. Without that fight there can be no serious struggle against Right opportunism.

On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that the ground is still very favourable for petty bourgeois waverings of the frankly right-wing type. Opportunist flabbiness, and particularly passivity in matters relating to the struggle against the kulaks, are characteristic of this state of mind. For example, there are comrades who have thought it timely, in view of our successes in the villages, to close down the soviets in the districts of wholesale collectivisation. An Armavir paper recently published a note on this subject, headed: *Liquidation of Soviet Power*. In other places also, communists have been found to advocate the handing over of "soviet authority" to the managing bodies of the collective farms. These views reflected opportunism, lack of firmness, and frank passivity in the struggle against our class enemy. There is no other explanation possible for this liquidatory attitude towards the soviets, the basic organs of the proletarian dictatorship, the importance of which must *grow* in the period of intensified class struggle. Against these demobilising tendencies, the bolsheviks must also carry on an incessant warfare.

In a period of rapid successes, particularly in the countryside, it is necessary to emphasise the danger of "Left" over-zealousness. As you know, successes sometimes turn the head. A plan is fixed, let us say, for developing collectivisation, the plan is carried out and exceeded, and that in a much shorter time than anticipated. People begin to draw up super-plans—on paper. Another example. The organisation of the peasants in artels is proposed; and, directly the first successes begin, here and there attempts are made to hurry them into communes, without even waiting for the artels to become a little consolidated. All these cases are very like the attitude of: "We shall have a walk-over." We must take timely cognisance of the dangerous character of such a frame of mind, otherwise it will be easy to break away from our native soil and lose contact with the masses, which will be of direct assistance to our class enemy.

Our successes are great only because they rely on the active support of the masses. Without that support, without being buttressed by the widest possible mass of poor and middle peasants, all these successes will melt away. The absolute condition for

the proletariat's leading the peasant masses is the ability to reckon with the special conditions of their existence, which implies the proper recognition of the force of habit and the backwardness of the toiling masses in the country. The task of leadership is not only to determine the proper objective, but to be able to find the correct way to attain it. In present conditions this means rallying the poor peasants and the agricultural labourers around the Party as a nucleus and at the same time strengthening the alliance with the middle peasant in order to carry out the policy of liquidating the kulaks. Not to drag at the tail of the masses, but not to run ahead of them—this is the proper combination of means and end in the struggle to build socialism. Without stubborn and patient work in consolidating our successes in collectivisation, without resolute and systematic struggle against any scramble for purely showy rates of development, and against other forms of "Left" gymnastics, we shall not make our achievements stable and shall not be able to ensure our further progress.

The struggle on two fronts for the line of the Party and for Leninism remains of crucial importance to-day. The emphasis in the struggle has, however, to be laid according to the peculiarities of the moment.

IV.—Conclusions.

To sum up, What is going on in the U.S.S.R.? I will reply to this question first in the words of politicians in the bourgeois camp.

I will begin by quoting the opinion of Lloyd George, according to the "Neue Freie Presse" of December 28th, 1929.

"Bolshevism has not perished, and, it would seem, stands stronger on its feet than ever before. The future of bolshevism depends to a great degree on the success or failure of the Five Years' Plan. The main idea of the Five Years' Plan is as courageous as it is wise. In carrying out the Five Years' Plan, bolshevism is ruthlessly consistent. The bolshevik dictatorship is making heroic efforts to reorganise agriculture and industry. With the limited resources at its disposal, the Soviet Union is purchasing abroad the most up-to-date machines. If the Five Years' Plan succeeds, the Soviet Union will become an extremely important factor in the sphere of transport, commerce and finance."

In the last phrase, of course, Lloyd George attempted to narrow down the importance of our successes. We have no reason to be surprised at this.

Here is what Vandervelde, one of the leaders of the Second International, writes about the U.S.S.R. :

"One cannot shake off the impression that gigantic efforts are being made there, that these efforts have led at all events to a

partial success (as, for example, in the oil industry) and that in any case out of the chaos in which revolutionary Russia still subsists, something great, something new is arising which in no way resembles what has been created and exists in other countries" ("Rigasche Rundschau," January 4th, 1930).

One is bound to agree with Vandervelde that that which is taking place in the U.S.S.R. under the leadership of a party of the Third International is quite different from the situation in the capitalist countries where Socialists of the Second International held or hold the reins of power!

I will now quote an extract from an article in the leading journal of German military circles ("Militär Wochenblatt," February 11th, 1930):

"Just because the soviet government knows that growing industrialisation is identical with the growing defensive capacity of the country, it is seriously interested in the preservation of peace as the primary condition for carrying out the Five Years' Plan. On the other hand, it fears that its enemies have all the more reason to hinder the achievement of the Five Years' Plan, which means the uncommon consolidation of all the economic, political and military forces of the Soviet Union."

We are also bound to agree with these opinions of the experts of German militarism. There can be no doubt that the achievement of the Five Years' Plan does mean "the uncommon consolidation of all the economic, political and military forces of the Soviet Union."

Finally, the following is what the responsible British "Economist" says about the collectivisation of the villages (January 4th, 1930):

"Whether or not this hope be realised, the Russian agrarian revolution is still gathering impetus, and the experiments which are now being made in the one million Russian villages constitute one of the most important events in modern economic history."

In this article, headed: "Reconstruction in Russia. IV. Revolution by Tractor," there is particularly strong evidence of a desire to belittle the importance of what is going on here. How otherwise can we explain the attempt of the "Economist" to describe the collectivisation of millions of peasant farms as "revolution by tractor"? Even to calm one's own feelings such methods are not to be recommended. What is going on in our country is something very different from a mere "revolution by tractor." It is very far from this; it is something much bigger.

It is also said to be an "anti-kulak revolution." Of course, in a certain sense this is true. But even this definition is obviously insufficient to bring out the substance of the matter. Something much bigger than an anti-kulak revolution is taking place.

What, then, is going on in the U.S.S.R.? Let us turn to the facts and draw the conclusions. I will deal with three features.

First, the most important of all is what is going on in the sphere of *production*. Until quite recently, until the definite turn of the tide in collectivisation, it was only in industry that we had the predominance of the socialist type of production, and the importance of the consistently socialist elements in production and transport growing year by year. In agriculture, however, the socialist elements played an insignificant part. The decisive factor in recent months is the conversion of the main body of petty peasant farms to large-scale agricultural production of the socialist type, which is bound up with the liquidation of the capitalist elements in the villages. Socialist industry is now being reinforced by agriculture, which is reconstructing itself on socialist lines. In this way the U.S.S.R. takes its stand firmly on the basis of socialist production.

Secondly, in the sphere of *trade and credit*, the dominant position of state and co-operative trading has been firmly established. By the end of this year, even in retail trade, the private sector will represent only one-tenth. The reorganisation of the credit system finishes off, as it were, the adjustment of the economic apparatus with its "super-structures" to the period of reconstruction. Thus, the totality of changes in the economic apparatus, productive, commercial, and credit, gives a clear idea of the difference between the present stage of the New Economic Policy and its first stage.

Thirdly comes the question of the *state apparatus* as a whole. Here the reconstruction is proceeding much more slowly. But the changes now taking place in the productive basis, and also in commerce, particularly in connection with the development of the preliminary conditions for establishing planned exchange between town and country, are bound to reflect themselves in the whole machinery of the state. The motive force in the reconstruction of the state machinery is the participation of the mass of workers in the administration of the state. Through various channels the masses are to-day being drawn more and more into this work. Substantial achievements in the improvement of state administration as a whole are bound up with successes of the cultural revolution, the genuine beginnings of which are the rapidly increasing cultural requirements of the mass of workers and peasants.

The features I have enumerated which characterise the processes now at work in the U.S.S.R. make it possible to come to a general conclusion. The conclusion is that *in the Soviet Union to-day are being laid the foundations of socialist society*. We have set about

laying these foundations *all along the line* and, despite every difficulty, are successfully going ahead.

All this leads to a radical change, not only of the internal situation in the U.S.S.R., but also to most important changes in the international sphere. Let me deal briefly with this final point.

It is scarcely necessary to say that from the very moment that the Soviet Republic was founded, a sharp distinction of principle was drawn between the U.S.S.R. and the bourgeois states. The antagonism between the political principles of the land of the soviets and the bourgeois states told at every step. Only now, however, as a result of mass collectivisation, do these differences attain their most acute stage. Until quite recently, along the whole boundary of the U.S.S.R., there could be found on both sides more or less similar systems of economy; both there and here petty individual peasant economy was predominant. There were no radical differences in production, so far as agriculture is concerned. Now the position is sharply changing: collectivised agriculture has come squarely up to the very frontier of the bourgeois states. Thus, immediately after that frontier begins, not only a different political system, but also a different economic system and a different type of economy. The antagonism of principle between the country which is building socialism and the capitalism with which it is surrounded is being laid bare. This must be reckoned with in drawing political conclusions.

We must also reckon with the fact that such a situation vastly increases the importance of the U.S.S.R. in respect of its influence on the toiling masses of the capitalist countries and the countries of a colonial type, particularly in the conditions of the growing world economic crisis.

The bourgeoisie in the countries of imperialism is already drawing its conclusions. The frenzied anti-soviet campaign which is developing, whatever its pretext, is evidence of this. The question of the imperialist preparations for war against the U.S.S.R. now becomes particularly acute. The Soviet Union knows, however, that in the person of the international proletariat it has a mighty ally. In reply to the furious attacks of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R. there arise all over the world new columns of revolutionary workers, out to defend their rights, and to defend also the U.S.S.R. as the symbol of their emancipation. The rising revolutionary wave inspires confidence in the working class of our country and strengthens its faith in victory. The proletariat of the Soviet Union considers its first duty to be to strengthen its links with the whole international proletariat and the oppressed masses of the colonies. The successful progress of socialist industry; the developing collectivisation of the poor and middle

peasant masses in the villages; the realisation, in the measure that collectivisation proceeds, of the slogan of "liquidating the kulaks as a class"; the simultaneously growing support of socialist construction of the U.S.S.R. on the part of the international proletariat, are transforming our country into a force which cannot be broken, a state which cannot be overcome.

V.—Closing Remarks,

Comrades, it remains for me to express my complete solidarity with what has been said here by those who have spoken on behalf of other Communist Parties. Their speeches have shown that there is complete unanimity in the ranks of the Communist International in evaluating what is going on in the U.S.S.R. I will add only a few remarks on the meaning of the successes of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and on the difficulties of socialist construction.

Our *successes* are unquestionable. They are embodied most vividly in the successful carrying out of the Five Years' Plan. It has been proved in practice that the plan not only can be carried out, but will probably be completed in a shorter time. Furthermore, Comrade Thalmann had every reason to contrast the Five Years' Plan of the U.S.S.R. with the Young Plan in Europe. The comparison of these two plans—that which is being applied under the leadership of the bolsheviks, and the Young Plan, which is being applied by the finance capital of Germany and the victorious countries, under the hegemony of American imperialism—is an object lesson of the significance of the struggle of communism against capitalism. And the same comparison shows what prospects there are before each plan. The prospects of communism are the prospects of struggle for victory all over the world. The prospects of capitalism are the prospects of destruction, one of the most striking harbingers of which will be the collapse of the Young Plan. The Young Plan represents a new attempt of the victorious countries, in alliance with German finance capital, to increase the weight of the load upon the shoulders of the proletariat of the conquered country, and at the same time to increase the burden of exploitation borne by the workers and toilers in the other capitalist countries. The obligation of the communists, particularly the communists in the dominant capitalist countries of Europe, must be the international consolidation of their forces and the achievement of unity in their actions for the struggle against the Young Plan and other methods of enslaving the workers. The comparison of the Young Plan with the Five Years' Plan of the U.S.S.R. makes it possible to open up better before the workers the prospects of struggle for their emancipation.

I will refer again to the main conclusion of my report. This was that in the socialist transformation of the productive basis in agriculture—the joining of socialist forms of industrial production with large-scale agriculture on socialist lines—there is being developed along the whole front in the U.S.S.R. the construction of the foundations of the socialist order. The socialist order cannot arise otherwise than on the foundation of large-scale production in the decisive branches of economy. Only on the basis of such a reconstruction of the productive basis can there disappear the contradictions between town and country, and only with the final destruction of this contradiction is the building of socialist society possible. Consequently, mass collectivisation and the building of the soviet farms will complete the laying of the foundations for the development of the socialist order of society. The success of collectivisation and, consequently, the “liquidating of the kulaks as a class,” radically alter the conditions of economic, cultural and every other form of development in our country. On a new productive basis, on the basis of large-scale economy both in town and in country, there will proceed the vast reconstruction of all forms of our social life. This reconstruction has already begun.

It must be stated that nowadays nearly every day brings something new of great importance for socialist construction. Equally with yourselves, we who participate directly in this work are amazed at the new forms, new methods, new waves of enthusiasm which come out of the very heart of the masses. In the most scattered corners of the U.S.S.R., with its patchwork of economic and national peculiarities, in the central districts of the Union and the little national regions on our borders, there spring up new forces with unheard-of rapidity, great new masses of workers are drawn into the building of socialism. Taking into account the new forms of socialist construction, the Central Committee strengthens its connections with the districts by many various means. The central bodies would not be able to give anything like a prompt reply to the questions raised by living practice were it not for frequent visits to the districts, the study of practical work in the localities, of the execution of the plan in the factories, of collectivisation, etc., by members of the Central Committee and its Political Bureau themselves. In even greater measure this is true of our local committees, whose members spend months in the localities. Yet even so our organisations in many respects lag behind the requirements of practical work.

The speeding up of the rate, and the growth of new forms, of socialist construction are to be explained by the fact of the ever-increasing masses, millions upon millions of toilers, which are drawn into this work. The growing activity in the working class and the peasantry finds its expression in constantly new forms,

and at every step reveals the shortcomings in the work of our organisations and their unsuitability for work in the new conditions. Eleven and a half millions are organised in our trade unions. It is easy to see that the increase in the activity of the working masses has greatly complicated the work of the leading trade union bodies. The collective farming movement already embraces about 15 million peasant farms. Overturning the traditional order of things in the villages, collectivisation refashions the village anew, and, of course, to take control of this movement is patently beyond the powers of many agricultural co-operative organisations. In the growth of new forms of mass movement, both in the differing forms of socialist competition in the factories and in the building of collective farms in the villages, there is much that is as yet unstable and fluid. This involves—particularly in the backward districts—the danger that the movement may ebb, and that waverings may take place amongst the masses in other forms. The stormy torrent by which the country is undergoing its revolutionary transformation bears with it a great deal of silt; but the ever-increasing attraction of the masses into the work of socialist construction is the guarantee that socialism is being built up in our country on a firm and stable basis. In this, of course, one cannot exaggerate the importance of the leadership of the Bolshevik Party.

It is necessary to say a few words in particular about the tasks of the Party leadership in the present conditions. It is unnecessary to prove to you that the Party has always moved, and moves to-day, as the vanguard of the toiling masses, that it controlled and controls the whole enterprise of socialist construction. As new millions are drawn into that work, the tasks of the vanguard become particularly responsible. The vanguard has to show initiative, daring and consistency in its fight against the enemy, and at the same time it must be able to lead a mass numbering many millions in its train, patiently explaining the road to be travelled, raising its spirits and confidence in periods of inevitable difficulty. To be able to take the lead of millions and tens of millions of toilers in town and country means, on the one hand, not to give way to hesitation in applying our principles—something we will have to deal with more than once yet—and on the other hand, not to run too far ahead, to be able to consolidate the stage which has been passed through and to bring up the detachments which fall behind, taking into account the necessity for reckoning with the peculiar conditions of particular sections of the workers. Only given these premises will the victory of our cause be assured and confidence in victory develop amongst the masses themselves. Lenin taught us all this with particular insistence. Our successes are to be explained by the fact that amongst the masses of workers

and peasants there has grown up the knowledge that Lenin's policy is correct, and that the path along which we are moving is the right one, leading to a new and better life for the workers. That is why the popularity of socialist competition is growing amongst the mass of workers. That is why thousands upon thousands of collective farms are emphasising their objective by taking such names as *Lenin's Path*, *The Comintern*, *The Bolshevik*, *Red October*, etc.

But I must emphasise again and again that these successes do not come easily. There are still vast difficulties in the road to the building of socialism, and vast efforts by the working class and all the toilers will be required to overcome them.

It is only this year that we have emerged from the grain crisis. During the two previous years the question of grain was one of the most difficult of all. In order to get grain for the cities we had to break down tremendous resistance on the part of the kulaks. In 1928 and 1929 the grain front was the most dangerous sector of our construction. We have, moreover, to reckon with the possibility of bad harvests in the future. But even now we cannot say that everything stands well with us as regards a number of most important foodstuffs, such as meat and butter. Our backwardness in cattle-breeding makes itself felt in the consuming centres, and in this sphere we have done very little. The main conditions for developing cattle-breeding is the improvement of our grain harvest.

Further, the collective farming movement, which is developing into the wholesale collectivisation of the countryside, means at the same time the application of the policy of liquidating the kulaks as a class. This is bound up with very great difficulties, and leads at the present stage to the intensification of the class struggle. It is a task of great difficulty to rally the overwhelming mass of the peasantry in practice around the Party, and to lead them against the kulak, who only yesterday not infrequently enjoyed great influence in the village. Our organisations in the villages are tiny. The soviets are weak. The masses are very little cultured. The forces of the enemy are straining their last effort and making desperate attempts. Despite all the successes of our work amongst the mass of peasantry, we cannot under any circumstances depreciate the difficulties of the present stage of socialist construction in the villages.

A few words more about personnel, particularly technical personnel. All our work is now being brought up against this problem first and foremost. We are intensifying our efforts to re-educate the old technical cadres and are paying special attention to the training of new cadres, cadres of Red experts. Our difficulties in this sphere are particularly great, owing to the cultural

backwardness of the masses. The problem of personnel is, in fact, only part of a much wider problem, that of the cultural revolution. Here we require such a speed of development as is unthinkable in any country without the rule of the working class : we require the raising of the cultural level of masses which number many millions.

Last come our international difficulties. In this sphere lie the chief difficulties which the U.S.S.R. has to face. The representatives of the Communist Parties who spoke here have sufficiently emphasised this aspect. We cannot forget that the rising wave of revolution in the capitalist countries and in the colonies leads to the strengthening of imperialist hostility to the U.S.S.R. We are accustomed to anti-soviet provocation on the part of our foreign enemies. We know that to-day the toiling masses of our country have to be ready for new acts of provocation and new attempts to develop a military attack on the U.S.S.R.

In conclusion, I will quote Lenin's notable words in his article : "On Our Revolution." In this article, directed against the "socialists" of the Second International and against those who, like N. Sukhanov, were following after them, Lenin reveals the significance of the November Revolution with exceptional power. Lenin writes :

" 'Russia has not reached the high level of development of productive forces which makes socialism possible.' All the heroes of the Second International, including, of course, Sukhanov, carry this principle about like the holy sacrament. They repeat this unquestionable truth in a thousand different ways, but I think it is not a decisive method of appraising our revolution."

After pointing out the peculiarity of the international and internal conditions under which the November Revolution took place, Lenin exposes the anti-Marxist essence of the position taken up by the socialists of the Second International, stating his case as follows :

"If to create socialism requires a definite level of culture (though no one can tell us what exactly is that definite 'level of culture'), why can we not begin first of all with the conquest by revolutionary means of the preliminary conditions for that definite level, and later, on the foundation already of 'a workers' and peasants' government and the soviet system, move forward to catch up the other peoples?"

Developing this thought, Lenin writes :

"To build up socialism, you say, requires civilisation. Very good. Then why could you not begin by creating such premises of civilisation at home as the expulsion of the landlords and the driving out of the Russian capitalists, in order to begin the movement to socialism afterwards?"

It is necessary to recall this most profound observation of Lenin.

As you are aware, the Party under Lenin's leadership did exactly as he suggested. The November Revolution completed the bourgeois democratic revolution in the countryside and at the same time, in its capacity of a genuine proletarian revolution, effected the "driving out of the Russian capitalists." With the passing of industry into the hands of the working class the foundations of the socialist order of society *began* to be laid. The success of the collectivisation of agriculture will mean the *completion* of the building of that foundation in our country. From this we can draw conclusions as to the significance of the present stage of socialist construction.

More than one year, of course, will be required to consolidate that foundation. But it is an established fact that the foundations of the socialist order to society are now being laid along the line—even in the backward village—and thereby is being accomplished the destruction of the last roots of capitalism. On the basis of the Leninist policy of the Party and the Communist International, socialism is being victoriously built in the U.S.S.R., thus hastening the great victory of the international proletariat.



